

THE TEXT OF THE GOSPELS  
IN CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA



Society of Biblical Literature



The New Testament in the Greek Fathers

Michael W. Holmes,  
Series Editor

Number 9

THE TEXT OF THE GOSPELS  
IN CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA

THE TEXT OF THE GOSPELS  
IN CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA

Carl P. Cosaert

Society of Biblical Literature  
Atlanta

## THE TEXT OF THE GOSPELS IN CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA

Copyright © 2008 by the Society of Biblical Literature

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by means of any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act or in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission should be addressed in writing to the Rights and Permissions Office, Society of Biblical Literature, 825 Houston Mill Road, Atlanta, GA 30329 USA.

### Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Cosaert, Carl P., 1968–

The text of the Gospels in Clement of Alexandria / by Carl P. Cosaert.  
p. cm. — (New Testament and the Greek Fathers ; no. 9)

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN: 978-1-58983-372-2 (paper binding : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-1-58983-373-9 (electronic library copy)

1. Clement, of Alexandria, Saint, ca. 150–ca. 215. 2. Bible. N.T. Gospels—Criticism, Textual. 3. Bible. N.T. Gospels Greek—Versions. I. Title.

BS2551.C67 2008

226'.0486—dc22

2008032440

16 15 14 13 12 11 10 09 08 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free, recycled paper  
conforming to ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (R1997) and ISO 9706:1994  
standards for paper permanence.



In memory of

Melinda R. Cosaert

(May 15, 1990-July 18, 2006)

Beloved daughter

whose loving presence and  
sweet smile is dearly missed



## CONTENTS

Series Editor's Foreword .....	ix
Preface .....	xi
Abbreviations .....	xiii
1. Clement of Alexandria: The Most Learned of All.....	1
2. Clement and the New Testament .....	20
3. Introduction to the Text and Critical Apparatus.....	45
4. The Gospel Text in Clement: Text and Apparatus.....	57
5. Quantitative Analysis .....	219
6. Group Profile Analysis .....	251
7. The Typology of Clement's Readings.....	277
8. The Transmission of the Gospels in Alexandria.....	305
Appendix 1: Indeterminable Gospel References.....	311
Appendix 2: Catena Fragments and Latin References .....	336
Appendix 3: The Gospel Text of Clement's Opponents .....	339
Appendix 4: Clement in the Apparatus of NA <sup>27</sup> and UBS <sup>4</sup> .....	343
Bibliography .....	355





## SERIES EDITOR'S FOREWORD

Properly interpreted, patristic evidence for the text of the New Testament offers a major resource of primary importance for establishing the text of the New Testament as well as for writing the history of its transmission. In contrast to the earliest New Testament manuscripts, which can often be dated only rather generally and about whose geographical provenance frequently nothing is known, citations of the New Testament by Christian writers of late antiquity can be located, often with some degree of precision, with respect to both time and space. It is this feature of patristic citations that makes them particularly important for the task of writing the history of the transmission and development of the text of the documents that now comprise the New Testament. The ability of patristic evidence to document the existence of a variant reading or textual tradition at a particular time in a specific geographic location renders this category of testimony invaluable for the historian of early Christianity.

The Society of Biblical Literature's monograph series *The New Testament in the Greek Fathers* is devoted to explorations of patristic texts and authors that will contribute to a better understanding of the history of the transmission of the New Testament text. Each volume investigates the text of the New Testament (or parts thereof) as preserved in the writings of a significant Christian author. While the series does not impose a specific format, each volume provides an exhaustive presentation of the relevant data, an apparatus that indicates the alignment (or lack thereof) of this data with carefully selected representative textual witnesses, and a statistical analysis of these data and alignments—typically both a quantitative assessment of their affinities with leading representatives of known textual traditions and a profile analysis that nuances the quantitative findings. Finally, since the goal is not only to gather and assess the evidence but also to interpret its significance, conclusions or observations are offered regarding the implications of the findings for the history of the text and its transmission.

Dr. Carl Cosaert's contribution to the series takes the form of a thorough, comprehensive, and much-needed investigation of the text of the Gospels in the writings of Clement of Alexandria (ca. A.D. 150–216). Although uncertainty surrounds the place of Clement's birth, Clement's interest in the teachings of Christianity led him eventually to settle in Alexandria as a young man around A.D. 180, first as a student under the

tutelage of a respected Christian teacher known as Pantaenus, and finally as the head of his own "Christian school." During his tenure in Alexandria, Clement wrote extensively in defense of his understanding of the Christian faith, filling his writings with literally thousands of biblical and classical citations. Although an outbreak of persecution in 202 brought an end to his stay in Alexandria, Clement had already established himself as the first in a series of major church fathers whose names would be forever connected with the famed intellectual heritage of that renowned and influential city.

Dr. Cosaert's meticulous study (which renders obsolete previous work on the subject) reveals that, while a "textual" connection does appear to exist between Clement and later Alexandrian fathers, his text of the Gospels was not monolithic. On the contrary, Clement's Gospel citations document the presence of a number of different textual streams in circulation in Alexandria at the end of the second century. A primarily Alexandrian influence is evident in John and Matthew, while in Luke and in his citations of Mark 10 a stronger Western influence is observable. In all, Dr. Cosaert's volume is a substantial contribution to the series that will be of interest to New Testament and patristic scholars alike.

Michael W. Holmes

Editor, The New Testament in the Greek Fathers

## PREFACE

While the importance of patristic citations for establishing both the text and the transmission history of the New Testament has long been recognized, it is only recently that major methodological advances have made access to the patristic evidence more accessible and reliable than ever before. Since the publication of Bart Ehrman's study of Didymus the Blind's text of the Gospels in 1986, a slow but ever-steady number of published and unpublished dissertations have continued to provide invaluable patristic evidence about the form of the text in specific locations around the Mediterranean. This book seeks to continue in that tradition by examining the text of the Gospels in the writings of Clement of Alexandria.

My interest in the significance of the patristic evidence for New Testament textual criticism originated in a graduate seminar with Larry Richards at Andrews University. After reading and discussing an article by Gordon Fee on the topic, I became so interested that I decided to pursue a doctoral degree at the University of North Carolina, where I would be able to work under the supervision of Bart Ehrman. During my doctoral studies at Chapel Hill, I noticed that a considerable amount of attention had focused on the possible connection between the so-called "Alexandrian" text and the biblical citations of church fathers from Alexandria such as Didymus, Origen, and Athanasius. While studies suggested a correspondence does exist between the Gospel citations of several Alexandrian fathers and the manuscripts traditionally labeled as "Alexandrian," I realized an important piece of the evidence was missing: the reevaluation of Clement, the earliest of the Alexandrian fathers, on the basis of the latest methodological advances.

Without an analysis of Clement's Gospel citations, it is impossible to know what form of the New Testament text existed in Alexandria at the end of the second century. Did the "Alexandrian" text exist in Alexandria at that time, or did it emerge at a later time? Moreover, did Clement's textual tradition have any influence on the textual inclinations of later Alexandrian fathers? It was these kind of questions that ultimately led to my decision to undertake the rigorous task of identifying, collating, and evaluating Clement's text of the Gospels. It is my hope that the findings in the following chapters will help in answering some of these questions and in the process might contribute yet another piece of evidence for better understanding the transmission history of the New Testament text.

The challenges and joys that I have experienced in completing this project, both in its original form as a doctoral dissertation and in its current thoroughly revised form, have convinced me that such a momentous task could never have been accomplished without the guidance, encouragement, and support of many individuals. I owe particular thanks to Bart Ehrman. In addition to benefiting from this support and candid guidance as my dissertation advisor, my academic experience was enriched more than I would have ever imagined as the result of the opportunity to work as his research and teaching assistant during the years I spent in North Carolina. Special thanks also goes to the members of my dissertation committee, Elizabeth Clark, Jodi Magness, Zlatko Pleše, and, in particular, to my external examiner, Michael Holmes. I am indebted to him not only for his insightful reactions and suggestions that enabled me to see additional ways in which to develop the significance of this work but also for his encouragement, guidance, and editorial work that helped bring this volume into print.

I would be negligent if I failed to extend my thanks to my colleagues in the graduate program at Carolina for their support, good humor, and friendship during our time together as students. I especially thank Jared Anderson, Catherine Burris, Jason File, Rabia Gregory (now at the University of Missouri-Columbia), Pamela Reaves, Bennie Reynolds, Jacob Shields, and Eric Scherbenske. Thanks also goes to the members of the Raleigh Seventh-day Adventist Church for making my family feel at home in North Carolina.

I am also grateful for my newest set of colleagues and friends at Walla Walla University. To them I am indebted not only for the warm collegiality and rich intellectual life I have found here but most of all for the emotional support they provided (and continue to provide) when my sixteen-year-old daughter, Mindy, tragically drowned nearly a year after we arrived.

My deepest appreciation is reserved for my family: to my children, Mindy, Marissa, McKenzie, and Matthew for their love and patience with a busy Dad; and, most of all, to my wife Carol for all her support and untiring love. Last of all, however, I thank my God, who gives me hope that the pain and suffering that so mars this life is not the end. It is because of the hope I have in him that I dedicate this book to my darling daughter Mindy.

Carl P. Cosaert,  
College Place, Washington  
February 2008

## ABBREVIATIONS

ANTF	Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i> . Part 2, <i>Principat</i> . Edited by Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972–.
BDF	Friedrich Blass, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk, <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament</i> . Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
CGTC	Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary
<i>CH</i>	<i>Church History</i>
<i>CQR</i>	<i>Church Quarterly Review</i>
<i>Div</i>	<i>Divinitas</i>
EFN	Estudios de Filología Neotestamentaria
<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses</i>
FC	Fathers of the Church
<i>FgNT</i>	<i>Filologia Neotestamentaria</i>
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte
<i>HeyJ</i>	<i>Heythrop Journal</i>
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<i>JAC</i>	<i>Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JP</i>	<i>Journal of Philology</i>
<i>JRH</i>	<i>Journal of Religious History</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
NA <sup>27</sup>	Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27th ed.
NHMS	Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies

PatSor	Patristica Sorbonensia
<i>REA</i>	<i>Revue des études anciennes</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>RHR</i>	<i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i>
<i>RSR</i>	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLNTGP	Society of Biblical Literature The New Testament in the Greek Fathers
SC	Sources chrétiennes
SD	Studies and Documents
<i>SecCent</i>	<i>Second Century</i>
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
<i>StPatr</i>	<i>Studia patristica</i>
TR	Textus Receptus (Stephanus, 1550)
<i>TLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
TS	Texts and Studies
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen
TUGAL	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
UBS <sup>4</sup>	United Bible Societies Greek New Testament, 4th ed.
<i>VC</i>	<i>Vigiliae christianae</i>
VCSup	Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
<i>ZKG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>
<i>ZWT</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie</i>

## CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA: THE MOST LEARNED OF ALL

With its rich cultural and intellectual heritage, dating back to its founder Alexander the Great, Alexandria is a particularly tantalizing source for understanding how Christianity took root and spread in such an influential city of the ancient world, a city second only to Rome in size and importance. Being a significant center of trade and commerce, as well as home of the largest Jewish community outside of Palestine, Alexandria would have been an ideal location for Christianity to take root at a very early date. Unfortunately, a veil of darkness shrouds the beginning of Christianity in Alexandria for over a century. It is only through the writings of Clement of Alexandria in the second half of the second century that the first reliable glimmer of light begins to shine on the Christian community there.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Although Eusebius mentions a couple of events in connection with the emergence of Christianity in Alexandria, there is likely little historical value in his legendary account. In his attempt to connect an apostolic tradition to the spread of Christianity, Eusebius claims that Mark was the first to visit Egypt with the gospel and that he was personally responsible for establishing churches in Alexandria (*Hist. eccl.* 2.16.1). Eusebius even claims that the ascetic community known from Philo's writings as the Therapeutae were Mark's first Christian converts.

The combination of the absence of primary evidence for the presence of proto-orthodox Christianity in Egypt and Alexandria until the late second century and the presence of heterodox teachers like Basilides and Valentinus in Alexandria led Walter Bauer to claim that the earliest type of Christianity in Egypt was "gnostic" (see his *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* [trans. and ed. R. A. Kraft et al.; Philadelphia: Fortress 1971; repr., Mifflintown, Pa.: Sigler Press, 1996], 44–53; trans. of *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* [2nd ed.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1964]). Though Baur's general thesis that earliest Christianity was highly diverse from its inception has withstood the test of time, his claim that Christianity in Egypt was originally gnostic is an overstatement. Though there remains no extant evidence from the first century, the discovery of early Christian manuscripts dating back to the second century with the presence of *nomina sacra* has led to a growing consensus among scholars on the strong influence of Jewish Christianity in Egypt (Colin H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* [London: Oxford University Press]; A. F. J. Klijn, "Jewish Christianity in Egypt," in *The Roots*

In addition to the significance of Clement's writings for the fields of church history and theology, his writings also offer, at least *prima facie*, a treasure trove of text-critical information. Clement's writings are packed with literally thousands of biblical (both canonical and noncanonical) and classical citations.<sup>2</sup> Though not always orthodox in his views—at least from the perspective of later orthodoxy—Clement's knowledge and love of literature still lead many later church scholars to admire the breadth of his erudition. Jerome, for example, no simpleton himself, refers respectfully to Clement as “the most learned of all.”<sup>3</sup> Clement's familiarity and interaction with such a broad spectrum of literary texts not only paints a fascinating portrait of a man unsurpassed in erudition among early Christians but also provides a particularly important patristic witness to the transmission of the text of the New Testament in Alexandria at the end of the second century C.E.

---

*of Egyptian Christianity* [ed. B. A. Pearson and J. E. Goehring; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986], 161–75; Birger A. Pearson, “Earliest Christianity in Egypt: Some Observations,” in Pearson and Goehring, *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, 132–56). Everett Procter also points out that the absence of distinctly gnostic features in Christian writings associated with Alexandria (e.g., Epistle of Barnabas) may indicate that such texts belong to the proto-orthodox communities living in the city (*Christian Controversy in Alexandria: Clement's Polemic against the Basilideans and Valentinians* [New York: Lang, 1995], 5 n. 2). Thus in light of the limited evidence available, it is probably best to conceive of earliest Christianity in Alexandria, at least until the first quarter of the second century, as comprising a diverse group of Christians of sundry theological perspectives.

<sup>2</sup> Ascertaining the exact number of Clement's citations is difficult, since his references include direct quotations as well as adaptations and allusions to his text. If one includes all three categories, there are approximately 5,000 references to the New Testament and over 3,200 to the Old Testament in Clement's writings (Eric F. Osborn, “Clement and the Bible,” in *Origeniana sexta: Origène et la Bible* [ed. G. Dorival and A. le Boulluec; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1995], 121). Even if one excludes indirect citations, W. Krause clearly shows that his direct quotations from both biblical and Greek literature far surpass their use among other early church fathers (*Die Stellung der frühchristlichen Autoren zur heidnischen Literatur* [Vienna: Herder, 1958], 26). While Krause compiled the statistics for the following chart from indices that are outdated today, the overall sense of the usage is still valid.

	O.T.	N.T.	Christ.	Greek	Roman
Irenaeus	57	865	—	16	—
Hippolytus	194	269	61	118	—
Clement	1002	1608	152	966	1
Origen	552	934	6	39	—

<sup>3</sup> Jerome, *Ep.* 70.4. Throughout this study I make use of existing English translations, though I frequently make minor alterations in light of modern usage without comment.



The primary value of any patristic witness for the text of the New Testament resides in the ability to pinpoint with relative accuracy a Father's use of a text to a specific place and time in history, unlike the ambiguity that typically surrounds manuscripts, for example.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, recent patristic studies have shown that the ability to place a Father's text in a specific historical context also provides the possibility of understanding how local events may have played some role in the way a Father chose to transmit his text.<sup>5</sup> Therefore, before surveying the previous text-critical work on Clement, this study will commence with a brief overview of Clement's life and writings, as well as a consideration of his citation habits, in an attempt to consider fully the influences that may affect Clement's use of the New Testament Gospels.

#### CLEMENT'S LIFE

There is little certainty regarding the details of Clement's life.<sup>6</sup> His Latin

---

<sup>4</sup> Eldon J. Epp demonstrates, for example, that the "dynamic interchanges of people, letters, and books to and from Egypt" rules out the assumption that all of the extant Egyptian papyri discovered in Egypt originated from Egypt ("The Papyrus Manuscripts of the New Testament," in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis* [ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes; SD 46; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995], 8). The most accurate source of dating and locating manuscripts is the presence of colophons identifying a manuscript's scribe, location, and date. Unfortunately, such colophons are extremely rare and always late (e.g., 623, 1562). While the value of paleography should not be overlooked, patristic witnesses continue to offer the most datable and geographically certain evidence available. See Gordon Fee, "The Use of the Greek Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism," in Ehrman and Holmes, *Text of the New Testament*, 191–207; Bruce Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Palaeography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981).

<sup>5</sup> This is one of the significant advances in recent patristic textual studies. An example can be seen in John Brogan's brilliant analysis of Athanasius's text of the Gospels. Brogan demonstrates that Athanasius's historico-polemical context not only influenced his own use of the text but also actually influenced the transmission history of the New Testament itself. This took place when Athanasius's textual corruptions "found their way into the stream of textual transmission, being placed there by unknown scribes who belonged to interpretive communities influenced by Athanasius and/or his teachings" (John Jay Brogan, "The Text of the Gospels in the Writings of Athanasius" [Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1997], 299).

<sup>6</sup> Eusebius is the principle biographical source for Clement's life, though his comments are far from extensive. Eusebius's work should not be accepted uncritically, however. Eusebius not only possessed little information himself about Clement, but he also clearly wrote from an apologetic perspective. Thus in addition to drawing inferences beyond the extent of the evidence, Eusebius sought to establish the

name, Titus Flavius Clemens, may suggest that one of his ancestors was a freedman attached to the house of T. Flavius Clemens, a distinguished Roman aristocrat of the imperial Flavian family, who was put to death by the

---

legitimacy of Christianity in his day by establishing an unbroken succession of orthodox bishops and teachers dating back to the apostles themselves. Commenting on the problems associated with Eusebius's history, Robert T. Grant notes that it "contains a judicious mixture of authentic record with a good deal of suppression of fact and occasional outright lies" ("Early Alexandrian Christianity," *CH* 40 [1971]: 133). For a more detailed account of some of the difficulties associated with an uncritical acceptance of Eusebius, see Manfred Hornschuh, "Das Leben des Origenes und die Entstehung der alexandrinischen Schule," *ZKG* 71 (1960): 1–25, 193–214; and Patricia Cox, *Biography in Late Antiquity: A Quest for the Holy Man* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983), 69–101.

The meager biographical information among ancient sources about Clement's life has prohibited the publication of an extensive biographical account of his life—the one exception being the two somewhat dated but magisterial volumes by R. Tollinton, *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Liberalism* (2 vols.; London: Williams & Norgate, 1914). Biographical accounts of Clement's life are, therefore, limited to short survey articles or introductory chapters within a broader study of his thought. For the most thorough and readable presentation of such accounts, see John Ferguson, *Clement of Alexandria* (New York: Twayne, 1974); idem., *Introduction to Stromateis: Books One to Three* (FC 85; Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1991), 3–19; Hans von Campenhausen, "Clement of Alexandria," *The Fathers of the Greek Church* (trans. S. Godman; New York: Pantheon, 1959), 29–39; Simon P. Wood, introduction to *Christ the Educator* (FC 23; Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1954), v–xviii.

In contrast to the meager scholarly work on Clement's life, a much larger amount of secondary material exists on his writings and thought. For a current biography and description of Clement's writing, see especially Charles Kannengiesser, "Clement of Alexandria (CA. 150–215)," in *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 1:507–15. A helpful survey of the study of Clement during the twentieth century can be found in Eric F. Osborn, "Clement of Alexandria: A Review of Research, 1958–1982," *SecCent* 3 (1983): 219–44; and Walter H. Wagner, "A Father's Fate: Attitudes and Interpretations of Clement of Alexandria," *JRH* 7 (1971): 219–31. For a comprehensive yet readable study of Clement's thought, see Jean Daniélou, *Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture* (vol. 2 of *A History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea*; trans. J. A. Baker; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1973); Henry Chadwick, "The Liberal Puritan," in *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition: Studies in Justin, Clement, and Origen* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), 31–65; John Patrick, *Clement of Alexandria* (Edinburgh: Blackwood & Sons, 1914); Claude Mondésert, *Clément d'Alexandrie: Introduction à l'étude de sa pensée religieuse à partir de l'écriture* (Paris: Editions Montaigne, 1944); Tollinton, *Clement of Alexandria*; and Eric F. Osborn, *The Philosophy of Clement of Alexandria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957; repr., Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus, 1978).

emperor Domitian, his cousin, on the charge of “atheism.” The charge may suggest his sympathy with Judaism or a conversion to Christianity; it is impossible to know for sure. Whether a connection exists between the two or not, our Clement appears to have been born around 150 C.E. and, according to Christian tradition, in either Athens or Alexandria.<sup>7</sup> Both traditions, however, appear to be based on assumptions drawn from Clement’s writings rather than explicit evidence. Due to his intimate knowledge of Greek literature, customs, mystery religions, and his description of Athens, it is often assumed that Clement was born and raised in a Greek pagan family in Athens and that he converted to Christianity only later in life.<sup>8</sup> Eusebius’s claim in *Demonstratio evangelica* that Clement converted to Christianity appears to be an example of such an inference drawn from Clement’s vivid description of paganism.<sup>9</sup> Though entirely plausible, such conclusions cannot be put forward with any degree of certainty. By following this same line of reasoning, one could also conclude, as some apparently have, that Clement’s knowledge of Alexandria betrays an Alexandrian birth. Furthermore, on the basis of Clement’s equally profound knowledge of Christian literature, one could even claim that Clement’s familiarity with Christianity reveals a Christian upbringing at an early age.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Epiphanius, *Pan.* 32.6. Epiphanius states, “Next those who had compiled the truth <about> them well refuted <them> in their own treatises. Clement did, whom some call Clement of Alexandria, and others, Clement of Athens” (Epiphanius, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis* [NHMS 35; trans. F. Williams; Leiden: Brill, 1997], 196).

<sup>8</sup> Some see implicit evidence of Clement’s upbringing in Athens, or at least in Greece, in Clement’s statement that his first Christian teacher lived in Greece (*Strom.* 1.11.2). This view assumes that Clement mentions Greece first because he grew up there, and his subsequent mention of other teachers and cities around the Mediterranean indicates his travels away from his homeland. Though this is possible, it cannot be proven. Even more speculative is Tollinton’s claim that descriptions in Clement’s writings of “the temples of the city, the roads and mountains in its neighbourhood, [and] the attire of its magistrates” reveal such a strongly personal acquaintance with Athens that it must surely come from an Athenian (Tollinton, *Clement*, 1:3).

<sup>9</sup> Eusebius, *Dem. ev.* 2.2.64. As further evidence of Clement’s pagan background, John Ferguson also cites passages in *Paed.* 1.1.1 and 2.8.62 that make reference to people drawn to the truth from a worldly background (*Clement of Alexandria*, 13). Ferguson claims too much; Clement in no way indicates that these passages are biographical.

<sup>10</sup> According to Mondésert, Clement’s extensive knowledge of Christian and non-Christian literature “raises a problem which the complete absence of biographical information makes insoluble: was he truly raised a Greek pagan? Or how did he become, in manhood, so profoundly Christian?” (Mondésert, *Clément d’Alexandrie*, 265).

Thus, in the absence of any explicit statement by Clement himself, no firm conclusion can be put forth regarding the place of his birth or the nature of his upbringing.

If Clement did emerge from a pagan background, he tells us little of his conversion. He only recounts that as a young man he went on a quest for a deeper knowledge of Christianity. His travels led him across the Mediterranean from Greece to Southern Italy, Palestine, and eventually to Alexandria (*Strom.* 1.11.2). During his travels, Clement mentions studying under at least six teachers. Unfortunately, he fails to mention any one of them by name, though he does give a few clues to their identity. He mentions, for example, that one was from Assyria; this may suggest that he studied with Tatian, former student of Justin and author of the renowned *Diatessaron*, or, perhaps, Bardesanes, the famous Edessene Christian. Though the identity of his Assyrian teacher cannot be known for sure, there is no question that the final teacher he found in Alexandria was Pantaenus. While Clement only describes him here as being far greater than all his other teachers in power—the “real Sicilian bee who drew from the flowers of the apostolic and prophetic meadow”<sup>11</sup>—he later refers with affection to him as “our Pantaenus” in his *Eclogae prophetae* 56.3. According to Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 5.11.2), Clement also specifically mentions Pantaenus as his teacher in his now-lost work the *Hypotyposeis*. Though Eusebius also claims that Pantaenus was a convert from Stoicism and later missionary to India, all that can really be said for sure is that he appears to be a respected Christian teacher in Alexandria.

Building on Eusebius, scholars generally assume that Clement’s relationship with Pantaenus began sometime around 180 C.E. and that during the following years Clement progressed from pupil, to assistant, and finally, with the death of Pantaenus, the new headmaster of the Alexandrian “school.” The precise time when Clement succeeded Pantaenus is impossible to say, though 190 C.E. is often suggested. Whatever the case, as first pupil and then teacher, Clement’s stay in Alexandria lasted for approximately twenty-two years. During that time, Clement established himself as a prolific author, producing a number of books in defense of his understanding of the Christian faith.

Two of the more intriguing and debated questions connected to Clement’s stay in Alexandria center around the nature of the Alexandrian

---

<sup>11</sup> The designation does not likely indicate that Pantaenus was from Sicily, as some have assumed (e.g., Tollinton, *Clement of Alexandria*, 1:16). Since Sicily was known in the ancient world for its superior honey, Clement’s comment is a clever way of describing the brilliance of his teacher’s teaching in contrast to what he gathered from others. For a description of the quality of Sicilian honey, see Pliny, *Nat. hist.* 11.13.32.

“school” and the related question of Clement’s connection with the proto-orthodox church in the city. How should this “school” be conceptualized during the time of Pantaenus and Clement? Eusebius refers to it as a catechetical “school,”<sup>12</sup> places Pantaenus as its first known head at the beginning of the reign of Commodus (180–192), and identifies Clement as his successor; the school, supposedly, had even more ancient roots unknown to Eusebius. The traditional view, which largely follows Eusebius uncritically, argues that the school was an “established” educational institution for the preparation of catechumens for baptism, operated under the auspices of the proto-orthodox church and led out by duly appointed presbyters.<sup>13</sup> This seems unlikely. Besides its uncritical use of Eusebius, the traditional view is anachronistic: it is more reflective of a more developed stage of the church hierarchy in the Alexandria after Clement had already left the city. For this reason, at this early period of ecclesiological governance in Alexandria, it is better to describe the “school” as a more informal, private setting of independent Christian lay teachers instructing students of all backgrounds—a situation not unlike that of Justin Martyr in Rome.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Though Eusebius does not specifically designate the school as “catechetical” when he first talks of Pantaenus’s relationship to it, he clearly designates it as such in later passages that connect Pantaenus and Clement to the school (see *Hist. eccl.* 5.10.1; 6.6.1; 5.11.1).

<sup>13</sup> Anniewies van den Hoek is the most recent and outspoken advocate of this view (“The ‘Catechetical’ School of Early Christian Alexandria and Its Philonic Heritage,” *HTR* 90 [1997]: 59–87). See also W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 286–89.

<sup>14</sup> Advocates who hold to this view in varying degree include Roelof van den Broek, “The Christian ‘School’ of Alexandria in the Second and Third Centuries,” in *Centres of Learning* (ed. J. W. Drijvers and A. A. MacDonald; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 39–48; Clemens Scholten, “Die alexandrinische Katechetenschule,” *JAC* 38 (1995): 16–37; David Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992); M. Hornschuh, “Das Leben des Origenes”; Pierre Valentin, “L’École d’Alexandrie,” in *Clément d’Alexandrie: Eglise d’hier et d’aujourd’hui* (Paris: Éditions ouvrières, 1963), 9–14; G. Bardy “Aux origines de l’école d’Alexandrie,” *RSR* 27 (1937): 65–90; idem, “Pour l’histoire de l’école d’Alexandrie,” *Vivre et penser* (1942): 80–109; Campenhausen, “Clement of Alexandria,” 30; and Tollinton, *Clement*, 1:45–48. For a discussion of theological education in Alexandria before Origen, see Robert M. Grant, “Theological Education in Alexandria,” in Pearson and Goehring, *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, 178–89.

As initially pointed out by Méhat and more recently Wilken,<sup>15</sup> much of the difficulty in understanding the nature of the Alexandrian “school” centers on the use of the word “catechetical” by Eusebius. Van den Hoek, for example, argues that Clement’s use of “catechesis” points to a technical sense of the term that refers to the necessary moral instruction for those preparing for baptism.<sup>16</sup> Such a precise definition of catechesis in connection to baptism leads van den Hoek to two conclusions: (1) the catechesis in the Alexandrian school must have entailed a fixed curriculum administered under the auspices of the church, and (2) Clement’s role in instructing catechumens must have included a “liturgical role” in the Christian community as a presbyter.<sup>17</sup> Unfortunately, there is no explicit evidence in Clement’s writings to support either conclusion.<sup>18</sup> Rather than discounting Clement’s terminology as merely metaphorical, Wilkin, following Méhat, argues that catechesis needs to be defined as “instruction or teaching in general and hence ... not inappropriately applied to the ‘private’ schools of Pantaeus and Clement.”<sup>19</sup> A broader definition of catechesis not only provides a far less speculative picture of Clement and the Alexandrian school, but it also makes more sense of the little evidence available. Much like Justin before him in Rome, Clement functioned as a lay teacher in Alexandria. His “school” did not center on a fixed curriculum but around the personal relationships between a teacher and his students who gathered together for instruction and communion in a private home.

While the Alexandrian “school” during Clement’s time in Alexandria did not likely operate under the direction and patronage of the church, one need not assume that Clement held a hostile or even disinterested reaction to

---

<sup>15</sup> A. Méhat, *Étude sur les “Stromates” de Clément d’Alexandrie* (PatSor 7; Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1966), 62–70; Robert L. Wilken, “Alexandria: A School for Training in Virtue,” in *Schools of Thought in the Christian Tradition* (ed. P. Henry; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 15–30.

<sup>16</sup> Van den Hoek, “The ‘Catechetical’ School,” 69.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 77–78, 86.

<sup>18</sup> Clement never refers to himself as a presbyter. He prefers to refer to himself as a pedagogue (*Paed.* 3.97.2–3.98.1) and only once refers to himself as a shepherd (*Paed.* 1.37.3). Clement is referred to by Alexander, a former student, as a πρεσβύτερος in a letter recounted by Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 6.11.6). Even if the word is used in a technical sense of presbyter, it does not necessarily indicate that Clement was appointed to the office in Alexandria. Origen is a noteworthy example of the latter. Origen functioned in a very similar role as Clement in Alexandria without being appointed as a presbyter. In fact, Origen’s appointment as a presbyter only occurred while traveling outside Egypt—much to the dismay of his Alexandrian bishop Demetrius.

<sup>19</sup> Wilken, “Alexandria,” 17. Though it should be noted that Méhat still considers Clement to have been a presbyter (Méhat, *Étude*, 54–58).

the church as the body of Christ. On the contrary, though Clement does not mention the church frequently, when he does he speaks positively of it as here for the “good” (*Paed.* 3.98.1) and even as “our Mother” (*Paed.* 1.21.1). This does not mean, of course, that Clement looked with approval on all that was happening within the church. Nor does it mean that members of the church did not look upon him without suspicion. Clement’s writings reveal his concern with a tension within the church between the uneducated and the educated. On the one hand, he refers to the multitudes within the church as the uneducated who “are scared of Greek philosophy, as children are of masks, fearing that it will lead them astray.”<sup>20</sup> At the same time, however, Clement is also concerned with the intellectuals within the church who have been influenced by gnostic ideas involving extreme predestinarian views and a pessimistic view of the world.<sup>21</sup> Caught in the middle of these two groups, Clement may have been viewed with suspicion by both.

Whatever the case, Clement’s tenure in Alexandria came to an abrupt end with the outbreak of a persecution against the Alexandrian Christians during the reign of the emperor Septimius Severus in 202 or 203 C.E. Fearing for his life, Clement fled the city, apparently never to return. It was this same persecution that took the life of Origen’s father Leonides (*Hist. eccl.* 6.1.1). Scholars have often wondered whether Clement’s decision to flee, rather than face martyrdom, might explain why Clement’s name is never mentioned in Origen’s extant writings,<sup>22</sup> a surprising fact, even if one questions Eusebius’s claim that Origen was Clement’s student (*Hist. eccl.*

---

<sup>20</sup> *Strom.* 6.80.5; see also 6.89.1. The challenge that Clement faced in trying to counteract the mindset of a large number within the church who were opposed to using Greek philosophy to understand and even defend Christianity can be seen in the way early Christians were perceived by outsiders. In reference to the uneducated mindset of Christians, Galen, the famous second-century philosopher and physician, said, “If I had in mind people who taught their pupils in the same way as the followers of Moses and Christ teach theirs—for they order them to accept everything on faith—I should not have given you a definition (R. Walzer, *Galen on Jews and Christians* [London: Oxford University Press, 1949], 15). Even leaders within the church looked with dismay on philosophy. Tertullian has nothing good to say about philosophy: “For worldly wisdom culminates in philosophy with its rash interpretation of God’s nature and purpose. It is philosophy that supplies the heresies with their equipment” (*Praescr.* 7).

<sup>21</sup> John E. L. Oulton and Henry Chadwick, *Alexandrian Christianity: Selected Translations of Clement and Origen* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1954), 1:21–22, 31.

<sup>22</sup> E.g., Edgar J. Goodspeed, *A History of Early Christian Literature* (rev. and enl. by R. M. Grant; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), 128. One would expect, however, that Clement would have had a scriptural injunction for his action in the words attributed to Jesus in Matt 10:23: “When they persecute you in this city, flee to another.”

6.6.1). On the basis of a letter written around 211 C.E. and attributed to Alexander, then bishop of Cappadocia, later of Jerusalem, it is often suggested that Clement found a safe haven in Cappadocia. Writing to the church in Antioch, Alexander refers to Clement as follows:

My honored brothers, I have sent this letter to you by Clement, the blessed presbyter [πρεσβύτερος], a man virtuous and approved, whom you yourselves also know and will recognize. Being here, in the providence and oversight of the Master, he has strengthened and built up the Church of the Lord. (*Hist. eccl.* 6.11.6)

Beyond the connection of Clement to Cappadocia, the letter is significant for two points: (1) it suggests that Clement's stay in Cappadocia was extensive; and (2) it is the only reference that specifically designates Clement as a πρεσβύτερος. The former is significant since it opens the possibility that Clement may have written some of his works outside of Alexandria. This possibility will be addressed more fully when Clement's works are discussed in more detail below.

It is uncertain whether the designation of Clement as πρεσβύτερος by Alexander employs the technical sense of an ordained presbyter or merely as a title of respect. The term is somewhat surprising, since Clement never uses this word to refer to himself.<sup>23</sup> The fact that Alexander refers to Clement in a second letter (*Hist. eccl.* 6.14.8–9) as “holy [ἱερός] Clement” may indicate that his former use of πρεσβύτερος is also only honorary. Hugo Koch finds evidence against the strict ecclesiastical use of the term in the absence of the name of a church that normally follows such designations and specifies the area of one's ministry.<sup>24</sup> If πρεσβύτερος does indicate Clement was ordained as a presbyter, it is uncertain if he obtained the position during his stay in Alexandria. While Méhat acknowledges that Clement was likely viewed with suspicion in Alexandria for some of his teachings, he thinks it would have been too obvious an injustice to have denied him a position among the Alexandrian presbytery.<sup>25</sup> This objection seems unfounded; Demetrius had no problem withholding the position from Origen, a person far more influential and controversial than Clement. Thus Clement's situation in and outside of Alexandria may not have been unlike that of Origen, who was ordained as a presbyter outside of Alexandria.

Alexander's high regard for his former teacher may have prompted him to appoint Clement as one of his own presbyters in Cappadocia. If this is the case, Osborn points out that Koch's objection no longer holds true, since “it

---

<sup>23</sup> See n. 18 above.

<sup>24</sup> Hugo Koch, “War Klemens von Alexandrien ein Priester?” *ZNW* 20 (1921): 43–48.

<sup>25</sup> Méhat, *Étude*, 56.



would have been superfluous for a bishop to specify in a letter of introduction the church of one of his own presbyters.”<sup>26</sup> While this is probably correct, there is no evidence to support Osborn’s suggestion that Clement’s ordination by Alexander may have been necessary for Clement’s financial security, since his unexpected flight from Alexandria might have left him destitute—isolated from whatever wealth he formerly had.

In any case, Clement does not appear to have lived much longer after his trip to Antioch. A second letter by Alexander, this time written to Origen around 216, indicates that Clement had died: “For we know well those blessed fathers who have trodden the way before us, with whom we shall so be; Pantaenus, the truly blessed man and master, and the holy Clement, my master and benefactor” (*Hist. eccl.* 6.14.8–9).

#### CLEMENT’S WRITINGS AND MANUSCRIPT TRADITION

Clement is clearly one of the most prolific authors among the early church fathers. His extant writings portray a gentle, well-read, and inquisitive man whose love of learning is surpassed only by his passion to commune with God. A quick perusal of almost any one of his extant writings reveals the distinctive characteristics of his work: (1) an awareness of Greco-Roman literature and philosophy combined with a desire to “draw them into fruitful conversation”<sup>27</sup> with Christianity; and (2) a desire not only to instruct, but also an openness to learn God-given truth even when it is found outside the Christian Scriptures.

Clement’s writings can be divided into three categories based on their availability: (1) his extant writings; (2) lost writings only partially extant; and (3) works either never written or lost.

##### I. Extant Writings:

- A. *Stromateis* (or *Miscellanies*) in eight books<sup>28</sup>
- B. *Protrepticus* (or *Exhortation to the Greeks*)
- C. *Paedagogus* (*Christ the Educator*) in three books
- D. *Quis dives salvetur* (or *Salvation of the Rich*)

<sup>26</sup> Osborn, *The Philosophy of Clement*, 4.

<sup>27</sup> Campenhausen, “Clement of Alexandria,” 30.

<sup>28</sup> The eighth book of the *Stromateis* is incomplete and followed by the *Excerpta ex Theodoto* and the *Eclogae propheticae*. The latter two books are listed separately in this list, since, as Casey notes, “the contents and aim of each is sufficiently different from the others to justify separate treatment. *Eclogae propheticae* shows Clement as a commentator; *Excerpta* exhibits him as a critic and theologian” (Robert P. Casey, *The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria* [SD 1; London: Christophers, 1934], 4).

- E. *Excerpta ex Theodoto* (*Excerpts of Theodotus*)
- F. *Eclogae propheticae* (or *Extracts from the Prophets*)

II. Writings Partially Extant<sup>29</sup>

- A. *Hypotyposeis* (or *Outlines*) selections from eight books
- B. *On the Pascha*
- C. *Exhortation to Perseverance* (or *To the Newly Baptized*)
- D. *Ecclesiastical Canon* (or *Against Judaizers*)
- E. *On Providence*

III. Works Either Lost or Never Written<sup>30</sup>

- A. *On Marriage* (*Paed.* 3.41.3)<sup>31</sup>
- B. *On Continence* (*Paed.* 2.52.2; 94.1)<sup>32</sup>
- C. *On First Principles* (*Strom.* 3.13.1; 21.2; 5.140.2; and *Quis div.* 26.8)<sup>33</sup>
- D. *On the Resurrection* (*Paed.* 2.104.3)
- E. *On Prophecy* (*Strom.* 4.2.2; 5.88.4)
- F. *On the Soul* (*Strom.* 5.88.4)
- G. *On the Origin of Man* (*Strom.* 3.95.2)
- H. *On the Devil* (*Strom.* 4.85.3)
- I. *On Prayer* (*Strom.* 4.171.2)
- J. *On the Origin of the Universe* (*Strom.* 6.168.4)

<sup>29</sup> With the exception of *On Providence*, which is mentioned by Photius, Eusebius also identifies the following works as belonging to Clement (*Hist. eccl.* 6.13.103).

<sup>30</sup> Clement refers to the following works himself.

<sup>31</sup> It is uncertain whether Clement is referring to a separate work on marriage that was written later and now lost or if his planned work was completed when he wrote on marriage in *Strom.* 3. The answer to this question centers to some extent on the order in which one believes Clement's works were composed and his reference to a completed work *On Continence* in *Paed.* 2.52.2 (see the following note). The use of the future tense in Clement's verb here (ἐν τῷ γαμικῷ διεξιμένῳ) would seem to indicate the work was completed later, when *Strom.* 3 was written, unless it is assumed that *Strom.* 2 and 3 were written before *Paed.* 3. For a discussion of the different theories put forward for the order of Clement's works, see Patrick, *Clement of Alexandria*, 301–9 and the discussion that follows.

<sup>32</sup> It is difficult to determine if Clement's reference is to a completed work *On Continence* or a reference to what he wrote in *Strom.* 2.23 and 3. The use of the perfect tense (διεληφάμεν δὲ βαθυτέρῳ λόγῳ) would imply a separate, completed work now lost, unless one assumes that *Strom.* 2 and 3 were written before *Paed.* 2. See Patrick, *Clement of Alexandria*, 301–9.

<sup>33</sup> According to Patrick, a comparison of the terminology associated with this book and the remaining works mentioned by Clement in this section indicates this work was completed and the others were not (*ibid.*, 309–10).

While there are a number of extant fragments of Clement's writings, only a handful of relatively late continuous text manuscripts exist today.<sup>34</sup> The oldest surviving manuscript is the tenth century Arethas Codex located in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris (Parisinus gr. 451 = P). The manuscript claims to be copied for the Archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia between September 913 and August 914. The codex originally contained all of the *Protrepticus* as well as the three volumes of Clement's *Paedagogus*. The codex is badly mutilated, however, and no longer preserves the first ten chapters of *Paed.* 1 and the opening lines of chapter 11. In addition to its condition, Marcovich notes that the manuscript appears to derive from an "exemplar full of textual corruptions, lacunae, interpolations and dislocations."<sup>35</sup> The primary witness for the missing part of the *Paedagogus* is the eleventh-century manuscript Mutinensis, gr. 126 (= M). This manuscript contains all of the *Protrepticus* and *Paedagogus*. The nearly identical nature of M and P has led scholars to conclude that M was copied directly from P. A twelfth-century manuscript known as Laurentianus V 24 (= F) also appears to be related to M. This manuscript is not as significant as M, however, since it contains a number of inferior readings that indicate it is not a direct descendant of P. For some unexplained reason, F does not contain the *Protrepticus*.

The text of the *Stromateis*, *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, and the *Eclogae prophetae* is also primarily dependent upon one late manuscript. In the case of these writings, the manuscript is the eleventh-century Laurentianus V 3 (= L) located in Florence. It has been thought that this manuscript might also have belonged to Arethas, Archbishop of Caesarea.<sup>36</sup> As the case was with P, L is full of textual corruptions: errors of names, numbers, omissions, misplaced sentences, as well as the insertion of marginalia into the text.<sup>37</sup> The

---

<sup>34</sup> Otto Stählin's discussion of the manuscript tradition behind Clement's writings is by far the most comprehensive available (*Protrepticus und Paedagogus* [vol. 1 of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, 3rd ed.; ed. U. Treu; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1972], xvi-lxv; idem, *Stromata Buch I–VI* [vol. 2 of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, 4th ed.; ed. L. Früchtel and U. Treu; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1985], vii–xi; idem, *Stromata Buch VII–VIII, Excerpta ex Theodoto, Eclogae prophetae, Quis dives salvetur, Fragmente* [vol. 3 of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, 2nd ed.; ed. L. Früchtel and U. Treu; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1970], ix–xxxviii). Though over a century old, the most extensive discussion in English is P. Mordaunt Barnard's *Clement of Alexandria: Quis dives salvetur* (TS 5.2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897), ix–xxx.

<sup>35</sup> Miroslav Marcovich, *Clementis Alexandrini Paedagogus* (VCSup 61; Leiden: Brill, 2002), ix. See also the description in idem, *Clementis Alexandrini Protrepticus* (VCSup 34; Leiden: Brill, 1995), vii.

<sup>36</sup> Stählin, *Stromata Buch I–VI*, vii; Ferguson, *Introduction to Stromateis*, 15.

<sup>37</sup> For a detailed list of the corruptions, see Fenton J. A. Hort and Joseph R. Mayor, *Clement of Alexandria, Miscellanies Book VII: The Greek Text with*

textual corruptions in L do not appear, however, to be due to the frailty of the scribe who copied it. Commenting on Hort's extensive examination of the textual corruptions in the *Stromateis*, Frederic Kenyon concluded that the extensive nature and character of the corruptions point to a damaged ancestor—probably going all the way back to a poorly copied papyrus archetype.<sup>38</sup> The only other manuscript for these texts is the sixteenth-century *Parisinus Supplementum* 250. Copied directly from L, this manuscript is of no independent value.

The only other significant extant manuscript for Clement's writings is an eleventh- or twelfth-century manuscript that preserves all but the final twenty lines of the *Quis dives salvetur*. This manuscript is known as Scorialensis W III 19 (= S) and also contains nineteen homilies on Jeremiah by Origen. This manuscript served as the exemplar for the sixteenth-century manuscript Vaticanus Gr. 623 (= V).

The fact that the sole authority for each of Clement's extant writings is ultimately dependent upon a single manuscript is far from ideal. For text-critical purposes, one would prefer to have several independent manuscripts for each of Clement's writings. This would make it possible to determine if his New Testament citations had been carefully preserved or altered through transcription. Unfortunately, this is not possible. While the manuscript evidence makes it impossible to rule completely out the possibility that Clement's citations were altered through the transmission process, the absence of large block quotations of the Gospels and the absence of a standardized text form suggest later scribes made no deliberate attempt to bring his citations into conformity with any particular textual tradition.<sup>39</sup>

#### THE PROVENANCE OF CLEMENT'S WRITINGS

A question of utmost importance to the study of Clement's text of the New Testament is the provenance of his extant writings. As previously mentioned, Clement lived for a considerable time after he fled from the persecution in Alexandria, and scholars agree his departure appears not to have curbed his penchant for writing.<sup>40</sup> This opens the possibility that Clement may have relied upon different manuscripts for his New Testament

---

*Introduction, Translation, Notes, Dissertations, and Indices* (London: Macmillan, 1902), lxxv-xci. See also I. Bywater, "Critical Notes on Clement of Alexandria," *JP* 4 (1872): 203-204.

<sup>38</sup>Hort and Mayor, *Clement of Alexandria*, lxxix-lxxx.

<sup>39</sup>For a fuller discussion, see the introductory comments on Clement's text of Mark in chapter 4.

<sup>40</sup>Evidence that Clement continued his literary career after leaving Alexandria has been seen in Clement's dedication of his work *Canon ecclesiasticus* to Alexander.

citations in his post-Alexandrian writings. While previous textual studies fail to address this question, it should not be overlooked. If Clement did use different manuscripts for his non-Alexandrian writings, it could have serious ramifications for the analysis of his text, since during the first few centuries the textual character of the New Testament was not always consistent in the different urban centers of Christendom.<sup>41</sup> An example of how the move from one city to another could affect the character of a Father's citations is illustrated in the change that took place in Origen's text of Mark after he moved to Caesarea—a change that appears to be due to the differences between the manuscripts available to him in Alexandria and those in Caesarea.<sup>42</sup>

What do we know about the provenance and dates of Clement's writings? Unfortunately, the lack of clear evidence makes any attempt at establishing the provenance of Clement's writings difficult (this may explain why this issue is largely ignored today,<sup>43</sup> though it was a center of debate at the turn of the twentieth century). The situation is little better when it comes to assigning absolute dates to Clement's writings. The only certain date connected to Clement's work derives from his reference to the death of Commodus (192 C.E.) in *Strom.* 1.144.3–5. Allowing for some time between the event and the completion of his writing suggests a date around 195 C.E., at least for *Stromateis* 1.

In spite of the difficulties associated with determining the provenance and dates of Clement's writings, over the years scholars have suggested a number of theories based on indications they have found in statements made by Clement.<sup>44</sup> Until the end of the nineteenth century, the traditional view

---

<sup>41</sup> Bart D. Ehrman, Gordon D. Fee, and Michael W. Holmes, *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen* (SBLNTGF 3; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 15.

<sup>42</sup> Gordon D. Fee, "Origen's Text of the New Testament and the Text of Egypt," *NovT* 28 (1982): 350–53. Though few would follow his argument in all its details today, B. H. Streeter is the person most responsible for associating the development of the various text-types with the principal sees of the ancient church. See B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: Macmillan, 1936). For an analysis of Streeter's views in connection to the so-called Caesarean text-type, see Roderic L. Mullen, *The New Testament Text of Cyril of Jerusalem* (SBLNTGF 7; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 29–52.

<sup>43</sup> For example, Annewies van den Hoek ignores this question entirely in her study, "How Alexandrian Was Clement of Alexandria? Reflections on Clement and His Alexandrian Background," *HeyJ* 31 (1990): 179–94. She appears to work on the principle that all of Clement's extant writings were written in Alexandria.

<sup>44</sup> For a summary of the following theories of the provenance of Clement's writings, see Walter Wagner, "Another Look at the Literary Problem in Clement of Alexandria's Major Writings," *CH* 37 (1968): 251–60; Tollinton, *Clement of Alexandria*, 2:324–33; Patrick, *Clement of Alexandria*, 301–8.

had largely seen all of Clement's extant writings as written in Alexandria.<sup>45</sup> This view is primarily based on the sequence of thought believed to be developed in the three works of his so-called trilogy: the *Protrepticus*, *Paedagogus*, and *Stromateis*. Commenting on the aim of each of these works, Arthur Patrick notes:

They may be regarded as one work in three sections, the general aim of which was to transform the Greek pagan by stages into a Christian Gnostic, to initiate the reader into the ethics and philosophy of the Christian faith by setting forth different aspects of the activity of the one Logos.<sup>46</sup>

Theodor Zahn agrees but makes one modification. He argues that Clement's reference to his work *First Principles* in *Quis div.* 26.8, which had only been contemplated while writing the *Stromateis*, indicates that the work was finally completed subsequent to Clement's departure from Alexandria. Thus he concludes that Clement's homily *Quis dives salvetur* must have been written at a later time outside of Alexandria.<sup>47</sup>

The challenge to the traditional view began with an article by Paul Wendland in 1898 and was later adopted with minor modification by Karl

---

<sup>45</sup> Exponents of the traditional view include William Wilson, *The Writings of Clement of Alexandria* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1901); repr. in vol. 2 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* (ed. A. Roberts and J. Donaldson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 166–69. Arthur Patrick also belongs in this group, though he acknowledges the difficulty in assigning a specific date to *Quis dives salvetur* (see *Clement of Alexandria*, 21–22). Eugene de Faye also belongs with this group, but he argues that the *Stromateis* is a digression and not the planned conclusion (the *Didaskalos*) to Clement's trilogy (*Clément d'Alexandrie: Étude sur les rapports du Christianisme et de la philosophie grecque au IIe siècle* [2nd ed.; Paris: Leroux, 1906; repr., Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1967]).

<sup>46</sup> Patrick, *Clement of Alexandria*, 10.

<sup>47</sup> Theodor Zahn, *Supplementum Clementinum* (vol. 3 of *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur*, Erlangen: Deichert, 1884), 39, 176. See also Barnard, *Clement of Alexandria*, 44. In opposition to Zahn, others argue that the reference refers only to a work that was still being contemplated (e.g., Faye, *Clément d'Alexandrie*, 42; Adolf von Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* [2nd ed.; ed. K. Aland; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1958], 2:19). While agreeing with Zahn, Tollinton argues that the introduction to *Strom.* 1 indicates it is likely Clement's first "published" work. The *Protrepticus* and *Paedagogus*, according to Tollinton, precede the *Stromateis*, but they were not written originally for publication. They initially served as his own lecture notes and were only published sometime later in Alexandria (Tollinton, *Clement of Alexandria*, 2:325–27).

Heussi and by Harnack.<sup>48</sup> According to these scholars, *Strom.* 1–4 was written first with *Paedagogus*, and then *Strom.* 5–7 was written later outside of Alexandria. The main arguments for this new perspective were twofold: (1) the lack of references to the *Protrepticus* and the *Paedagogus* in *Strom.* 1–4 indicate they were not yet written; and (2) three passages relating to marriage in *Paedagogus* (2.52.2, 94.1; 3.41.3) refer to passages on marriage already written in the second and third volumes of the *Stromateis*.<sup>49</sup> Traditional scholars highly contested this view, often devoting entire appendices to the subject.<sup>50</sup>

Méhat put forth one of the more recent suggestions on the chronology of Clement's life and writings in his 1966 work on the *Stromateis*. Though Méhat provides little evidence for his conclusions, Ferguson found his timetable "reasonable" and adopted it in his own work on Clement.<sup>51</sup> Méhat's chronology is significant in that it marks a slightly modified return to the traditional view. He lists the possible dates of Clement's writings as follows: (1) *Protrepticus* ca. 195; *Paedagogus* ca. 197; *Stromateis* 1 ca. 198;

---

<sup>48</sup> Paul Wendland, review of Eugene de Faye, *Clément d'Alexandrie: Étude sur les rapports du Christianisme et de la philosophie grecque au II<sup>e</sup> siècle*. TLZ 25 (1898): 652–58; Carl Heussi, "Die *Stromateis* des Clemens Alexandrinus und ihr Verhältnis zum *Protreptikos* und *Pädagogos*," ZWT 45 (1902): 465–512; Harnack, *Geschichte der alchristlichen Literatur*, 2:1–23.

<sup>49</sup> Tollinton, *Clement of Alexandria*, 2:324–33; Patrick, *Clement of Alexandria*, 301–8. Opponents of this perspective argued that the argument from silence was hardly conclusive when dealing with an author like Clement. Tollinton points out that the very nature of this argument would even contradict Harnack's own position that the *Hypotyposesis* precedes the *Stromateis*, since no reference is made to the *Hypotyposesis* in it (*Clement of Alexandria*, 2:328). In response to the weightier arguments on the passages to marriage in the *Paedagogus*, the following points are put forth: (1) the passage in *Paed.* 3.41.3 points toward the discussion of marriage in *Strom.* 2–3; (2) the passage in *Paed.* 2.52.2 does point to a completed work, but the subject matter indicates it relates to what is discussed in *Strom.* 2–3; it must, therefore, point to a lost work; and (3) the final reference in *Paed.* 2.94.1 refers to a specific work on continence and can hardly be a reference to the *Stromateis*. It is also important to realize that each of these arguments largely rests on the assumption that Clement intended to write a threefold work and that references within the *Protrepticus* and the *Paedagogus* points to a sequential process that would have culminated in the writing of the *Stromateis* as either the final volume of the trilogy or as a preliminary work, preparing the way for it. Johannes Munck struck the most decisive blow against the Wendland-Heussi-Harnack thesis by demonstrating that passages in *Strom.* 1 and 3 are based upon the *Paedagogus* (*Untersuchungen über Klemens von Alexandria* [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933], 146ff.).

<sup>50</sup> Faye, *Clément d'Alexandrie*, 340–350; Patrick, *Clement of Alexandria*, 301–8; and Tollinton, *Clement of Alexandria*, 2:324–33.

<sup>51</sup> Méhat, *Étude*, 50–54; Ferguson, *Clement of Alexandria*, 16–17.

*Stromateis* 2–5 ca. 199–201; *Stromateis* 6–7 ca. 203 (after his flight from Alexandria); *Quis dives salvetur* ca. 203; *Eclogae propheticae* ca. 204; and *Hypotyposesis* ca. 204–210.<sup>52</sup>

Rather than merely assuming one of these theories as the basis for this study, I compared each theory with the textual analysis of Clement's text to determine if any one theory reveals a discernable difference in Clement's citations that might point to a non-Alexandrian provenance of some of his works. To do this I first determined the overall character of all of Clement's writings. These results are presented in chapter 4. The textual character of his citations were then examined book by book, and also in the various groups based on the suggested theories of the Alexandrian and non-Alexandrian provenance of his writings. While some of Clement's works lack a significant number of citations for individual analysis,<sup>53</sup> the following conclusions are drawn from his citations in the *Paedagogus* and the *Stromateis*:

1. No dramatic change is apparent in the textual character of *Strom.* 1–5 and 6–7 in Matthew<sup>54</sup> (cf. Méhat).
2. The textual character between *Strom.* 1–4 and 5–7 in Matthew or John<sup>55</sup> reveals no significant difference (cf. Wendland, etc.).
3. The textual character of Clement's citations to Matthew, Luke, and John<sup>56</sup> in the *Paedagogus* is consistent with his other writings (cf. Wendland, etc.).
4. No dramatic shift is detected in the nature of Clement's citations of Matthew or Luke in *Quis dives salvetur* as compared to his other writings.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> Méhat, *Étude*, 54.

<sup>53</sup> E.g., there are not a sufficient number of Gospel citations to come to any conclusion about the textual character of either *Ecl.* or *Exc.* In fact, *Strom.* 8 fails to yield even one single Gospel citation. In addition, some books provide a sufficient number of citations for one Gospel but not for another (e.g., *Paed.* 1 contains fifty citations to John but only twelve in Matthew).

<sup>54</sup> While the citations in *Strom.* 1–5 are consistent with the overall character of Clement's writings in both Luke and John, there are not a significant number of citations to analyze the textual character of *Strom.* 6–7 in either Gospel.

<sup>55</sup> The pattern in *Strom.* 1–4 in Luke was also consistent, but there were not enough citations to analyze the textual character of *Strom.* 5–7 in Luke.

<sup>56</sup> It should be noted that the results for John are based solely on *Paed.* 1, since there is only one citation to John in *Paed.* 2 and none in *Paed.* 3.

<sup>57</sup> There are not a significant enough number of citations of John in *Quis dives salvetur* to draw any conclusion.



While these results fall short of proving that Clement's *Paedagogus*, *Stromateis*, or *Quis dives salvetur* were written in Alexandria, the overall nature of these data reveal no reason to conclude that differences in his citations suggest any one of his extant writings were written from different locations. Of course, this does not rule out the possibility that Clement may have taken manuscripts from Alexandria when he left the city and relied upon them for some of his later writings.

Annewies van den Hoek argues for an Alexandrian provenance for Clement's writing by the presence of an Alexandrian influence in his writing, namely, the "impressive repertory of material of probable Egyptian origin Clement had at his disposal."<sup>58</sup> In particular, she notes Clement's knowledge and use of the works of Philo and early Christians writings with probable roots in Alexandria (e.g., Barnabas), including Christians of gnostic persuasion (e.g., Basilides and Valentinus). While this may be the case, one could just as easily conclude that Clement's experience in Alexandria had a lasting effect on his writing even after he left the city.

In any case, the text critical data suggests that, regardless of the provenance of his writings, the overall nature of Clement's citations does not change from one work to another. For this reason, none of Clement's extant writings have been excluded from consideration. Before commencing with the textual analysis of Clement's writings, the following chapter will examine Clement's attitude and use of the New Testament writings.

---

<sup>58</sup> Van den Hoek, "How Alexandrian Was Clement of Alexandria?" 187.

## CLEMENT AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

### CLEMENT'S HERMENEUTICAL PERSPECTIVE

The distinguishing characteristic that sets Clement apart from other early church fathers is his extensive knowledge and use of literature—whether pagan, Jewish, or Christian. An accurate description of Clement's use of the New Testament writings cannot be separated from this wider literary context.<sup>1</sup> Whereas some Christians found little, if any, redeeming value in pagan literature,<sup>2</sup> Clement's concept of the divine Word or *logos* working among all nations in preparation for the coming of Christ enables him to discern a divine voice behind the words of any author. In his penetrating study, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*,

---

<sup>1</sup> For a more detailed account of Clement's exegetical method, its relation to other early Christians, gnostic approaches, and pagan and Jewish antecedents, see Dawson, *Allegorical Readers*; Thomas F. Torrance, "The Hermeneutics of Clement of Alexandria," *TS* 7 (1988): 61–105; repr. in *Divine Meaning: Studies in Patristic Hermeneutics* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995), 130–78; R. P. C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event* (Richmond: Knox, 1959; repr., with introduction by J. W. Trigg, Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002); Annewies van den Hoek, "Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria: A View of Ancient Literary Working Methods," *VC* 50 (1996): 223–43; idem, "Divergent Gospel Traditions in Clement of Alexandria and Other Authors of the Second Century," *Apocrypha* 7 (1996): 43–62; Osborn, "Clement and the Bible," 121–32; Alain le Boulluec, "De l'usage de titres 'néotestamentaires' chez Clément d'Alexandrie," in *La Formation des canons scripturaires* (ed. M. Tardieu; Paris: Cerf, 1993), 191–202; James A. Brooks, "Clement of Alexandria as a Witness to the Development of the New Testament Canon," *SC* 9 (1992): 41–55; G. Brambillasca, "Citations de l'écriture sainte et des auteurs classiques dans le Προτρεπτικὸς πρὸς Ἕλληνας de Clément d'Alexandrie," *StPatr* 11 (1972): 8–12; J. Ruwet, "Clément d'Alexandrie, Canon des écritures et apocryphes," *Bib* 29 (1948): 77–99, 240–68, 391–408; Tollinton, *Clement of Alexandria*, 2:165–230; Hermann Kutter, *Clemens Alexandrinus und das Neue Testament* (Giessen: Richer, 1897).

<sup>2</sup> E.g., Cyril of Jerusalem (see Mullen, *New Testament Text of Cyril*, 16–17).

David Dawson refers to this as Clement's "hermeneutic of divine voice" and describes it by the following analogy:

Just as a ventriloquist "throws" his or her voice, making it appear as though any number of other objects are speaking, so Clement construes scripture and other texts as expressions of a single divine voice, the discourse of God's own speech.<sup>3</sup>

Thus Clement can argue that Greek philosophy, at its best, was to the Greek world what the Law and Prophets were to Israel: a pedagogue to lead them to Christ.<sup>4</sup>

This does not mean, however, that Clement places pagan literature, the Hebrew Bible, and the emerging New Testament writings on an equal level; he does not. Instead, when considered on their own terms, these three categories represent an ascending scale of divine expression. Thus Clement claims that any divine truth in pagan literature was received only indirectly, either from common reason, plagiarism from the Hebrew Bible,<sup>5</sup> or from lower angels.<sup>6</sup> While the Hebrew Bible also offers a partial expression of the divine *λογος*, it occupies a higher place in Clement's hierarchy than pagan literature. The Hebrew Bible not only offers a more direct expression of the divine *λογος*, but Clement believes it is superior to philosophy; whereas Gentiles had to turn first away from idolatry, those who follow the Law only lack faith (*Strom.* 6.44.4). The New Testament writings stand at the pinnacle of Clement's scriptural hierarchy as the fullest and most direct literary expression of the divine *λογος*.

When speaking of Clement's use of the New Testament writings, one should not conclude that Clement's Scripture comprises a fixed collection of books identical to the twenty-seven within the modern New Testament canon. The boundaries of the New Testament canon were not sharply defined during the second century and often fluctuated from place to place and person to person.<sup>7</sup> Since the content of Clement's New Testament

---

<sup>3</sup> Dawson, *Allegorical Readers*, 184.

<sup>4</sup> *Strom.* 1.28.3; 37.1; 80.6; 6.41.7–42.3; 44.1; 7.10.2–11.

<sup>5</sup> *Strom.* 1.87.2; 150.1–4; 170.4; 2.20.1; 78.1; 6.27.5; 55.4

<sup>6</sup> *Strom.* 7.6.3–4; 6.157.4–5; 161.2–6. For a fuller discussion of these three indirect sources of Greek wisdom, see Daniélou, *Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture*, 48–68.

<sup>7</sup> An example of the difference of opinion in early Christianity over which books should comprise the New Testament canon can be seen in the differences between some of the earliest canonical lists still available (e.g., Muratorian Canon [175?], Eusebius, Athanasius, and the books contained in early codices). See Bruce Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987); Lee McDonald, *The Formation of the Christian Biblical*

canon is both more ambiguous and far more expansive than our twenty-seven books,<sup>8</sup> the term *New Testament* is limited in this study to only those books that comprise our modern corpus. The only New Testament books not clearly referred to within Clement's writings are Philemon, James, 2 Peter, and 3 John. According to Brooks, Stählin's index of Clement's writings contains 3,279 New Testament references. The number includes 1,579 references to the Gospels, 57 to the book of Acts, 1,372 to the Pauline Epistles (including Hebrews), 237 to the General Epistles, and 34 to Revelation.<sup>9</sup> As the number of references indicates, Clement places a high value on the Gospels and Paul.<sup>10</sup>

Like other learned Alexandrians before and after him, Clement's primary method of reading is allegory.<sup>11</sup> Clement's allegorical method of interpretation is what allows him to extract a single "divine voice" from behind the words of very diverse literature. While Clement's allegorical method clearly depends on the common literary theory of Alexandrians long before him, there is a striking interpretative contrast between how Philo and

---

*Canon* (rev. ed.; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1995); and, more recently, Lee McDonald and James Sanders, eds., *The Canon Debate* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002).

<sup>8</sup> While Clement appears to use the phrase διαθήκη to refer to a collection of writings (e.g., *Strom.* 3.54.4; 71.3; 6.3.3), his writings are ambivalent about what the complete list of those books might be (see Boulluc, "De l'usage de titres," 192, 201; Brooks, "Clement of Alexandria," 50). Tollinton contends that διαθήκη refers more generally to a dispensation rather than to a collection of writings (*Clement of Alexandria*, 2:204–5).

While it is impossible to say definitely what additional books Clement would include in his New Testament canon, frequency of citation and authoritative references indicate it would probably include *1 Clement*, *Barnabas*, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, the *Apocalypse of Peter*, and the *Didache* (Goodspeed, *A History of Early Christian Literature*, 133). For a numerical count of Clement's references to New Testament and noncanonical Christian writings, see John William Stewart, "Doctrinal Influence upon the New Testament Text of Clement of Alexandria" (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1966), 17–24.

<sup>9</sup> Brooks, "Clement of Alexandria," 47.

<sup>10</sup> One should not conclude that "written" texts are Clement's sole source of authoritative apostolic tradition. He also believes in an oral gnosis that passes directly from Jesus to the apostles and to their successors (*Strom.* 1.11.3; 6.68.2; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 2.1.4).

<sup>11</sup> Examples of Clement's use of allegory with the New Testament can be seen in *Strom.* 3.68.1; 5.55.1–3; *Quis div.* 29.2–5. For additional examples, see Stewart, "Doctrinal Influence," 43–53. In light of these examples, it is surprisingly that Grant claims Clement "does not treat the New Testament and the story of Jesus' allegorically" (Robert M. Grant, "Alexandrian Allegorists," in *The Letter and the Spirit* [New York: Macmillan, 1957], 89).

Clement use allegory: whereas Philo uses the lexical details of Scripture to control its meaning, Clement gives the meaning—what he sees as the “divine voice” that speaks through all texts—control over the lexical details. An example of this can be seen in *Strom.* 5.10.52.5–53.4, where Clement links together three very different stories: the Song of Miriam in Exodus, Plato’s allegory of the soul as a horse-drawn chariot, and the attack of Joseph by his brothers. In the midst of his allegorical explanation of the passages, Clement never once refers to the similar lexical details between the stories to justify or buttress his interpretation. Instead, his whole focus resides in the allegorical meaning that he sees behind general themes, concepts, and images. Dawson describes Clement’s allegorical method as follows:

By using a divine voice rather than a specific text as the basis for revisionary reading, Clement can include direct quotations from competing literature, as well as titles of works and names of authors. He can do this precisely because the textual or authorial specificity of his precursors is irrelevant to the fact that when subjected to his revisionary reading, they express the same underlying voice or meaning.... The difference, then, between a revisionary reading strategy based on a text and one based on a voice helps explain why Philo rarely quotes nonscriptural texts directly or cites them by title and author, while Clement fills his pages with direct quotations and explicit citations.<sup>12</sup>

Dawson’s insight into Clement’s hermeneutic is significant, but it should not lead one to conclude that Clement has little interest in the actual text of the New Testament. While Clement’s method of allegorical argumentation rarely centers on textual details and terminology, his whole methodology is found on his belief that the voice of God resides *in* the literal words of the text (e.g., *Protr.* 82.1–2). In other words, the words of the text are important in as much as they convey the *λογος*. In fact, there is a degree of correspondence in how Clement views the literal words of the text and the actual historical events behind them. Even though Clement often uses allegory to strip texts of their original context, it does not mean that he denies the validity of the literal historical narratives themselves.<sup>13</sup> Both the

---

<sup>12</sup> Dawson, *Allegorical Readers*, 206. See Dawson for several detailed examples of how Clement and Philo refer to the same text but argue in very different ways. Where Philo emphasizes shared lexical details to make his point, Clement ignores the textual details and argues on the basis of a common meaning.

<sup>13</sup> In comparison to other Alexandrian allegorists, Clement is more comfortable with the literal meaning of Scripture. Commenting on this, Hanson notes, “Clement of Alexandria does not indeed show quite the same tendency to undermine historical narratives by allegory as Philo does, or as Origen does after him. He has, in fact, a stronger grasp upon the doctrine of the Incarnation than Origen” (Hanson, *Allegory and Event*, 120).

words and historical events that gave birth to them are important to Clement—but not for their own sake. For Clement, the divine *λογος* in the New Testament is not confined to a specific historical point in time. Rather, as the voice of God, it is a living *λογος* that spoke in the life of Jesus, but also continues to speak to all generations. Thus the literal text is foundational to Clement's entire methodology, and the evidence indicates that Clement knew his text well.

#### CLEMENT'S NEW TESTAMENT CITATIONS

Clement's extensive knowledge and use of the New Testament, while seemingly an ideal subject for text-critical analysis, is to a certain extent a "poverty of riches." The almost ubiquitous presence of New Testament allusions, coupled with a large number of quotations ranging in accuracy from very loose to very strict, makes a textual analysis of Clement's writings complicated at the very least. The various ways in which Clement makes use of the New Testament writings points to four general observations about his citation habits: (1) Clement was so immersed in the New Testament, particularly with the words of Jesus, that the words and expressions of the text became part and parcel of his own vocabulary; (2) Clement often cites from memory with varying degrees of accuracy; (3) at other times, and particularly in the Pauline Epistles, Clement's quotations appear to come directly from a manuscript before him; and, finally, (4) some of his quotations indicate a dependence on a oral catechetical tradition and at other times a deliberate altering of the text to better emphasize his own theological understanding of the meaning of the text. The general significance of each of these categories for the textual analysis of Clement's use of the Gospels is highlighted below.

Clement's allusions to the New Testament present a particularly difficult problem for an analysis of his text. For the sake of completeness, one would ideally like to consider all of his references to the New Testament; such a task, however, would prove difficult in reality. For example, if his allusions were included *in toto*, they would not only render the data unmanageable, but their large number would also obscure the results of the other data. Even if this were not the case, Clement's vocabulary is so saturated with New Testament terminology, and his allusions often so remote, that it would be impossible to tell in many cases whether an allusion is intentional or not. Thus any sort of unqualified inclusion of Clement's allusions would invite a decree of speculation and uncertainty that would jeopardize the entire textual analysis. In order to avoid these difficulties, this study includes only those allusions whose textual source is clearly identifiable and whose character indicates they may be somewhat significant to ascertaining the

nature of Clement's text. These allusions are divided into two basic categories: (1) allusions that are textually significant for establishing Clement's text;<sup>14</sup> and (2) allusions that provide supporting evidence for readings already established.<sup>15</sup>

While these allusions may play only a limited role in establishing Clement's text of the Gospels, at least in comparison to his more direct citations, they are also important for understanding the foundation of his citation habits. Clement's wide-ranging familiarity with the words of the New Testament indicates he must have committed large portions of the New Testament to memory. This observation is significant since it implies that for this to have taken place Clement must have first been intimately acquainted with a written text.<sup>16</sup>

Evidence that Clement likely committed portions of the New Testament to memory can be seen in five different ways in which he regularly makes use of the text. First, his citations often reveal a conflation between the words of two or more passages. An example of this can be seen in *Protr.* 82.3, where Clement states, "Unless you become as little children again and be born again, as the Scriptures says, you will not receive the true Father, 'nor shall you enter the kingdom of heaven.'" As Kutter observed long ago, it is obvious that this citation is not copied directly from a text but is drawn from the combination of Matt 18:3 and John 3:5 in Clement's memory.<sup>17</sup> A second indication of Clement's reliance on his memory are those places where he mistakenly attributes a citation from one author to another, as he does in *Strom.* 3.30.3, where he attributes the words of Jesus in John 8:34 to Paul.<sup>18</sup> In this case, the similarity between John 8:34 and Rom 6:16 appears to be the source of Clement's mistaken attribution—a blunder that would surely not occur if he were quoting directly from a text. The remaining indications that Clement relied on his memory when citing Scripture include his occasional use of ambiguous citation formulae ("it says

---

<sup>14</sup> E.g., there are a total of five textually significant allusions to Clement's text of Matthew (5:22; 10:42; 18:22; 19:13; 23:8) and another two in Luke (6:44; 14:33).

<sup>15</sup> E.g., allusions to Matt 5:28.

<sup>16</sup> Reuben Swanson drew this conclusion from the freedom of Clement's New Testament quotations represented in the *Stromateis*, but it is implied in his numerous allusions as well (Reuben J. Swanson, "The Gospel Text of Clement of Alexandria" [Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1956], 3).

<sup>17</sup> Kutter, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, 28. Other examples include the combination of 1 Tim 2:9 and 1 Pet 3:1–4 in *Paed.* 3.66 and the conflated nature of Clement's extensive citation of Mark 10:17–31.

<sup>18</sup> Other examples include attributing the words of 1 Tim 2:9–10 to Peter instead of Paul (*Paed.* 2.127.2) and attributing the words from Rom 8:15 to the words Paul wrote in 2 Tim 1:7 (*Strom.* 4.49.5).

somewhere in Scripture”),<sup>19</sup> his many deviations from all known manuscript readings,<sup>20</sup> and, last of all, the loose nature of some of his citations.<sup>21</sup>

Although Clement’s memory was not as encyclopedic as we might hope, it would be a mistake to conclude that his citations from memory are completely inaccurate. This is clearly not the case; there are a number of places where Clement cites the text with only minor modification.<sup>22</sup> Even if it is impossible to know if a completely accurate citation is drawn from memory or copied from a manuscript, the places where Clement mistakenly attributed a book to the wrong author demonstrate that his citations themselves were not completely misguided.<sup>23</sup> While the idiosyncrasies of Clement’s memory citations may limit the amount of material available for comparison, they still contain enough verbal agreement with our extant textual witnesses to warrant our consideration.

While Clement does frequently draw Gospel citations from his memory, he also makes use of a number of quotation techniques that indicate that at times his Gospel text is based on an exemplar. The evidence for this can be seen in the introductory formulae Clement uses to introduce a quotation from the New Testament. His most frequent introductory formulae include εὐαγγελίῳ and φησὶν ὁ κύριος. According to the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, the expression εὐαγγελίῳ occurs eighteen times in reference to the New Testament Gospels, while φησὶν ὁ κύριος appears almost an equal number of times, at seventeen. An examination of each occurrence reveals that both phrases usually introduce a quotation that has a higher degree of verbal accuracy than passages lacking an introductory formula.<sup>24</sup> In many of

<sup>19</sup> E.g., *Paed.* 2.4.5 of Luke 14:8,10; *Prot.* 84.3 of Heb 3:7–11; *Strom.* 5.15.3 of 1 Cor 4:15.

<sup>20</sup> E.g., Matt 10:42 (*Quis div.* 31.4); 11:12 (*Quis div.* 21.3); 25:39 (*Quis div.* 30.3); 25:41 (*Protr.* 83.2).

<sup>21</sup> E.g., Matt 5:25 from *Strom.* 4.95.3. The clearest example of this is seen in Clement’s citation of Mark 10:17–31 in *Quis div.* 4.4–10. Barbara Aland notes examples of the following types of minor changes found in Clement’s citation of Mark: (1) changes in verbs and verbal forms, (2) transpositions, (3) synonyms, (4) omissions, (5) additions, and (6) harmonization to the Synoptic context. These types of minor changes should not lead one to conclude that his text is in no way reliable regarding textual data. On the whole, as Aland notes, these changes are minor and largely concern “banalities” (see Barbara Aland, “The Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri in Early Church History,” in *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels—The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex P<sup>45</sup>* [ed. Charles Horton; London: T&T Clark, 2004], 119–20. I am indebted to Michael Holmes for this reference).

<sup>22</sup> E.g., Matt 25:34 (*Paed.* 3.93.4); Matt 25:36 (*Quis div.* 30.2).

<sup>23</sup> See n. 18 above.

<sup>24</sup> The expression φησὶν ὁ κύριος always introduces a quotation, though it is used once for an Old Testament passage (*Strom.* 2.15.66.7) and twice for a quotation



the passages, Clement's quotation agrees exactly with readings extant today,<sup>25</sup> while in others the syntax of the passage appears to be slightly modified by Clement to fit his context.<sup>26</sup> Of course, the expressions themselves do not always indicate Clement is working from a text, since there are a few places where both expressions introduce a very loose paraphrase.<sup>27</sup> Surprisingly, while the introductory formula γέγραπται consistently introduces verbally accurate citations from the Pauline Epistles,<sup>28</sup> of the six times it is used in connection to the Gospels it never introduces an exact quotation.<sup>29</sup> Before speculating on why the accuracy of Clement's citations of the Pauline Epistles and the Gospels differ whenever they are introduced by the introductory formula γέγραπται, it is important to first consider the other introductory expressions he uses as well.

---

from 1 Clement (*Strom.* 2.91.2; *Strom.* 3.107.2). On the other hand, εὐαγγελίω is used also as a general reference to the gospel (*Paed.* 2.9.2; *Strom.* 2.59.4; 147.2; 3.70.3; 76.1; 4.130.4; 6.88.5; 7.64.7; *Frag.* 4; 8.3; 8.5); as part of the title of the Gospel according to the Hebrews (*Strom.* 2.45.5) or the Gospel of the Egyptians (*Strom.* 3.63.2); and in reference to an unknown Gospel (*Strom.* 5.63.7).

<sup>25</sup> This use of φησὶν ὁ κύριος can be seen in Matt 10:30; Luke 12:7 (*Paed.* 3.19.4); Matt 10:39; Mark 8:35; Luke 9:24 (*Strom.* 2.108.3); Matt 11:15; 13:9, 43, etc. (*Strom.* 6.115.6); Matt 11:27; Luke 10:32 (*Strom.* 5.84.3); John 4:32 (*Paed.* 1.45.4); 6:55 (*Paed.* 1.36.5); 7:18 (*Strom.* 1.100.3); While the inverted word order in Clement's quotation of John 6:27 (*Strom.* 1.7.2) and Matt 10:27 (*Strom.* 1.100.3) is found in no other manuscript, the fact that the passages are quoted twice in the same form may suggest Clement relied upon a manuscript reading for these two verses that is no longer extant. This use of εὐαγγελίω can be seen in Matt 13:8; Mark 4:8 (*Strom.* 6.114.3); 23:33 (*Paed.* 1.80.1); 27:46 (*Ecl.* 57.3); Luke 13:34 (*Paed.* 1.79.2); 7:25 (*Paed.* 2.109.3); John 17:24–25 (*Paed.* 1.71.2).

<sup>26</sup> This use of φησὶν ὁ κύριος can be seen in Matt 13:13 (*Strom.* 1.2.3); 22:37 (*Paed.* 3.88.1); John 8:24 (*Strom.* 5.85.1); 10:16 (*Strom.* 6.108.2). This use of εὐαγγελίω can be seen in Matt 1:17 (*Strom.* 1.147.5); 20:28; Mark 10:45 (*Paed.* 1.85.1); 23:37 (*Paed.* 1.76.1); 25:35, 40 (*Strom.* 2.73.1); Luke 12:19 (*Paed.* 2.125.2; *Strom.* 3.56.3); John 6:33 (*Paed.* 1.38.2); 13:33 (*Paed.* 1.13.3).

<sup>27</sup> This use of φησὶν ὁ κύριος can be seen in Matt 5:36 (*Paed.* 3.16.4); 12:50 (*Ecl.* 20.3); 23:27 (*Paed.* 3.47.4); Luke 6:36 (*Strom.* 2.100.40). This use of εὐαγγελίω can be seen in Matt 13:47–48 (*Strom.* 6.95.3); 19:29; Mark 10:29 (*Strom.* 4.15.4); 10:17–31 (*Quis div.* 5.1); John 21:4–5 (*Paed.* 1.12.2).

<sup>28</sup> Rom 10:14–15 (*Strom.* 2.25.2); 8:36–37 (*Strom.* 4.47.5); 14:21 (*Strom.* 3.85.2); 1 Cor 2:9–10 (*Strom.* 5.25.4); 1 Tim 4:12 (*Strom.* 4.100.6). The expression is also used in connection to 1 Clement (*Strom.* 4.110.2; 5.80.2) and the Gospel according to the Hebrews (*Strom.* 2.45.5).

<sup>29</sup> Matt 5:25 (*Strom.* 4.95.3); 12:36 (*Paed.* 2.50.2); Mark 10:17–31 (*Quis div.* 5.1); Luke 3:1 (*Strom.* 1.145.2); 4:19 (*Strom.* 1.145.3). It is also used to introduce a very loose quotation from Acts 10:10–15.

Clement's repertoire of introductory formulae is not limited to only a few expressions. His penchant for quoting all types of literature required that he have an arsenal full of sundry terms. Several of his more prominent expressions are discussed in van den Hoek's "Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria." There she notes that Clement could use any of the following expressions or a combination of them, generally coupled with some reference to speaking or writing, to introduce a quotation: κατὰ λέξιν ("according to the words"), ὥδὲ πῶς ("thus" or "in this way"), ἄντικρυς ("straight on" or "openly"), and διαρρήδην ("expressly" or "explicitly"). An examination of these expressions reveals two important observations. First, these introductory formulae are associated much more frequently with quotations of Greek and Jewish literature than they are of the New Testament.<sup>30</sup> In cases where they do refer to the New Testament, however, they generally refer to the Pauline Epistles;<sup>31</sup> only rarely do they refer to the Gospels.<sup>32</sup> Second, and more significantly for this study, while the quotations to the Pauline Epistles are always highly accurate—they almost always agree verbatim with readings extant today—the quotations of the Gospels that follow these introductory formulae are usually very loose. Even in those few cases where the citations of the Gospels are more exact, they reveal a slight

<sup>30</sup> This can be seen from the following chart produced by van den Hoek, "Techniques of Quotation," 237. Although it is implied in the category labeled "NT/Early Chr.," it should be noted that no distinction is made between Pauline, Gospel, or noncanonical Christian writings. In addition, the identification of eight of the sixteen references of ἄντικρυς to the Sermon on the Mount is somewhat misleading, since they are not always associated with a specific quotation.

	Total	Greek Lit.	OT	Jewish	NT/Early Chr.	Gnost.
κατὰ λέξιν	24	8 (3 Plato)	0	1	3	12
ὥδὲ πῶς	69 (6)	37 (7 Plato)	13	0	16	3
ἄντικρυς	53 (7)	23 (4 Plato)	14	0	16 (8 Sermon M)	0
διαρρήδην	21 (3)	5 (2 Plato)	5	0	8	0

<sup>31</sup> κατὰ λέξιν (0); ὥδὲ πῶς (8): Rom 2:17–20 (*Strom.* 1.174.1); 1 Cor 2:6–8 (*Strom.* 5.25.2); 3:1–3 (*Strom.* 5.66.1); 14:20 (*Paed.* 1.33.1); 2 Cor 10:15–16 (*Strom.* 6.164.4); Gal 3:23–25 (*Paed.* 1.30.3); Eph 4:13–15 (*Paed.* 1.18.3); Col 1:28 (*Strom.* 5.61.2); ἄντικρυς (4): Rom 5:3–5 (*Strom.* 4.145.1); 10:9 (*Strom.* 4.99.2); 1 Cor 11:1 (*Strom.* 2.136.5); 1 Tim 4:1–5 (*Strom.* 3.85.1); διαρρήδην (4): 1 Cor 11:1 (*Strom.* 2.136.5); Eph 5:3 (*Paed.* 2.98.1); Col 1:16 (*Exc.* 19.4); 2:2–3 (*Strom.* 5.61.4).

<sup>32</sup> κατὰ λέξιν is used once to introduced a chain of citations to Luke 12:15; Matt 16:26; Luke 12:22–23; and Matt 6:32 beginning in *Strom.* 4.34.3; ὥδὲ πῶς (1): Matt 13:11; Mark 4:11 (*Strom.* 5.80.6); ἄντικρυς (3): Matt 5:44; Luke 6:27–28, 35 (*Strom.* 7.84.5); 19:9 (*Strom.* 2.145.3); John 14:4 (*Strom.* 4.83.1); διαρρήδην (4): Matt 6:33; Luke 12:31 (*Paed.* 2.120.2); 17:5 (*Paed.* 1.97.2); 19:17 (*Paed.* 1.72.2); and a chain of citations to Luke 12:8; Mark 8:38; Matt 10:32; and Luke 12:11 in *Strom.* 4.70.1.

degree of modification that is still greater than that associated with the other quotations of the New Testament.<sup>33</sup>

Another important introductory formula for our study of Clement's citations is ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ φησὶν ("in the Gospel, he/it says"). While this phrase often introduces citations from the Gospel of Matthew, one should not automatically assume that Clement always has the Gospel of Matthew in mind. It is best to take the expression as a more general reference to any one of the canonical Gospels, since at times it introduces citations that come from the other Gospels.<sup>34</sup>

Finally, it is important to note that some of the changes in Clement's New Testament citations are not always the result of carelessness or a faulty memory. Similarities in quotations between Clement, Justin Martyr, and other early Christian literature suggest that a few of his quotations are not necessarily inaccurate but reflect an early catechetical tradition.<sup>35</sup> In addition, though there are only a few significant examples of it, Clement can also deliberately alter the form of a citation to emphasize his understanding of the text or for dogmatic purposes.<sup>36</sup> A well-known example of the former is Clement's quotation of Jesus' saying: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God" (Matt 19:24; Mark 10:25; Luke 18:25). Clement replaces the phrase "to enter the kingdom of God" with "to become a philosopher" (*Strom.* 2.22.3). Tollinton makes the following comment:

Christianity being in Clement's eyes the true philosophy, the last phrase is not an unnatural equivalent to write in the place of the words, "enter into the

---

<sup>33</sup> The more exact Gospel quotations are limited to the two chains of quotations introduced by κατὰ λέξιν (*Strom.* 4.34.3–6) and διαρρήδην (*Strom.* 4.70.1–4).

<sup>34</sup> E.g., it can introduce passages from John (John 21:4–5 in *Paed* 1.12.2, John 17:24–26 in *Paed* 1.71.2), Luke (Luke 15:11–14 in *Paed* 2.9.2), as well as Matthew (Matt 23:37 in *Paed* 1.76.1).

<sup>35</sup> E.g., Matt 5:16, 28; 6:33; and Luke 12:48. See Michael Mees, *Die Zitate aus dem Neuen Testament bei Clemens von Alexandrien* (Quaderni di "Vetera Christianorum" 2; Rome: Istituto di Letteratura Christiana Antica, 1970), 190–205; Arthur J. Bellinzoni, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr* (Leiden: Brill, 1967); van den Hoek, "Divergent Gospel Traditions," 43–62.

<sup>36</sup> For the principal studies dedicated to this type of textual alteration in Clement, see Eric L. Titus, *The Motivation of Changes Made in the New Testament Text by Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria: A Study in the Origin of New Testament Variation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945); and Stewart, "Doctrinal Influence, 125–207. While it is important to note that Clement can alter his text, this type of alteration has little affect on this study. Since changes of this nature typically result in singular readings, they are not identified as significant variants for determining the nature of Clement's text.

Kingdom of God,” which stands in the Synoptic Gospels. But it is clearly an intentional variation, not a different reading.<sup>37</sup>

Clement’s citations of John 1:1 provide an instance of a theologically motivated change made to his text for christological reasons. Clement quotes John 1:1 correctly several times: ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. On two occasions, however, he replaces πρὸς τὸν θεόν with ἐν τῷ θεῷ (*Protr.* 110.2; *Paed.* I 62.4). Why the change? Stewart contends that the change is “born of controversy.”<sup>38</sup> On the one hand, Clement is concerned to note that, although some despise the Lord for his outward earthly appearance, he is in reality the “Divine Word.” In the other example, Clement is refuting the Marcionite idea that “the Old Testament God is inferior” because “he demonstrates hate instead of love.”<sup>39</sup> Clement clearly displays a desire to emphasize the unity of the λόγος and God elsewhere in his writings (e.g., *Paed.* 1.24.3; 2.75.2), and in the two cases mentioned above it appears that he intentionally modifies his text to make his point stronger.

#### CLEMENT AND THE GOSPELS

What conclusions can we draw from Clement’s citation habits of the New Testament? First, it is clear from the contrasting degree of verbatim agreement between his quotations of the Pauline Epistles and the Gospels that Clement’s citation habits are not monolithic. On the contrary, Clement’s citation habits generally depend on the source of his quotation or the nature of his polemic. If he is referring to a passage from Paul, Clement generally cites the passage with a high degree of accuracy, especially if some form of introductory formulae precedes it. The high level of accuracy in such cases strongly suggests that these quotations derive from a New Testament manuscript before him. The length and consistently high level of textual exactitude of his Pauline quotations makes any other conclusion unlikely. The situation, however, is not so simple when it comes to Clement’s use of the Gospels.

Clement’s Gospel citations focus almost exclusively around the words of Jesus. His tendency for the majority of these quotations is to cite the passage from memory. This can often result in a conflation of similar passages or even a very loose citation. At other times, his memory is more accurate, but even in these cases he usually modifies the text to fit his context, if ever so

---

<sup>37</sup> Tollinton, *Clement of Alexandria*, 2:178.

<sup>38</sup> Stewart, “Doctrinal Influence,” 143.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 144. See also Titus, “The Motivation of Changes,” 28.

slightly. In a more limited number of places, Clement's quotations are more exact, and this appears to be a result of his dependence upon a manuscript for the citation. This typically occurs when Clement introduces his quotation with either the introductory formula εὐαγγελίῳ or φησὶν ὁ κύριος, though even here the text may be slightly modified to fit his context. Gospel citations introduced by other more common introductory formulae used by Clement are not as accurate, the only exception being those isolated places where a chain of quotations occurs.

Why does Clement treat his citations of the Gospels and Paul's writings so differently? A hypothesis drawn from the evidence by Tollinton may point to a likely explanation. Tollinton remarks:

When we come to consider the New Testament in the light of Clement's citations, several fresh considerations demand our notice. To begin with, the Lord's teaching was for Clement the most authoritative and important element in the whole collection of the Scriptures. It is, therefore, antecedently probable that his familiarity with the Bible will here be at its highest, and his tendency to quote *memoriter* consequently more pronounced than elsewhere. This is borne out by the fact that his quotations from the Gospels (and these are mainly quotations of *teachings*: incidents are referred to but rarely in the *ipsissima verba* of the text) are less closely in accordance with the MSS. than quotations from other New Testament books.<sup>40</sup>

While the general observation about Clement's tendency to rely upon his memory has already been demonstrated, what is significant is Tollinton's observation that the teachings of Jesus are "the most authoritative and important element in the whole collection of the Scriptures" for Clement. This observation throws considerable light upon the nature of Clement's New Testament quotations. Viewed from this perspective, Clement's more precise quotations of Paul are not the result of a higher value placed on Paul's writings but evidence of the primacy of the words of Jesus for Clement; Clement is simply more familiar with the words of Jesus than he is with those of Paul. This also makes particular sense in connection with Clement's hermeneutic of the "divine voice." While the λόγος may be heard even through pagan literature, its clearest expression is found in the very words of Jesus himself. It makes sense that Clement would be, therefore, more acquainted with these words than any other.

While his knowledge of Jesus' words obviously originates with a written text, he has come to know them so well that he feels little need to refer to a given text when referring to them. At first this might seem nonsensical; if the words mattered that much to Clement, why does he show so little

---

<sup>40</sup> Tollinton, *Clement of Alexandria*, 2:183–84.

concern at times for citing them exactly? The answer appears to rely again on Clement's overall hermeneutic: it is not so much the words themselves that matter to Clement, but the voice that speaks through the words. That voice, for Clement, is a living voice, and it continues to speak catechetically to all those who are willing to hear. Thus Clement feels he has the freedom to allow that voice to address people living in his own day: at times that means allowing the sense/meaning of that voice not to be fettered to the actual "words" of the text, while at other times he conveys that voice through the actual words of the text itself!

While the varying levels of textual exactitude evident from Clement's citation habits render his Gospel text far from ideal for a text-critical analysis, his text, nevertheless, continues to offer a considerable amount of valuable text-critical information that merits attention. In hope of that valuable information, namely, a better understanding of the text and transmission of the Gospels at the end of the second century in Alexandria, several scholars have attempted to overcome the difficulties associated with the study of Clement's text. Before discussing the methodology that this study will follow, the success and—more often than not—failures of several previous attempts at understanding Clement's New Testament text will be briefly surveyed below.

#### PREVIOUS TEXTUAL STUDIES

It is not surprising that, as one of the earliest patristic witnesses to the text of the New Testament, Clement's use of the New Testament has been the subject of several text-critical studies. The principle studies of Clement's text have been done by P. Mordaunt Barnard (1899), John Patrick (1914), Reuben J. Swanson (1956), James. A. Brooks (1966), G rassime Zaphiris (1970), and Michael Mees (1970). While each of these studies grapples with the intractable nature of Clement's text, they each have significant limitations that call into question their respective conclusions—conclusions that are themselves often vastly different.

##### 1. BARNARD AND BURKITT (1899)

P. Mordaunt Barnard undertook the first significant text-critical study of Clement's New Testament citations in 1899.<sup>41</sup> In the course of sixty-four

---

<sup>41</sup> P. Mordaunt Barnard, *The Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria: In the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles* (TS 5.5; intro. F. C. Burkitt; Cambridge:

pages, Barnard's study presents the quotations and allusions to the four Gospels and Acts from Clement's writings. Each citation Barnard feels is significant for identifying the form of Clement's text is printed in Greek font and clearly identified by New Testament book, chapter, and verse. Parallel passages that cannot be identified to a specific Gospel, or where Barnard thinks a New Testament allusion provides "little or no light on the text used by Clement,"<sup>42</sup> are listed only as a reference.

Barnard's study employs a system of underlining and carets to indicate words and phrases of textual significance. Words and phrases underlined in bold are significant indicators of Clement's text, while normal underlining indicates variants of lesser interest or insignificant places where Clement's text differs from all others. Underlining made of consecutive dots indicates differences in word order. To indicate an omission of significant textual importance, Barnard inserts a bold caret; he identifies omissions of lesser importance by a regular caret. The number of significant variants identified totals approximately 390.<sup>43</sup> The apparatus that appears at the bottom of each page cites the manuscript evidence for only 90 of the variants. For the remaining evidence, Barnard presumes that the reader has "Tischendorf's *Editio octava critica maior* open before him."<sup>44</sup> The affinity of the 90 variants listed divide into four categories: (1) a "Western" type of text = 65; (2) Alexandrian = 11; (3) Byzantine = 1; and (4) the remaining 13 are mixed or cannot be classified textually.

Barnard draws no general conclusions in the apparatus; the fuller conclusions of the textual analysis appear in the thirteen-page introduction by F. C. Burkitt. On the basis of the number of "Western" readings in Clement's text, Burkitt concludes that Clement's Gospel text belongs to the "Western" textual tradition. Though Clement's text in Acts is not nearly as predominantly "Western," Burkitt argues that "it was safer simply to suspend judgment,"<sup>45</sup> since not enough evidence is available for the text of Acts in early Christianity. On this basis, Burkitt draws the following overall conclusion: "With Clement's evidence before us we must recognize that the earliest texts of the Gospels are fundamentally 'Western' in every country of which we have knowledge even in Egypt."<sup>46</sup>

While Barnard's presentation does a fine job of identifying and presenting Clement's text, his conclusions are questionable for a number of

---

Cambridge University Press, 1899; repr., Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus, 1967), vii-xix, 1-63.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., 2.

<sup>43</sup> Tabulations are taken from James A. Brooks, "The Text of the Pauline Epistles in the Stromata of Clement of Alexandria" (Th.D. diss., Princeton University, 1966), 5.

<sup>44</sup> Barnard, *The Biblical Text of Clement*, 2.

<sup>45</sup> Burkitt in *ibid.*, xvii.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., xviii.

reasons. First, Barnard's analysis of Clement is not based on a critical edition of Clement's work. Rather than using any of the editions available,<sup>47</sup> Barnard bases his study on his own collations of Clement.<sup>48</sup> Thus the very foundation of Barnard's study becomes unstable.

The problem of the reliability of Barnard's text of Clement is further accentuated by methodological weakness. Barnard never states the methodology behind his study. Since he states that it is presumed one will have Tischendorf's eighth edition of the New Testament "open before him," one is left to assume that Barnard makes some kind of comparative analysis of Clement's text with the witnesses listed in Tischendorf's apparatus. Though Clement's text clearly has Western readings, there is, however, no way to tell to what extent those readings exist without a clearly stated methodology accompanied by a clear summary of the results of a full quantitative analysis of Clement's text with leading representatives of all the established textual traditions. This simply does not exist in the study. Moreover, since the study only lists the citations of Clement that Barnard feels are significant, one has no way to evaluate his conclusion on the omitted readings.

In addition to the problems associated with Barnard's text and methodology, a fresh evaluation of Clement's text is needed for other reasons. For example, Barnard's comparison of Clement's text with that of other church fathers is questionable, since he takes the text of the other church fathers from Migne's unreliable edition of his *Patrologiae cursus completus: Series graeca*.<sup>49</sup> One is left to wonder why Barnard would avoid Migne for his own text of Clement but cite him for other church fathers. In addition to taking advantage of the numerous advancements in text-critical theory and methodology, a definitive analysis of Clement's textual affinities needs to include a comparison with the significant papyri discoveries not

---

<sup>47</sup> Though this is unfortunate, it should be noted in Barnard's behalf that his options were limited. The most current editions of Clement's work available were Le Nourry's edition in the Migne *Patrologiae graecae cursus completus* (1891) or Dindorf's 1869 edition. Unfortunately, both these editions are defective in a number of ways. (The definitive critical edition of Clement's work by O. Stählin would not appear until six years later, in 1905.) Barnard's only other option was J. Potter's 1715 edition, but it lacked the most current manuscript evidence of Clement's works.

<sup>48</sup> The only exception to the latter is the Fragments, where he follows the work of Zahn and Harnack.

<sup>49</sup> In discussing the problems associated with Migne, Robert M. Grant notes the following: "Migne should never be used. His own misprints and other errors render his editions less satisfactory than those of the old Benedictine editors whom he usually followed" ("The Citation of Patristic Evidence in an Apparatus Criticus," in *New Testament Manuscript Studies* [ed. Merrill Parvis and Allen Wikgren; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950], 120).



available to Barnard in Tischendorf's text. Finally, the results of Barnard's study would have been greatly enhanced, and perhaps changed, if a textual analysis of each of the Gospels would have accompanied the overall analysis. As it stands, it appears Burkitt assumes that the textual character of Clement's Gospel writings is consistent as a whole—an assumption later text critics would disprove.

## 2. JOHN PATRICK (1914)

The next person to examine Clement's text was John Patrick in 1914. Patrick's examination of Clement's text of the Pauline Epistles is far from substantial; it only covers five pages tucked in an appendix at the back of his volume on Clement's life.<sup>50</sup> Patrick's work still deserves mention, however, because it is the only examination of Clement's text that relies on the Textus Receptus (TR) as the base text against which Clement's text is compared. Patrick concludes that Clement's text of the Pauline Epistles is closer to the Alexandrian text than the Western. While at the beginning of his study Patrick mentions Barnard and Burkitt's identification of Clement's text of the Gospels and Acts as "Western," his conclusions, surprisingly, include no reference or discussion as to why Clement's text of the Pauline Epistles belongs to a different text-type.

While the use of the TR as a collation basis was standard procedure during Patrick's era, it has since been demonstrated to be completely inadequate.<sup>51</sup> As is the case whenever one uses the TR to determine textual affinity, there is little, if any, value to the conclusions rendered. In short, the problem with this method is that it omits a large amount of the evidence. In this case, Clement's text is only considered when it *differs* with the TR. While this clearly indicates the relationship of Clement to the TR, it says little about his relationship to other manuscripts—the main factor in determining textual affinity. Moreover, the results of the study are not easily verified: the text of Clement is never actually presented; only the biblical passages are referenced where Clement agrees or disagrees with the TR.

<sup>50</sup> Patrick, *Clement of Alexandria*, 311–16.

<sup>51</sup> Bart D. Ehrman's article, "Methodological Developments in the Analysis and Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence," *NovT* 29 (1987): 22–45, provides the most comprehensive overview and assessment of the methods used by text critics since John Mill in 1707 for analyzing and classifying New Testament textual witnesses. Bruce Metzger delivered the *coup de grâce* for the use of the TR as a collation base in his "The Caesarean Text of the Gospels," *JBL* 64 (1945): 457–89; repr. in *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1963): 42–72. For a fuller discussion of methodological developments in New Testament textual criticism, see chapter 5.

## 3. REUBEN J. SWANSON (1956)

A significant methodological advancement to the study of Clement's text appeared in a 1956 dissertation by Reuben J. Swanson.<sup>52</sup> Swanson's study directly challenges the results of Barnard's study that the text of Clement in the Gospels is "Western." Though Clement's text is mixed, Swanson argues that it is predominantly "Egyptian" (= Alexandrian) in Matthew and John but predominantly "Western" in Luke. Due to the limited evidence for Mark, Swanson draws no conclusion for its textual affinity.

In addition to basing his study on Stählin's first critical edition of Clement's work, Swanson broke from the popular methodology of patristic analysis that focused on passages where a Father's text differs from the TR. In contrast, Swanson subjects Clement's text in the Gospels to a quantitative analysis by direct comparison with other manuscripts. In the description of his methodology, Swanson lists a number of leading representative witnesses from each of the established textual traditions, that is, the Egyptian (= Alexandrian), the Western, the Caesarean, and the Byzantine. To determine the textual affinities of Clement's text, Swanson collates the variant readings of these primary witnesses<sup>53</sup> against each other, then records the attestations for and against Clement in "tables of readings" for each Gospel.<sup>54</sup> He then places the results from the tables of readings in charts that allow one quickly to assess Clement's reading in comparison to the control manuscripts. In addition to his quantitative analysis, Swanson also anticipated future methodological advances by classifying the different variant readings into separate family profiles.

Despite the significant methodological advances made in Swanson's study, his study has a number of weaknesses that render the findings inconclusive. While Swanson's classification of his control manuscripts into the Egyptian, Western, Caesarean, and Byzantine textual traditions were adequate for his time, studies since 1956 have reclassified a number of the manuscripts. One example of this is Swanson's identification of Codex Sinaiticus as a representative witness of the Alexandrian text throughout the four Gospels. While Codex Sinaiticus is generally a leading representative of

---

<sup>52</sup> Swanson, "The Gospel Text of Clement of Alexandria."

<sup>53</sup> Due to the errors and limitation of readings in the critical editions of the New Testament, Swanson makes a distinction between what he calls primary and secondary witnesses. The representative witnesses that make up his control group are designated as primary witnesses, and their readings are checked against the original manuscript. Secondary witnesses are those readings that have not been verified. They are included in the textual apparatus in parentheses, but they are not used to determine Clement's textual affinities.

<sup>54</sup> Although Swanson includes Clement's singular readings in the tables of readings, they are not used to determine textual relationships.

the Alexandrian text, Gordon Fee has demonstrated that in John 1:1–8:38 it is actually representative of the Western tradition.<sup>55</sup> This one reclassification alone calls into question Swanson's conclusion that Clement's text in John is predominately Alexandrian. A second weakness involves the passages of Clement that he identifies for analysis. While Swanson is generally correct in his identification of Clement's Gospel citations, there are a few passages that he either (1) fails to include,<sup>56</sup> (2) does not properly identify as a parallel passage,<sup>57</sup> or, as in one case, (3) mistakenly attributes to Clement.<sup>58</sup> While some of these are obviously miscues on the part of Swanson, some may be due to a difference of opinion on the significance of a loose quotation and others to the limited scriptural indexes that originally accompanied Stählin's critical edition.

While some methodological weaknesses were outside of Swanson's control, two other shortcomings were not. First, while Swanson rightly excludes itacisms and Gospel parallels from his findings, it would have also been helpful if a distinction had been made to indicate the level of exactitude of the citations used for the analysis. This is especially the case, since Swanson acknowledges that at times he made use of allusions that offer some "basis for critical analysis."<sup>59</sup> Without distinguishing between quotations, adaptations, and allusions, one is unable to isolate which readings are more valuable in determining Clement's text. More serious, however, is Swanson's choice to limit his study to only those Gospel references that appear in the *Stromateis*. This decision seriously limits the value of the entire study. It is also somewhat surprising, since Swanson contrasts his findings with those of Barnard. How can such a comparison be made when Swanson's study is not as comprehensive? Unfortunately, he provides no reason for this delimitation of the study.

#### 4. J. A. BROOKS (1966)

In 1966, J. A. Brooks broadened the examination of Clement's text by examining the quotations from the Pauline Epistles in the *Stromateis*.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>55</sup> Gordon D. Fee, "Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John: A Contribution to Methodology in Establishing Textual Relationships," *NTS* 15 (1968–69): 23–44.

<sup>56</sup> E.g., Matt 5:19 (*Strom.* 2.97.2); 5:28 (*Strom.* 3.8.4); 10:10 (*Strom.* 2.94.3); 22:14 (*Strom.* 5.17.5); Luke 3:2, 23 (*Strom.* 1.145.2); 20:34 (*Strom.* 3.87.3).

<sup>57</sup> E.g., Matt 5:3 (*Strom.* 4.26.3); 5:32 (*Strom.* 3.47.2); 22:30 (*Strom.* 4.140.1); Mark 5:34 (*Strom.* 4.161.2); 10:19 (*Strom.* 7.60.4); 10:48 (*Strom.* 6.132.4); Luke 6:46 (*Strom.* 7.104.4).

<sup>58</sup> Luke 6:30 (*Strom.* 2.100.4).

<sup>59</sup> Swanson, "The Gospel Text of Clement of Alexandria," 11.

<sup>60</sup> Brooks, "The Text of the Pauline Epistles."

Written under the direction of Bruce Metzger, Brooks's dissertation has thoroughness in scope of presentation and methodological discussion that is far superior to any previous textual study on Clement. His study begins with a survey of the conclusions of previous work on Clement's text and the weaknesses in their respective methodologies.<sup>61</sup> This is followed by a full explanation of his methodology and an explanation of his critical apparatus.<sup>62</sup> The apparatus itself is massive; it occupies some three hundred pages! The final hundred-plus pages centers largely on a statistical summary of the relationship between each of the manuscripts employed in the apparatus and concludes with a brief summary of the findings. On the basis of Clement's quotations in Stählin's second critical edition, Brooks concludes that Clement's citations of the Pauline Epistles in the *Stromateis* belong predominately to the Alexandrian text-type.

While Brooks follows Swanson's lead by implementing a quantitative form of analysis, he also goes beyond Swanson's study in presenting the Greek text of Clement's quotations together with the critical apparatus. Though minor, this change is significant in that it makes the information much easier to access than any previous study.

In spite of the advances made in Brooks's study, his conclusions are also, unfortunately, limited for several reasons. First, the analysis is limited only to Clement's references in the *Stromateis*. As was the case with Swanson's study, this is an unfortunate limitation, since any definitive conclusion about Clement's text requires the examination of *all* his extant writings. In addition, the analysis considers the textual affinity of the Pauline Epistles as a single corpus and thus fails to account for the possibility of differing affinities among the Pauline Epistles.

A third shortcoming in Brooks's study relates to his methodology. Instead of selecting a limited number of representative control witnesses whose readings can be verified (i.e., Swanson), the critical apparatus and quantitative analysis includes every witness (patristic and manuscript) attested in the editions of Tischendorf, von Soden, Nestle, Souter, and Merk, plus the papyri available to Brooks at the time—for a grand total of 340 witnesses! While a large number of witnesses are not undesirable, it poses two problems for Brooks's study. First, the inclusion of such a large number of witnesses not only makes the apparatus cumbersome, but it also obscures the evidence and increases the possibility of error within the apparatus. Second, and more damaging, is Brooks's decision to rely uncritically on the witnesses cited for the variant readings listed in the editions of the Greek

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 4–19, 21–44. In addition to the more extensive textual work of Barnard, Patrick, and Swanson, Brooks also surveys the more cursory views of Hermann F. von Soden, E. A. Hutton, Heinrich Seesemann, and Günther Zuntz.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., 45–59.

New Testament mentioned above, the only exception being the papyri, which he collates independently. In Brooks's opinion, Swanson's concern for the possibility of error in these critical editions, and his decision to rely upon the manuscripts themselves,<sup>63</sup> while admirable, is completely unnecessary. Brooks justifies his opinion in two ways: (1) he argues that the readings listed in the Greek editions of the New Testament must be sufficient, since "the great majority of studies of Patristic quotations depend upon such critical apparatuses";<sup>64</sup> (2) moreover, a fresh collation to verify each reading would involve far too much work, limit the number of witnesses used, and probably produce little difference.<sup>65</sup> Unfortunately, such reasoning not only condemns Brooks to repeat the errors of the past, but, more seriously, it calls into question the accuracy of his conclusions—especially in light of the well-known problems associated with the accuracy of two of his primary sources for textual evidence: the apparatus of von Soden and Merk.<sup>66</sup> While providing fresh collations of the manuscripts themselves is probably asking for too much, Brooks would have been better off to have limited his witnesses to a number of representational witnesses whose readings could be verified in published collations or critical editions of the texts.

Thus the value of Brooks's study for understanding Clement's text of the New Testament is undermined both by questions of accuracy in his apparatus as well as by the decision to limit his analysis to only the *Stromateis*.

##### 5. GÉRASSIME ZAPHIRIS (1970)

In 1970, Gérassime Zaphiris published a massive volume of over eleven hundred pages on Clement's citations of Matthew.<sup>67</sup> After presenting every quotation and allusion from Clement to the Gospel of Matthew based on editions of Stählin's critical edition available at the time, Zaphiris provides a comprehensive analysis of every reference from Clement against the evidence from Greek manuscripts, versions, and the patristic tradition. In

<sup>63</sup> Swanson, "The Gospel Text of Clement of Alexandria," 17–21.

<sup>64</sup> Brooks, "The Text of the Pauline Epistles," 34 n.1.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

<sup>66</sup> See the discussion in Bruce Metzger and Bart Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (4th ed.; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 189–90. For a more extensive discussion of von Soden's work and the problems associated with his apparatus, see Frederik Wisse, *The Profile Method for Classifying and Evaluating Manuscript Evidence* (SD 44; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 9–18.

<sup>67</sup> Gérassime Zaphiris, *Le texte de l'Évangile selon saint Matthieu d'après les citations de Clément d'Alexandrie comparées aux citations des pères et des théologiens grecs du II<sup>e</sup> au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1970).

addition to identifying which witnesses agree or disagree with Clement, he also classifies the readings into the traditional text-types, or, as he calls them, “the well-known order of the recensions”: the “Western” (D); the Egyptian (B); the Caesarean, which he divides into both an earlier and later form (C<sub>I</sub> and C<sub>II</sub>); and the Koine (K).<sup>68</sup> A full detailed running analysis accompanies the presentation of the textual evidence through Matt 11:27; from that point on, the textual comments occur only sporadically—one can only imagine how enormous the tome would be otherwise! The bulk of the textual analysis is made up of Zaphiris’s presentation of the quotations from patristic and ecclesiastical witnesses from the second to the fifteenth century.

In contrast to the conclusions of Swanson (with, surprisingly, no reference to his work), Zaphiris concludes that his statistical analysis demonstrates that “Clement follows as a whole the ‘Western’ text or the popular recension D.”<sup>69</sup> When he departs from this text, “it is to witness, in the first place, to the Caesarean text, and that in its Palestinian form (C<sub>II</sub>) rather than its earlier Alexandrian form (C<sub>I</sub>). It is only secondarily that he agrees with the learned B recension.”<sup>70</sup> Zaphiris draws two general conclusions: Clement often modifies the text of Matthew in the light of his catechetical interests; and, his quotations of Matthew represent the unharmonized form of the text before it was revised as part of the later Alexandrian recension.

While Zaphiris’s work is a valuable treasure trove of ecclesiastical evidence keyed by chapter and verse to Matthew, his conclusion is marred by problems associated with his “statistical”<sup>71</sup> methodology. Whereas Swanson and Brooks make a distinction between the significance of readings for determining textual affinity, Zaphiris makes no distinction between the values of the readings. Because variants that have questionable significance for determining textual affinity are not excluded, Zaphiris’s conclusions are also rendered unreliable. For example, the omission of the particle δε at the beginning of Clement’s quotation of Jesus’ saying in Matt 6:33 in *Paed.* 2.120.2 is identified as evidence of Clement’s affinity with D and C<sub>II</sub> over against the Alexandrian text. Text-critical studies have shown today, however, that the omission, deletion, or even the interchange of particles like δε, καί, γάρ, and οὐν at the beginning of a quotation are particularly susceptible to modification and therefore should not be used to determine textual affinity.<sup>72</sup> Zaphiris’s reliance on the omission δε as primary evidence

---

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., 7.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., 932.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., 6.

<sup>72</sup> Bruce Metzger, review of Gérard Zaphiris, *Le texte de l’Évangile selon saint Matthieu d’après les citations de Clément d’Alexandrie comparées aux citations*

of textual consanguinity is even more surprising since δε is present in Clement's reference to Matt 6:33 in *Strom.* 4.34.6.

Another example of Zaphiris's questionable use of evidence occurs in his reliance on the omission of οὐν at the beginning of Matt 19:6. In addition to being questionable for the same reason as the omission of δε above, the value of 19:6 for determining textual affinity is also nullified, since it is a Gospel parallel with Mark 10:6. Gospel parallels, as well as complex conflation or harmonizations, should not be included in determining a text's affinities, unless they can be identified clearly to a particular Gospel. In the case of Matt 19:6 and Mark 10:6, both references are identical, and there is no indication of which passage Clement is citing.

While there is no question that Clement's text of Matthew includes Western readings, the evidence amassed by Zaphiris, while impressive in sheer size, is far too inclusive in its use of variants to be of any significant value in determining Clement's textual affinities. Moreover, by relying on such matters as the omission of particles, moveable-nus, and common synonyms, Zaphiris' study has no way of minimizing the possibility that many of the small agreements used to support his conclusion are only the result of scribal error or mere coincidence.

#### 6. MICHAEL MEES (1970)

A second textual analysis of Clement's New Testament citations was also published during the same year as Zaphiris's textual analysis. Originally written as a dissertation in 1966, Michael Mees's study was published in 1970 with the title *Die Zitate aus dem Neuen Testament bei Clemens von Alexandrien*.<sup>73</sup> Whereas previous studies focus on only a portion of the New Testament, or certain parts of Clement's writings, Mees attempts something no other author before him had: the collection and examination of every New Testament citation available in Clement's extant works. Since its publication, Mees's work has become the standard scholarly reference on Clement's text.

The examination of Clement's use of the New Testament is divided into two parts: commentary and text. In both sections, Mees examines Clement's

---

*des pères et des théologiens grecs du II<sup>e</sup> au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, *JTS* 24 (1973): 227. Though not as critical as Metzger, for other reviews of Zaphiris's work, see Frederick W. Danker, *CBQ* 35 (1973): 129–30; and M.-É. Boismard, *RB* 80 (1973): 612–13.

<sup>73</sup> Abbreviated forms of Mees's dissertation that focus exclusively on Matthew and on Luke were published in 1968: "Das Matthäus-Evangelium in den Werken des Clemens von Alexandrien," *Div* 12 (1968): 675–98; "Papyrus Bodmer XIV [P<sup>75</sup>] und die Lukasitate bei Clemens von Alexandrien," *Lateranum* 34 (1968): 97–119.

use of the New Testament with the evidence available from leading representatives of the established textual families. In his commentary on Matthew, for example, Mees first discusses the variants in relation to the testimony from the papyri, then in relation to the “Western” readings, then to the Alexandrian tradition, and finally to “other groups.” In the second half of the book, he presents Clement’s quotations and allusions (unfortunately, without distinction). He organizes the citations by New Testament book, chapter, and individual verse, and, in a positive advancement over previous studies, a critical textual apparatus that lists the various manuscript evidence for and against each reading immediately follows Clement’s text.

Like Swanson and Brooks, Mees challenges the Burkitt-Barnard thesis that Clement’s text is “Western.” This is not to say that Mees fails to acknowledge that Clement’s text, especially that of the Gospels, has “Western” elements. He merely argues that Clement’s text has far too many differences with established “Western” readings, particularly in the grammatical details, to categorize it firmly as “Western.”<sup>74</sup> Mees also notes that Clement’s citations lack the distinctive longer readings that characterize the “Western” tradition.<sup>75</sup> In addition, Mees argues that many of the readings identified as “Western” elements in Clement’s citations are not really “Western” at all. They are merely the result of the similarity between how Clement makes use of the Gospels for catechesis and the chief characteristic of “Western” readings. Here Mees has in mind Westcott and Hort’s characterization of the Western text:

The chief and most constant characteristic of the Western readings is a love of paraphrase. Words, clauses, and even whole sentences were changed, omitted, and inserted with astonishing freedom, wherever it seemed that the meaning could be brought out with greater force and definiteness.<sup>76</sup>

Proof that the catechetical elements in Clement’s citations are not really “Western” readings is found in the striking similarities some of his quotations share with the form of the text found in other early Christian writings. These similarities suggest a dependence on a common catechetical tradition.<sup>77</sup> On the basis of his understanding of Clement’s catechetical use of

---

<sup>74</sup> Mees, “Das Matthäus-Evangelium,” 693; idem, “Papyrus Bodmer XIV [P<sup>75</sup>] und die Lukaszitate,” 112–13.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid.

<sup>76</sup> B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1882; repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1988), 2:122. The footnote that follows Mees’s argument on page 66 indicates he has this passage in mind.

<sup>77</sup> Mees, *Die Zitate aus dem Neuen Testament*, 190–205; idem, “Das Matthäus-Evangelium,” 695–98.



the text, Mees is able to conclude that, when these elements are removed, Clement's text represents an early form of the Egyptian (= Alexandrian) text.

Despite the advances of Mees's presentation of Clement's text, a surprising number of critical errors indicate a carelessness to detail that seriously negates the credibility of his entire study. For example, an examination of the citations Mees lists for Matt 5 reveals several mistakes: five references from the *Stromateis* are omitted (5.70.1; 3.33.3; 6.115.3; 6.164.2; 4.95.2–3), two references are cited incorrectly,<sup>78</sup> and two other citations do not even belong to Clement.<sup>79</sup> An even more damaging blow to Mees's thesis is the numerous errors of manuscript attestation in the textual apparatus. For example, of the fourteen places where Mees lists the attestation of P<sup>45</sup> for Matthew, only two of these are valid;<sup>80</sup> the rest are lacunae! In a critical review, Swanson notes that "for D, 20 of 43 citations in the first 11 chapters of Matt are in error, incomplete, or wrongly presented; 18 of 73 inclusions under 'rel' are in error; 17 additional readings in support of Clement and 27 against could have been cited."<sup>81</sup> Gordon Fee also notes similar errors in attestation.<sup>82</sup> Though inexcusable, the extent and reason for so many of the problems in Mees's textual apparatus are understandable when one realizes, as Swanson points out, that the editions of von Soden and Merk are the source from which Mees prepared his apparatus.<sup>83</sup> Finally, in addition to making no distinction between a quotation and allusion from Clement, Mees blurs the nature of Clement's text by failing to exclude Gospel parallels from the main text.

Even if the miscues in the apparatus were corrected, the reliability of Mees's conclusions would still be questionable, since the study lacks a clear explanation of its methodology. On the basis of the extensive textual commentary in the first half of the work, it is clear that Mees employs some

---

<sup>78</sup> The reference at Matt 4:8–10 should be to *Strom.* 2.21.3, not 24.3–4. Further, the decision to identify this citation with Matt 4:8–10 is highly questionable, since the passage is parallel with Luke 4:5–8; the reference to *Strom.* 4.38.5 for Matt 5:7 should be *Strom.* 4.38.1.

<sup>79</sup> The references to Matt 5:16 in *Exc.* 3.2 and 41.3 appear to belong to Theodotus and not Clement. See François Sagnard, *Clément d'Alexandrie: Extraits de Théodote, texte grec, introduction, traduction et notes* (2nd ed.; SC 23; Paris: Cerf, 1970).

<sup>80</sup> The fourteen references are to Matt 25:41 (3X); 26:17, 23, 24, 26 (2X), 27, 29 (4), 32. The only references that are clearly valid are Matt 26:23 and the second citation listed for 26:26.

<sup>81</sup> Reuben J. Swanson, review of Michael Mees, *Die Zitate aus dem Neuen Testament bei Clemens von Alexandrien*, *JBL* 89 (1970): 518–19.

<sup>82</sup> Gordon D. Fee, "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Method in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations," *Bib* 52 (1971): 357–94.

<sup>83</sup> See n. 66 above.

kind of comparative analysis of Clement's text with the leading textual witnesses of the various text-types. The problem is that the study never explains how the readings are tabulated, nor does it present any kind of statistical summary of the evidence. This leaves the reader with two options: (1) merely accept Mees's findings without question, or (2) read through the entire commentary section in an attempt to access the rationale for Mees's conclusions. The latter would also require the daunting task of devising some way of tabulating the sundry comparisons that comprise the commentary section! In light of the work of Swanson and Brooks, and the methodological advances made in text criticism in the twentieth century, one can only wonder why Mees failed to see the necessity of providing some sort of quantitative analysis that could have been more easily accessed by his readers.

While Mees's overall approach to understanding Clement's text is commendable, the numerous errors in the apparatus and the problems associated with his methodology prohibit his work from being a definitive analysis of Clement's New Testament text. In light of the extent of these problems, it is surprising that no further textual analysis of Clement's text has been produced in the last thirty-five years.

The shortcomings associated with each of the text-critical studies surveyed in this chapter, along with the significant advances in the tools and methods in text criticism that have also emerged since the last two studies were published in 1970,<sup>84</sup> demonstrate the need for a fresh evaluation of Clement's text of the New Testament.

---

<sup>84</sup> See chapter 5.

## INTRODUCTION TO THE TEXT AND CRITICAL APPARATUS

### THE TEXT<sup>1</sup>

In the following chapters, I present in three separate lists the complete text of Clement's Gospel citations established from the critical editions of his work.<sup>2</sup> The most important list appears with a text-critical apparatus in chapter 4. This first list comprises all Clement's Gospel references that can clearly be identified with a particular chapter and verse reference in the Gospels. The second list is in appendix 1 and contains the various references whose exact location in the Gospels cannot be determined with absolute certainty. The latter comprise primarily those Gospel passages that the Synoptics share in common. These verses are, therefore, of no value for determining Clement's textual affinities for a particular Gospel. Greek catenae and Latin references attributed to Clement make up the third list in appendix 2. The indirect nature of the textual transmission of these references mitigates the value of their usefulness for determining Clement's textual proclivities.

Each of the Gospel references in chapter 4 are arranged in canonical order and classified into four different categories: citation; adaptation;

---

<sup>1</sup> The format and content of this chapter and the text and apparatus in the following chapter follows the procedure established first by Bart D. Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels* (SBLNTGF 1; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), and later refined in Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes, *Text of the Fourth Gospel*. The pattern established in these two studies has become the standard upon which the majority of subsequent patristic textual studies are based.

<sup>2</sup> The complete list of Clement's biblical references are gathered from the scriptural indices of the critical editions of Clement's works as well as the published list of Clement's references in J. Allenbach et al., eds., *Biblia patristica: Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique* (Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1975), vol. 1. These verses were then examined individually in context before a decision was made on their value for this study. These findings were then crosschecked against previous studies on Clement's text of the Gospels to make sure that every possible reference was fully considered.

allusion; or lemma. The term “citation” [C] designates a verbally exact quotation of a particular Gospel passage; an “adaptation” [Ad] is a quotation that Clement modifies either syntactically or materially to accommodate the context of his reference; an “allusion” [All] represents a clear echo of a Gospel passage but fails to contain a sustained verbal agreement with it;<sup>3</sup> and a “lemma” [L] refers to a Gospel passage that appears as the text of a running commentary. While each of these categories are not organically associated with Clement’s references, they are helpful for determining the relative level of quotation accuracy and, therefore, of greater value when assessing how Clement employs a biblical text in his writings. Citations are displayed first, followed by adaptations, allusions, and lemmata. Within each of these categories, references are listed in accordance to the portion of the verse they attest.

While I include a complete list of the text-critical symbols used with Clement’s text of the Gospels at the end of this chapter, a few of those symbols deserve special attention. First, a portion of Clement’s text is occasionally placed within parentheses (). These parentheses identify words that are not verbally connected to Clement’s reference but may provide contextually valuable information or help identify the passage’s exact point of reference (e.g., Matt 5:3). Second, it is important to note that ellipses (...) have several different meanings depending on their location. Ellipses are used in Clement’s text to indicate the omission of intervening words within Clement’s reference deemed insignificant to his textual reference (e.g., Matt 5:3). Within Clement’s reconstructed text, however, they indicate when there is no intimation of Clement’s support (or lack of support) for the commonly attested text not listed. Finally, the plus sign (+) is attached to the beginning or end of a verse to indicate that it is part of a continuous quotation, either to the verse before it or after it or, in some cases, both.

An examination of Clement’s text of the Gospels reveals that his citations, adaptations, and allusions vary between multiple and single support for a given verse—and his support is often only partial. Due to this situation, I have made the following decisions to determine the precise nature of Clement’s references. First, when Clement cites a passage only once or in the exact same way more than once, that citation is used as the basis of collation. In those places where Clement cites a verse more than once with only minor

---

<sup>3</sup> Determining when and where to draw the line on what constitutes a textual allusion is not an exact science. The fundamental rule I aim for in this study is to include only those allusions that seem to be clearly connected to a specific Gospel passage. To have included every possible allusion no matter how distant, like the inclusion of single-word allusions in the *Biblia patristica*, would produce an unmanageable amount of data with little value for determining Clement’s textual proclivities.

differences, Clement's most probable text is identified by a double asterisk [C]\*\*. In those places where an adaptation or allusion provides evidence of a significant variant listed in the apparatus, a single asterisk (\*) designates that reading. At times, the discrepancy among Clement's references is so great or the individual references for a single verse so fragmentary that it is necessary to reconstruct the wording of Clement's text as far as the extant evidence makes possible.<sup>4</sup> Whenever Clement's text is reconstructed, it occurs at the bottom of all the references, and the heading TEXT designates it.<sup>5</sup>

#### THE CRITICAL APPARATUS

The critical apparatus, which I separate from Clement's Gospel references by a solid line, comprises four different types of data. The first part of the apparatus lists the manuscripts that are lacunose (Lac.) for the verse under consideration. If only a portion of the verse is lacunose in a manuscript, the witness is placed within parentheses, and the manuscript is then explicitly listed as lacunose for every unit of variation for which it does not contain the text.

The second and third sections of the apparatus are divided by a broken line (---) and contain the textual variants identified during collation. The readings listed in each section are given in the order in which they appear in the text. Variants listed above the broken line and immediately following the manuscripts identified as lacunose are readings that are supported by two or more of the representative textual witnesses (see p. 52). The readings below

---

<sup>4</sup> I employed the following criteria when it was necessary to reconstruct Clement's text: (1) preference was given to longer citations over shorter ones (the rationale being that a shorter citation may result from a partial quotation by Clement and therefore may not truly represent his text); (2) citations were given more preference than adaptations or allusions; (3) adaptations were considered of more value than allusions; and (4) minimal value was placed upon the use of lemmata, unless it could be demonstrated that they provided a reliable indication of Clement's text. The latter criterion is of concern only in Mark 10. These criteria are widely accepted by text critics and are employed in the patristic studies published in the Society of Biblical Literature series *The New Testament in the Greek Fathers*. For a detailed explanation of these principles see Gordon D. Fee, "The Use of Greek Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism: The State of the Question," in Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee, *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (SD 45; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 355; repr. from *ANRW* 26.1:246–65; idem, "Use of the Greek Fathers," 201–4.

<sup>5</sup> In those cases where the evidence is split between two different variant readings, both readings are included within brackets [ ] and are counted as representative of Clement's text (e.g., Matt 6:24).

the broken line are singular readings. I also include in this category those readings whose sole support is a church father (e.g., Matt 1:17; 6:20). The latter category is of little value to this study, since it cannot be used to determine Clement's textual affinities. The fourth section of the apparatus is divided by a short line of asterisk marks (\*\*\*) and contains readings supported exclusively by one or more of the Alexandrian fathers (e.g., Matt 10:32; 15:11). While not helpful for determining Clement's textual affinities, this category highlights readings that may reveal a common textual tradition among some of the Alexandrian fathers. In each of these three sections, the reading Clement supports is listed first, appears before the left-facing bracket ( ] ), and is accompanied by those manuscripts that also attest the reading. The readings that differ from Clement appear to the right of the bracket with their supporting witnesses. When more than one reading differs from Clement, a semicolon separates the readings.

The witnesses appear in the following order: papyri, majuscules, minuscules, Old Latin witnesses, modern editions of the Greek text, and other church fathers. In the few places where Clement's testimony spans two or more readings, his support of the other readings is indicated by the abbreviation Clem<sup>pt</sup>. This abbreviation appears before all the other witnesses. The symbol "rell." (*reliqui*, i.e., all the rest) designates all witnesses that are not explicitly cited either in the different readings or those identified as lacunose.

Finally, at times I list individual witnesses in parentheses. This signifies manuscripts that support a slightly altered form of the reading but that, nevertheless, clearly support the reading in question. Parentheses in the apparatus also indicate witnesses whose support is divided between two (or more) possible readings, but no others. This is primarily a feature with the Old Latin manuscripts and is due to some of the differences between the Latin and Greek languages (e.g., absence of a definite article in Latin). The remaining abbreviations and sigla in the text and apparatus are found in the list at the end of this chapter.

#### THE REPRESENTATIVE TEXTUAL WITNESSES

The textual witnesses cited in the apparatus and used in the collations are listed on page 52 according to the textual groups to which they belong for each Gospel.<sup>6</sup> These witnesses are selected for two reasons: (1) they comprise

---

<sup>6</sup> For an unheralded bibliography of articles, books, editions, and collations of the Greek New Testament manuscripts published in the last 150 years, see J. K. Elliott, *A Bibliography of Greek New Testament Manuscripts* (2nd ed.; SNTSMS 109; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); and "Supplement I to J. K.

the leading representatives accepted by most text critics for each of the major text-types, that is, the established families of shared readings;<sup>7</sup> and (2) they are consistently used in recent studies of patristic quotations.<sup>8</sup> Thus the choice of these textual witnesses not only benefits this study but also provides opportunity for further aspects of comparison among other textual studies.

In addition to each of the major textual families, the readings of four Alexandrian fathers whose texts have been recently examined in similar patristic studies are also included: Origen,<sup>9</sup> Athanasius,<sup>10</sup> Didymus,<sup>11</sup> and Cyril.<sup>12</sup> Since one of the questions associated with this investigation is whether a common form of the New Testament exists among the church fathers in Alexandria, the comparison of the extant readings of these fathers with Clement is significant. It should be noted, however, that though the readings of these fathers are included in the apparatus and the initial quantitative analysis, their testimony is not included in the quantitative

---

Elliott, *A Bibliography of Greek New Testament Manuscripts*, *NovT* 46 (2004): 376–400.

<sup>7</sup> Metzger and Ehrman, *Text of the New Testament*, 306–13; Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (2nd ed.; Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1994), 15\*–16\*; Harold Greenlee, *Introduction to Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (2nd ed.; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1995), 30–38, 80–87; Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* (2nd ed.; trans. Errol F. Rhodes; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 103–63, 186–90.

Strictly speaking, the Alands do not recognize the presence of text-types before 300 C.E. They prefer to classify manuscripts before the fourth century according to what they believe to be the accuracy of their transmission (normal, strict, free, or paraphrastic). They recognize only three text-types after the fourth century: the Alexandrian, Koine (Byzantine), and the D text (Western). In spite of the differences in terminology and classification, there is virtually complete acceptance among textual critics of the three basic types of textual groups most commonly referred to as Alexandrian, Western, and Byzantine. It makes little difference to this study that the Alands reject the idea of a Caesarean text-type, since they still recognize the importance of the manuscripts typically associated with it (f<sup>1</sup>, f<sup>13</sup>). See n. 15 in this chapter for more on the decision to include the so-called Caesarean text.

<sup>8</sup> E.g., Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind*; Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes, *Text of the Fourth Gospel*; Mullen, *New Testament Text of Cyril*; Brogan, “Text of the Gospels.”

<sup>9</sup> Sylvie Raquel, “The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Writings of Origen” (Ph.D. diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 2002); Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes, *Origen*.

<sup>10</sup> Brogan, “Text of the Gospels.”

<sup>11</sup> Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind*.

<sup>12</sup> Arthur Cunningham, “The New Testament Text of St. Cyril of Alexandria” (2 vols.; Ph.D. diss., University of Manchester, 1995).

analysis and group profiles that arrange the witnesses by textual group.<sup>13</sup> It would be presumptuous to have automatically classified these Alexandrian fathers as leading witnesses of the so-called Alexandrian text-type.<sup>14</sup> Moreover, to include them would have negatively affected the analysis, since some question still remains about the respective textual affinities of some of the Alexandrian fathers.<sup>15</sup>

Three other aspects in relation to the manuscript witnesses should be mentioned. First, in contrast to some patristic studies, manuscripts representative of “mixed” or “uncertain” text-types are not included. Since the concern of this study is to place Clement in relation to those text-types that are clearly defined, a mixed category provides little benefit. Second, in

---

<sup>13</sup> For a fuller discussion of the reasons for this decision, see the following two notes and n. 25 in chapter 5.

<sup>14</sup> The distinction between Alexandrian fathers and the “Alexandria” text-type should not be overlooked. The so-called Alexandrian text-type represents a group of readings characterized by a terseness and unrefined Greek style and grammar, as compared to other early manuscripts whose readings are often more expansive and paraphrastic (i.e., the so-called “Western” text). Due to these differences, text critics traditionally conclude that the former readings represent a more carefully preserved form of the “original” text. Since Alexandria, Egypt, has a rich history in preserving and establishing texts that had experienced corruption, scholars came to label this group of readings as “Alexandrian.” One should not conclude automatically, however, that the biblical text used by a Father from Alexandria is “Alexandrian” in text form. In this study, the Alexandrian text-type is used in this traditional sense with no prior assumption that such readings are geographically connected to the city of Alexandria. For a fuller description of the theories on the earliest transmission of the New Testament and attempts at redefining the traditional categories of manuscript readings, see Jacobus H. Petzer, “The History of the New Testament Text: Its Reconstruction, Significance and Use in New Testament Textual Criticism,” in *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Early Church History* (ed. B. Aland and J. Delobel; Kampen; Kok Pharos, 1994), 11–36. A different classification system of the traditional text-types based on the papyri discoveries occurs in Eldon J. Epp, “The Papyrus Manuscripts of the New Testament,” in Ehrman and Holmes, *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*, 13–18.

<sup>15</sup> Of the Alexandrian fathers considered in this study, only the Gospel text of Didymus and Athanasius are firmly established as Alexandrian. While each of the remaining studies present an Alexandrian father’s text, a further textual analysis is still necessary before their respective texts can be firmly classified. In the case of Origen’s text of John, Origen’s text is published, but the analysis of his text still awaits publication. For Origen’s text of Matthew and Cyril’s text of John, the textual analysis published at this time still needs further revision and refinement before their results can be considered conclusive. The latter should be used with care, since it requires numerous corrections, while the former needs to be collated against a larger number of representative manuscripts and requires a group profile analysis in addition to its quantitative analysis.



addition to the widely accepted witnesses this study employs, MS 1582 is included as a representative of the Caesarean text.<sup>16</sup> In a recent monograph on MS 1582, Amy Anderson demonstrates that in Matthew MS 1582 is a leading representative of the manuscripts identified as Family 1 (f<sup>1</sup>).<sup>17</sup> A comparison in this study between MS 1582 and Family 1 reveals that Anderson's assessment appears to be correct not only for Matthew but also for the rest of the Gospels as well, at least in the extant references in Clement.<sup>18</sup> For this reason, MS 1582 is included as one of the representative manuscripts of the Caesarean text-type.

Finally, though the UBS<sup>4</sup> and TR are modern eclectic texts and not in reality "Alexandrian" or "Byzantine" witnesses, their texts are included as representative of these two text-types. Despite their eclectic nature, these editions represent a very close affinity to their respective textual group. Moreover, these two editions continue to play an important role in text-critical studies. The text of the UBS<sup>4</sup> is identical with the NA<sup>27</sup> and is widely regarded as the foremost critical text of the New Testament available. While the TR is not highly valued for its manuscript base today, it has played a significant role as a collation base of numerous manuscript studies, including

---

<sup>16</sup> The existence of the so-called Caesarean text-type has become a much-debated subject in recent scholarship. While some question its actual existence as a text-type, others argue not only for its existence but also for the presence of two (or even three) Caesarean subgroups: a pre-Caesarean text (P<sup>45</sup>, W in Mark, f<sup>1</sup>, f<sup>13</sup>), and a Caesarean text proper (Θ, 565, and 700). In addition, while K. Lake and R. P. Blake identify a distinct relationship among several manuscripts in Mark that suggest they belong together as a textual family (Θ, f<sup>1</sup>, f<sup>13</sup>, 28, 565, and 700), the Caesarean text has yet to be established in the other Gospels. In spite of the questions surrounding the Caesarean text-type, it seemed best to include the category in this study with no distinction between Caesarean subgroups for at least two reasons: (1) whether they constitute a text-type or not, the manuscripts typically identified with this group share a clear level of agreement among themselves; and (2) this category of manuscripts has consistently been included in previous patristic studies. Thus by including this category, this study provides a point of reference with previous and future patristic studies and, furthermore, can determine if Clement provides any evidence for the existence of a Caesarean text-type in general before the time of Origen. For a history of the study of the Caesarean text, see Bruce Metzger, "The Caesarean Text of the Gospels"; and Larry Hurtado, *Text-Critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981).

<sup>17</sup> Amy Anderson, *The Textual Tradition of the Gospels: Family One in Matthew* (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

<sup>18</sup> MS 1582 differs from f<sup>1</sup> only once in Mark (10:27), seven times in Luke (6:38; 10:21; 12:31, 36; 14:15, 16; 17:3), and four times in John (6:33; 8:44; 17:21; 20:29). The limited number of differences between MS 1582 and f<sup>1</sup> was seen to have no significant affect on Clement's textual affinities.

## THE TEXTUAL WITNESSES CITED IN THE APPARATUS

**Matthew**

Primary Alexandrian:	Ⲡ B UBS <sup>4</sup>
Secondary Alexandrian:	C L 33 892
Western:	D a b e k
Caesarean:	Θ f <sup>1</sup> f <sup>13</sup> 1582
Byzantine:	A E Δ Π Ω TR
Church fathers:	Or, Ath, Did

**Mark**

Primary Alexandrian:	Ⲡ B UBS <sup>4</sup>
Secondary Alexandrian:	C L Δ Ψ 33 579 892
Caesarean:	Θ f <sup>1</sup> f <sup>13</sup> 1582
Byzantine:	A E Π Ω TR
Western:	D a b e k
Church fathers:	Or Ath Did

**Luke**

Primary Alexandrian:	P <sup>75</sup> Ⲡ B UBS <sup>4</sup>
Secondary Alexandrian:	C L Ψ 33 579 892
Caesarean:	P <sup>45</sup> Θ f <sup>1</sup> f <sup>13</sup> 1582
Byzantine:	A E Δ Π Ω TR
Western:	D a b e
Church fathers:	Or Ath Did

**John**

Primary Alexandrian:	P <sup>66</sup> P <sup>75</sup> Ⲡ (8:39-21:25) B UBS <sup>4</sup>
Secondary Alexandrian:	C L W Ψ 33 579 892
Caesarean:	P <sup>45</sup> Θ f <sup>1</sup> f <sup>13</sup> 1582
Byzantine:	A E Δ Π Ω TR
Western:	Ⲡ (1:1-8:38) D a b e
Church fathers:	Or Ath Did Cyr

the Synoptic Gospels under the direction of the International Greek New Testament Project.<sup>19</sup>

#### ABBREVIATIONS OF CLEMENT'S WORKS

The abbreviations used for the critical editions of Clement's works that serve as the base from which Clement's textual references are compiled are listed below. While complete information on these editions can be found in the bibliography, a few comments on the relative value of the most current editions are necessary at the outset of this study.

Though somewhat dated, Otto Stählin's critical edition, as revised by Ludwig Früchtel and Ursula Treu, continues to be the most reliable edition of Clement's work available. The most recent attempt to improve on Stählin's work has been by Miroslav Marcovich. In spite of the corrections and editions made to Stählin's work over the years, Marcovich contends that even with the revisions not enough attention is given "to the meaning of Clement's text and to the textual problems involved."<sup>20</sup> In order to address his concern, Marcovich published new editions of Clement's *Protrepticus* in 1995 and of the *Paedagogus* in 2002. While better editions are always a desideratum, Marcovich's editions are unreliable for establishing Clement's text of the New Testament. In his attempt to improve on the "meaning" of Clement's text, Marcovich sacrificed textual accuracy. In places where Clement's references to biblical passages appear incomplete, at least in Marcovich's judgment, he modifies Clement's references to bring them into harmony with readings from the LXX, known New Testament readings, or

---

<sup>19</sup> The use of the TR as a collation base of the IGNTP long stood as one of the major divisive issues separating the text-critical work done by the British and American Committees of the IGNTP and the work of Kurt and Barbara Aland at the Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung in Münster. This, however, is no longer the case. In an attempt to benefit from the collaboration of both groups, the IGNTP is exploring other options beyond the TR, including the use of the NA<sup>27</sup>. For a discussion of the events that led up to this decision, see D. C. Parker, "The Principio Project: A Reconstruction of the Johannine Tradition," *FgNT* 13 (2000): 111–18. For a history of the IGNTP, see Eldon J. Epp, "The International Greek New Testament Project: Motivation and History," *NovT* 39 (1997): 1–20.

<sup>20</sup> Miroslav Marcovich, *Clementis Alexandrini Paedagogus* (VCSup 61; Leiden: Brill, 2002), x. He makes virtually the same statement in the preface to his edition of the *Protrepticus*; see Marcovich, *Clementis Alexandrini Protrepticus* (VCSup 34; Leiden: Brill, 1995), vii.

Clement's use of the passage elsewhere.<sup>21</sup> While such emendations might "improve" the form and flow of Clement's biblical references from a literary perspective, they are disastrous from a text-critical perspective. Such so-called improvements actually constitute corruptions of Clement's text that, if accepted, would negate any attempt to examine the textual affinities of Clement's biblical references. For this reason, this study has found Stählin's editions still to be the most reliable critical edition for establishing Clement's text of the Gospels. Nevertheless, Marcovich's work has been crosschecked against Stählin for the sake of accuracy and thoroughness. Marcovich's emendations have been included in the footnotes when it seemed relevant.

<i>Can. ec.</i>	<i>Canon ecclesiasticus</i> <sup>22</sup> (GCS 17 [1970])
<i>Ecl.</i>	<i>Eclogae propheticae</i> (GCS 17 [1970])
<i>Exc.</i>	<i>Excerpta ex Theodoto</i> (GCS 17 [1970]; SC <sup>23</sup> 23 [1970])
<i>Frag.</i>	<i>Fragmente varia</i> (GCS 17 [1970])
<i>Hyp.</i>	<i>Hypotyposeis</i> (GCS 17 [1970])
<i>Paed.</i>	<i>Paedagogus</i> (GCS 12 [1972]; Marcovich [2002])
<i>Pasc.</i>	<i>De pascha</i> (GCS 17 [1970])
<i>Protr.</i>	<i>Protrepticus</i> (GCS 12 [1972]; Marcovich [1995])
<i>Quis div.</i>	<i>Quis dives salvetur</i> (GCS 17)
<i>Strom.</i>	<i>Stromata</i> (GCS 52 [1985; books 1–6], 17 [1970; books 7–8]; SC 428 [1997; book 7]; 446 [1999; book 6]; 463 [2001; book 4])

---

<sup>21</sup> The majority of these types of changes occur in Marcovich's edition of the *Paedagogus*.

<sup>22</sup> For convenience, the number following the references to *Canon ecclesiasticus*, *Hypotyposeis*, and *De pascha* refers to the fragment number by which Stählin's edition references each of these works.

<sup>23</sup> The Sources chrétiennes volumes do not constitute new critical editions of Clement's work. They merely reproduce the text of Stählin's critical editions with a handful of minor changes that do not affect the form of Clement's references found in this study. These volumes are included here because they are the most widely available form of Stählin's revised work currently available. I am also indebted to the work of François Sagnard for the classification of citations belonging to Clement and Theodotus found in the "Table analytique des citations," in *Extraits de Théodote* (SC 23), 241–54.

## ABBREVIATIONS AND SIGLA USED IN THE TEXT AND APPARATUS

[Ad]	Adaptation
[Ad]*	Adaptation that attests a reading of one or more of the significant variants in the apparatus
[All]	Allusion
[All]*	Allusion that attests a reading of one or more of the significant variants in the apparatus
[C]	Citation
[C]**	Citation taken to be representative of Clement's text, and used as the basis of the collation
<sup>c</sup>	Superscript letter "c" indicates a correction to the MS
[L]	Lemma
Lac.	lacunose: indicates where a verse or portion of a verse is missing from a particular manuscript
NA	Not Applicable: indicates when the testimony of the Old Latin MSS cannot support a reading (this is primarily used in those places where the Latin language is not able to identify a particular feature of the Greek, such as the absence of the definite article in Latin)
rell	<i>reliqui</i> : indicates all witnesses not explicitly cited as lacunose or as attesting another reading within the unit of variation
TEXT	Indicates the reconstructed text used as the basis of collation
vid	<i>videtur</i> : indicates the likely reading of a witness that is fragmentary or lacunose
<sup>pt</sup>	Partial: when attached to the abbreviation of a Father, indicates his testimony is divided between two (or more) variants
*	Indicates the original reading of a manuscript that has been corrected

- +
- Indicates a continuous quotation: when found at the end of a citation, the quotation continues without break into the following verse; when found at the beginning of a citation, the quotation is an uninterrupted continuation from the previous verse
- [ ]
- Brackets signify (a) words that Clement attests, when the form is in question; (b) words that Clement appears to attest, when there are residual doubts; and (c) diverging forms of the text, both/all of which Clement appears to attest
- ( )
- Parentheses indicate the following: (a) in Clement's text, to identify words that are not verbally connected to Clement's reference, but provide contextual information; (b) in the list of lacunose witnesses, to designate MSS that are partially lacunose (these are then explicitly listed as lacunose for every unit of variation for which they do not have text); (c) in the apparatus, to signify MSS that attest a slightly altered form; and (d) to indicate witnesses whose support is divided between two (or more) possible readings, but not any others (this is primarily related to the OL MSS, e.g., Matt 16:17)
- ...
- Ellipses are used (a) in Clement's text to indicate the omission of intervening words within Clement's reference deemed insignificant to his textual reference; (b) in Clement's reconstructed text, to indicate when there is no intimation of Clement's support (or lack of support) for the commonly attested text not listed; and (c) in the apparatus, to indicate the inclusion of all the words in between the words listed in Clement's extant text
- 
- Variants listed above this broken line in the apparatus are significant for textual analysis; the variants listed below this line are singular readings considered insignificant for establishing textual relationships
- \*\*\*\*\*
- Variants listed below this line of asterisks in the apparatus are readings whose sole support is one or more of the Alexandrian fathers. These readings are insignificant for determining Clement's affinities with the representative MSS, but they may reveal a common textual tradition among the Alexandrian fathers

# THE GOSPEL TEXT IN CLEMENT: TEXT AND APPARATUS

## THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

### Matt 1:17

(εν δε τω κατα Ματθαιον ευαγγελιω η απο Αβρααμ γενεαλογια  
 μεχρι Μαρίας της μητρος του κυριου περαιουται· γινονται γαρ  
 φησι) απο Αβρααμ εως Δαβιδ γενεαι ιδ, και απο Δαβιδ εως της  
 μετοικεσις Βαβυλωνος γενεαι ιδ, και απο της μετοικεσις  
 Βαβυλωνος εως του Χριστου ομοιως αλλαι γενεαι ιδ (*Strom.*  
 1.147.5) [Ad]

---

Lac. A D e Or Ath (Did)

-----  
 Αβρααμ εως **ⲛ** B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> ] μεν  
 του Αβρααμ εως του Did [NA: a b]

Δαβιδ<sup>1</sup> **ⲛ** B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] add τω  
 οντι Did [NA: a b]

δεκατεσσαρες **ⲛ** B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] add εισιν Did b

γενεαι<sup>2</sup> **ⲛ** B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did] sunt  
 (=εισιν) a b

ομοιως αλλαι] sunt (=εισιν) a b; omit **ⲛ** B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892  
 1582 k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [Lac. Did]

**Matt 2:1–2**

οι μαγοι οι μαγεια και του σωτηρος προεμηνυσαν την γενεσιν,  
 αστερος αυτοις καθηγουμενου εις την Ιουδαιαν αφικνουμενοι γην  
 (*Strom.* 1.71.4) [All]

---

Lac. A e Θ Ath Did

**Matt 2:11**

χρυσον αυτω γεννηθεντι βασιλειας συμβολον προσεκομισαν οι  
 μαγοι (*Paed.* 2.63.5) [All]

---

Lac. A e Θ (Or) Ath Did

**Matt 5:3**

(διο και προσεθηκεν ο Ματθαιος,) μακαριοι οι πτωχοι· (πως;) τω  
 πνευματι (*Quis div* 17.5) [C]

ουτος εστιν ο μακαριζομενος υπο του κυριου και πτωχος τω  
 πνευματι καλουμενος, κληρονομος ετοιμος ουρανου βασιλειας  
 (*Quis div.* 16.3) [All]

γνησιος πτωχος ... ο μεν κατα πνευμα πτωχος (*Quis div* 19.2) [All]

---

Lac. A L Θ e Ath

-----  
 τω πνευματι Ⲡ B C E Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did]  
 πνευματι D [NA: a b k]

**Matt 5:4<sup>1</sup>**

μακαριοι οι πενθουντες, οτι αυτοι παρακληθησονται (*Strom.* 4.37.5) [C]

ο κλαιων και ο πενθων δια δικαιοσυνην (*Strom.* 4.26.1) [All]

---

<sup>1</sup> Matt 5:4 and 5 are inverted in D 33 a b k.



Lac. A L Θ e (Or) Ath

πενθουντες 8<sup>\*</sup> B C D E Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] add  
vuv 8<sup>c</sup> 33 892 Did

**Matt 5:5**

μακαριοι (φησιν) οι πραεις, οτι αυτοι κληρονομησουσι την γην  
(*Strom.* 4.36.1) [C]

---

Lac. A L e Ath

**Matt 5:6**

μακαριοι οι πεινωντες και διψωντες την δικαιοσυνην του θεου:  
(*Quis div* 17.5) [Ad]

ουτω δε και τους πεινωντας και τους διψωντας δια δικαιοσυνην  
μακαριους λεγει (*Strom.* 4.26.2) [Ad]

μακαριοι (τω οντι κατα την γραφην) οι πεινωντες και διψωντες την  
αληθειαν, οτι πλησθησονται τροφης αιδιου (*Strom.* 5.70.1) [Ad]

μακαριοι γαρ οι πεινωντες και διψωντες την δικαιοσυνην του θεου:  
ουτοι γαρ και εμπληθησονται (*Ecl.* 14.4) [Ad]

και τους πεινωντες δικαιοσυνην (*Strom.* 1.7.2) [All]

καν πεινη καν διψη δια δικαιοσυνην (*Strom.* 4.25.2) [All]

καν την δικαιοσυνην αυτην πεινωσι, μακαριοι (*Strom.* 4.26.3) [All]

TEXT: μακαριοι οι πεινωντες και διψωντες την δικαιοσυνην...

---

Lac. A L e Ath

**Matt 5:7**

(παλιν φησιν) μακαριοι οι ελεημονες, οτι αυτοι ελεηθησονται  
(*Strom.* 4.38.1) [C]

και τους μεν ελεημονας μακαριζει, οτι αυτοι ελεηθησονται (*Paed.*  
3.92.2) [Ad]

ελεατε (φησιν ο κυριος) ινα ελεηθητε (*Strom.* 2.91.2) [All]

Lac. A L (a) e Or Ath

ελεηθησονται  $\aleph$  B C D E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Did] miseribitur Deus (=θεος ελεθησεται) a b; misericordiam  
insequitur (=ελεον ακολουθησει) k

### Matt 5:8

μακαριοι οι καθαροι τη καρδια, οτι αυτοι τον θεον οψονται (*Strom.*  
2.50.2) [C]

μακαριοι δε οι καθαροι τη καρδια, οτι αυτοι τον θεον οψονται  
(*Exc.* 11.1) [C]

μακαριους (ειπεν) τους καθαρους την καρδιαν, οτι αυτοι τον θεον  
οψονται (*Strom.* 4.39.1) [Ad]

οι καθαροι δε τη καρδια τον θεον οψονται (*Strom.* 5.7.7) [Ad]

οταν καθαρα η καρδια γενηται (*Strom.* 1.94.6) [All]

καθαρος την καρδιαν γενομενος (*Strom.* 6.102.2) [All]

οι καθαροι την καρδιαν (*Strom.* 6.108.1) [All]

αυτη των καθαρων τη καρδια η καταληπτικη θεωρια (*Strom.* 7.13.1)  
[All]

δι αυτην δε την γνωσιν καθαρως τη καρδια (*Strom.* 7.19.2) [All]

επειτα καθαροις τη καρδια γενομενοις κατα το προσεχες του κυριου  
(*Strom.* 7.56.5) [All]

τον καθαρων τη καρδια προσωπον προς προσωπον επιστημονικως  
και καταληπτικως τον θεον εποπτευειν διδαξασα (*Strom.* 7.57.1)  
[All]

η γνωστική ψυχη λαμβανει καθαρα τελειον γενομενη (*Strom.* 7.68.4)  
[All]

ινα καθαρος τη καρδια γενομενος ιδης τον θεον (*Quis div.* 19.3) [All]

TEXT: μακαριοι οι καθαροι τη καρδια, οτι αυτοι τον θεον οψονται

---

Lac. A L e

καθαροι ⲛ B C D E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or  
Ath Did] mundo (=καθαρα) a b

-----  
θεον ⲛ B C D E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Ath  
Did] Dominum (=κυριον) k

#### Matt 5:9

μακαριοι οι ειρηνοποιοι (*Strom.* 1.7.2) [C]

μακαριοι (τοινυν) οι ειρηνοποιοι (*Strom.* 4.40.2) [C]

+ οτι αυτοι υιοι θεου κληθησονται (*Strom.* 4.41.2) [C]<sup>2</sup>

TEXT: μακαριοι οι ειρηνοποιοι, οτι αυτοι υιοι θεου κληθησονται

---

Lac. A L e (Or) Ath

αυτοι B E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 892 1582 k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit ⲛ C D f<sup>13</sup> a  
b Did [Lac. Or]

#### Matt 5:10

μακαριοι οι δεδιωγμενοι ενεκεν δικαιοσυνης (*Strom.* 4.25.1) [C]

ως ουν τους δεδιωγμενους (*Strom.* 4.26.2) [Ad]

---

<sup>2</sup> Clement attaches this citation to the first half of Matt 5:10.

μακαριοι (φησιν) οι δεδιωγμενοι ενεκεν δικαιοσυνης + (*Strom.* 4.41.2)  
[C]<sup>3</sup>

---

Lac. A L e (Or) Did

---

ενεκεν Ⲛ B D E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Ath] add  
της C [NA: a b k]

εστιν Ⲛ B C E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Ath]  
εστε D

#### Matt 5:13

αλας της γης (καλει) (*Quis div.* 36.1) [C]

το γαρ αλας της γης ημεις (*Paed.* 3.82.4) [Ad]

υμεις εστε οι αλες της γης (*Strom.* 1.41.3) [Ad]

TEXT: υμεις εστε το αλας της γης ...

---

Lac. A L e (Or) Ath

αλας Ⲛ<sup>c</sup> B C E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did] αλα Ⲛ<sup>\*</sup>  
D Or [NA: a b k]

#### Matt 5:14

υμεις εστε το φως του κοσμου (*Exc.* 9.3) [C]

φως του κοσμου (*Quis div.* 36.1) [C]

η ημετερα πιστις φως ουσα του κοσμου (*Strom.* 4.80.3) [All]

---

Lac. A L e (Or) Ath

---

<sup>3</sup> This citation is attached to the second half of Matt 5:9.

κοσμου  $\aleph$  B C D E  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$   $f^1$   $f^{13}$  33 892 1582 k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or  
Did] *huis mundi* (=τουτου κοσμου) a b

-----  
υμεις  $\aleph$  B C D E  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$   $f^1$   $f^{13}$  33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or  
Did] add δε  $\Delta$

**Matt 5:16**

τα αγαθα υμων εργα<sup>4</sup> λαμψατω (*Strom.* 3.36.4) [All]

λαμψατω γαρ σου τα εργα (*Strom.* 4.171.2) [All]

-----  
Lac. A C e (Or) Ath

**Matt 5:17**

(ο δε κυριος) ου καταλυειν τον νομον αφικνεται αλλα πληρωσαι  
(*Strom.* 3.46.2) [Ad]

-----  
Lac. A C e Ath Did

**Matt 5:18**

ων ουδε κεραια παραλευσεται μια, μη ουχι επιτελης γενομενη  
(*Protr.* 82.1) [Ad]

-----  
Lac. A C (33) e (Or) Ath Did

**Matt 5:19**

μεγιστος (φησι) εν τη βασιλεια ος αν ποιη και διδασκη (*Strom.*  
2.97.2) [Ad]\*

-----  
-----  
<sup>4</sup> The substitution of εργα for φως also appears in the writings of Justin, Tertullian, Origen, and Eusebius (Arthur J. Bellinzoni, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr* [Leiden: Brill, 1967], 92–94). The fact that this reading is common among these church fathers suggests that it is not accidental but part of an early catechetical tradition that emphasized the importance of good works.

Lac. A C (33) e Ath

μεγιστος ... διδασκη / ος δ αν ποιηση και διδασκη ουτος μεγας  
κληθησεται εν τη βασιλεια B E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 a b k  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did] omit *in toto* D 8<sup>5</sup> [Lac. 33]

### Matt 5:20

πλεον των γραμματεων και Φαρισαιων (*Strom.* 6.115.3) [C]

(οντως γαρ ως ο κυριος εφη) εαν μη περισσευση η δικαιοσυνη υμων  
πλειω των γραμματεων και Φαρισαιων, ουκ εισελευσεσθε εις  
την βασιλειαν του θεου (*Strom.* 3.33.3) [Ad]\*

(τοτε ακουσονται της γραφης:) εαν μη πλεοναση υμων η δικαιοσυνη  
πλειον των γραμματεων και Φαρισαιων (*Strom.* 6.164.2) [Ad]\*

TEXT: ...εαν μη περισσευση υμων η δικαιοσυνη πλεον των  
γραμματεων και Φαρισαιων ... εις την βασιλειαν του θεου

Lac. A C e (33) Or Ath (Did)

υμων η δικαιοσυνη 8 B E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 UBS<sup>4</sup> Did] η  
δικαιοσυνη υμων Clem<sup>pt</sup> f<sup>1</sup> 33<sup>vid</sup> a b TR; iustitia (=η δικαιοσυνη) k

omit *in toto* D

περισσευση 8 B E L Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did]  
περισσευσαι Δ; omit D [Lac. 33]

πλειον/πλεον/πλειων 8 B E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Did] πληονα L; omit D [NA: a b k]

θεου ] ουρανων 8 B E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>; omit D [Lac. Did]

<sup>5</sup> Though Clement's adaptation is quite loose here, it still indicates he was aware of the reading ος δ αν ποιηση και διδαξη, ουτος μεγας κληθησεται εν τη βασιλεια.

**Matt 5:22**

ει δε ο μωρον ειπων τον αδελφον ενοχος εις κρισιν (*Paed.* 2.50.2) [All]\*

---

Lac. A C e (Or) Ath Did

ενοχος **ⲛ**<sup>1</sup> B Ω UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] εικη ενοχος **ⲛ**<sup>c</sup> D E L Δ Θ Π f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892  
1582 a b k TR

**Matt 5:25**

ισθι ευνοων τω αντιδικω σου ταχυ, εως ουτου ει εν τη οδω μετ  
αυτου (*Strom.* 4.95.2) [C]

(γεγραπται γαρ) μηποτε παραδω σε τω κριτη, ο κριτης δε τω  
υπηρετη της αρχης του διαβολου (*Strom.* 4.95.3) [Ad]\*

TEXT: ισθι ευνοων τω αντιδικω σου ταχυ εως ουτου ει εν τη οδω μετ  
αυτου, μηποτε παραδω σε... τω κριτη,... ο κριτης τω υπηρετη...

---

Lac. A C e Or Ath (Did)

εν τη οδω μετ αυτου E Δ Θ Π Ω k TR] μετ αυτου εν τη οδω **ⲛ** B  
D L f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b UBS<sup>4</sup> Did

παραδω σε a b] σε παραδω **ⲛ** B E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582  
k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; σε παραδωσει D [Lac. Did]

κριτης **ⲛ** B f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 k UBS<sup>4</sup>] add σε παραδω E L Δ Θ Π Ω  
33 a b TR; add σε παραδωσει D [Lac. Did]

-----  
εως **ⲛ** B E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit D

**Matt 5:27**

ο μεν γαρ φησιν: ου μοιχευσεις + (*Strom.* 3.8.4) [Ad]

ηκουσατε του νομου παραγγελλοντος: ου μοιχευσεις + (*Strom.* 3.71.3) [Ad]

TEXT: ηκουσατε ... ου μοιχευσεις

---

Lac. A C e (Or) Ath Did

**Matt 5:28**

πας ο βλέπων γυναίκα προς το επιθυμῆσαι ἤδη ἐμοιχεύσεν αὐτήν  
(*Strom.* 3.94.3) [C]

ο ἰδὼν πρὸς ἐπιθυμίαν ἐμοιχεύσεν (*Strom.* 2.50.2) [Ad]

ο γὰρ ἐπιθυμήσας ἤδη μεμοιχεύκε (φησιν) (*Strom.* 2.66.1) [Ad]

+ πᾶς ο προσβλέπων κατ' ἐπιθυμίαν ἤδη ἐμοιχεύσεν (λεγει) (*Strom.* 3.8.4) [Ad]

ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω, οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις (*Strom.* 3.9.1) [Ad]

ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω, μὴ ἐπιθυμήσης (*Strom.* 3.31.1) [Ad]

+ ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω: οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις (*Strom.* 3.71.3) [Ad]

το γὰρ οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ γεγραμμένον τῷ νόμῳ  
περιτιθῆσιν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐπιστολῇ (*Strom.* 3.76.1) [Ad]

(ἐξηγουμένος γὰρ το) ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω, ο ἐμβλεψας τῇ γυναικὶ πρὸς  
ἐπιθυμίαν ἤδη μεμοιχεύκεν (*Strom.* 4.114.2) [Ad]

οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, ἐπιθυμία γὰρ μόνῃ μεμοιχεύκας (*Protr.* 108.5) [All]

ο γὰρ ἐμβλεψας<sup>6</sup>, φησι, περιεργότερον ἤδη ἡμάρτεν (*Paed.* 3.33.2) [All]  
ο ἐμβλεψας πρὸς ἐπιθυμίαν κρινεταί (*Strom.* 2.61.3) [All]

αὐτὰ μοιχεύειν ἐξ ἐνθυμήσεως κρίνει ὁ κύριος (*Strom.* 3.46.4) [All]  
ἐὰν εἰς κάλλος σώματος βλεψῇ τις, ὁ λόγος φησι, καὶ αὐτῷ ἡ σὰρξ

---

<sup>6</sup> While the existence of shared textual traditions in the early church is indisputable, Bellinzoni's suggestion that Clement's use of the compound verb ἐμβλεπεῖν in *Paed.* 3.33.2 and *Strom.* 2.61.3 is evidence of this kind of tradition is not convincing (Bellinzoni, *Sayings of Jesus*, 57–59). Though Justin, Origen, and Cyril of Jerusalem make use of ἐμβλεπεῖν in reference to this text, Clement's agreement is likely just a coincidence. This seems to be the more probable explanation for two reasons. First, even though Clement uses the same verb, he uses an entirely different verbal form of it. Second, the distinction between ἐμβλεπεῖν and βλεπεῖν is not significant enough to conclude that the use of one or the other is deliberate instead of accidental. Third, when Clement uses ἐμβλεπεῖν, his reference is part of a loose allusion to the text and suggests that Clement was not trying to provide an exact quotation.



ειναι κατ επιθυμian δοξη καλη, σαρκικως ιδων και αμαρτητικως δι  
ου τεθauμακεν κρινεται: (*Strom.* 4.116.1) [All]

TEXT: εγω δε λεγω ... πας ο βλεπων γυναικα προς το επιθυμησαι  
ηδη εμοιχευσεν αυτην ...

---

Lac. A C e Ath Did

επιθυμησαι **ⲛ**<sup>\*</sup> Π Or] add αυτην B D E L Δ Θ Ω f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a  
b UBS<sup>4</sup>; αυτης **ⲛ**<sup>c</sup> f<sup>1</sup> TR; causam (=αιτιαν?) k

αυτην **ⲛ** B D E L Θ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] omit Δ Π

-----  
 πας ο βλεπων **ⲛ** B D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup> Or<sup>pt</sup>] ος εαν εμβλεψη Or<sup>pt</sup>; ος αν εμβλεψη Or<sup>pt</sup>

#### Matt 5:36

ουδεις δε αλλος<sup>7</sup> (φησιν ο κυριος) δυναται ποιησαι τριχα λευκην η  
μελαιναν (*Paed.* 3.16.4) [Ad]<sup>\*</sup>

---

Lac. A C e Or Ath Did

ποιησαι τριχα [μian<sup>8</sup>] λευκην η μελαιναν (D) (k)] ποιησαι μιαν  
τριχα λευκην η μελαινα f<sup>1</sup> 1582; μιαν τριχα λευκην ποιησαι η  
μελαιναν **ⲛ** B 33 892 (a) (b) UBS<sup>4</sup>; μιαν τριχα λευκην η μελαιναν  
ποιησαι E Δ Π Ω TR; μιαν τριχα λευκην ποιησαι μελεναν L;  
μιαν τριχαν λευκην ποιηση η μελεναν Θ; μιαν τριχαν ποιησαι  
λευκην η μελεναν f<sup>13</sup>

-----  
 δυναται ] δυνασαι **ⲛ** B D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Marcovich replaces αλλος with ανθρωπος.

<sup>8</sup> While μιαν is omitted entirely from Clement's adaptation, his reading is included in this category, since in all other matters he clearly supports the reading in D against the numerous conflicting readings found in the other witnesses.

**Matt 5:37**

(παλιν αυτω του κυριου ρητω) εστω υμων το ναι ναι και το ου ου  
(*Strom.* 5.99.1) [C]<sup>9</sup>

εσται υμων το ναι ναι και το ου ου (*Strom.* 7.67:5) [C]<sup>10</sup>

Lac. A C e Or Ath Did

εστω ] add δε ο λογος  $\aleph$  D E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 (a) (b)  
(k) TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; εσται δε ο λογος B

**Matt 5:42**

τω αιτουντι σε δος (επιφερι), και τον θελοντα δανεισασθαι μη  
αποστραφης (*Strom.* 3.54.1) [C]

Lac. A C e Or Ath (Did)

αιτουντι  $\aleph$  B D E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omni  
petenti/poscenti (=παντω αιτουντι) a b k [Lac. Did]

δος  $\aleph$  B D f<sup>13</sup> 892 UBS<sup>4</sup>] διδου E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>1</sup> 33 1582 TR [NA:  
a b k; Lac. Did]

τον θελοντα  $\aleph$  B E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did] τω  
θελοντι D a b (k)

<sup>9</sup> Though the context provides no indication whether Clement is referring to Matt 5:37 or Jas 5:12, it is more probable that Clement has Matt 5:37 in mind. This appears to be indicated by the future middle indicative form of the verb ειμι that appears in the manuscript tradition of Matthew but not in James.

<sup>10</sup> Clement's text reveals the following two variants in Matt 5:37. Neither variant has been included in the textual analysis, since the affinity does not appear to be genetically significant. While Clement is clearly drawing on the words of Jesus, the similarity between this verse and Jas 5:12 suggests that he may have mixed the two passages together.

υμων το  $\Theta$ ] υμων  $\aleph$  B D E L  $\Delta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [NA: a b k]  
και το  $\Theta$  (a) (b)] omit  $\aleph$  B D E  $\Delta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; και L (a) (b)

δανεισασθαι D k] απο σου δανεισασθαι  $\aleph$  B E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup>  
33 892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did

σε  $\aleph^c$  D E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] σοι  $\aleph^*$

**Matt 5:44**

αγαπατε τους εχθρους υμων (λεγει), ευλογειτε τους καταρωμενους  
υμας, και προσευχεσθε υπερ των επηρεαζοντων<sup>11</sup> υμιν ... +  
(*Strom.* 4.95.1) [Ad]<sup>\*12</sup>

Lac. A C e Ath Did

ευλογειτε τους καταρωμενους υμας E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 TR]  
omit  $\aleph$  B f<sup>1</sup> 1582 a b k UBS<sup>4</sup> Or; ευλογειτε ... υμιν D

αγαπατε  $\aleph$  B D E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Or<sup>pe</sup>] αγαπησατε Or<sup>pe</sup>

υμας ] omit  $\aleph$  B f<sup>1</sup> 1582 k UBS<sup>4</sup> Or; add καλως ποιειτε τοις  
μισουσιν υμας D E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 (a) (b); add καλως  
ποιειτε τους μισουντας υμας (a) (b) TR

υμιν ] υμας E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR Or; omit  $\aleph$  B D  
f<sup>1</sup> 1582 UBS<sup>4</sup>

<sup>11</sup> The following variant from Matt 5:44 is not included in the textual analysis, since the nature of Clement's affinities is already indicated in the previous variant. The textual nuances provided in this variant offer no further genetically significant information for determining Clement's text.

επηρεαζοντων E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 TR Or<sup>pe</sup>] επηρεαζοντων D  
a b; omit  $\aleph$  B f<sup>1</sup> 1582 UBS<sup>4</sup>; διωκοντων Or<sup>pe</sup>; eis qui (=αυτων οι?) k

<sup>12</sup> This reference is taken from Matt 5:44–45 rather than Luke 6:27–28 because: (1) the verses are connected to a quotation of Matt 5:45, which is introduced by ος προστιθησιν; and (2) the context indicates that Clement is working from Matt 5, since he immediately goes on to quote Matt 5:45.

**Matt 5:45**

+ (οἷς προστιθησιν ἰνα) γενησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (*Strom.* 4.95.1) [C]

ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους (*Strom.* 4.137.2) [C]<sup>13</sup>

ἐπεὶ καὶ τῆς θείας χάριτος ὁ νετὸς ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους  
καταπεμπεται (*Strom.* 5.18.7) [C]

ὅς ἐπὶ πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἀνατέλλει τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ (*Prottr.* 114.3) [Ad]

ὁ πατήρ μου (φησιν) βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους (*Paed.* 1.72.3) [Ad]

ὁ βρέχων ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους (*Strom.* 6.29.2) [Ad]

βρέχει γὰρ ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους καὶ τὸν ἥλιον ἐπιλαμβάνει  
πᾶσιν (*Exc.* 9.3) [Ad]

ὁ πατήρ μου, φησιν, ἐπιλαμβάνει τὸν ἥλιον τὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πάντας  
(*Paed.* 1.72.2) [All]

ὁ τε γὰρ θεὸς ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους τὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπιλαμβάνει ἥλιον  
(*Strom.* 7.85.2) [All]

ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους καταπεμπεται (*Strom.* 7.86.5) [All]

TEXT: ... γενησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ...  
τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ... βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους

Lac. A C e Ath (Did)

τοῖς οὐρανοῖς Θ Π f<sup>13</sup> 33 Or<sup>pe</sup>] οὐρανοῖς ⲛ B D E L Δ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 892  
1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or<sup>pe</sup> [NA: a b k; Lac. Did]

αὐτοῦ ⲛ B D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit  
Did δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους ⲛ<sup>c</sup> B D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a  
b TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did] omit ⲛ<sup>c</sup>; superiuseos et iniustos  
(=χρεισσοντας καὶ ἀδίκους?) k

<sup>13</sup> The context indicates this is a quotation rather than an allusion.

**Matt 5:48**

(τοιουτοις τιςιν ο κυριος λεγει) γινεσθε ως ο πατηρ υμων τελειος  
(*Strom.* 4.137.3) [Ad]\*

ως ο πατηρ (φησιν) ο εν τοις ουρανοις (*Strom.* 6.104.2) [Ad]\*

(οπως ειρηται προς του κυριου) γινεσθε ως ο πατηρ υμων τελειοι  
(*Strom.* 7.88.4) [Ad]\*

και μη τι τον γνωστικον τελειον ειναι βουλομενος ο σωτηρ ημων ως  
τον ουρανιον πατερα (*Strom.* 7.81.3) [All]

μη τι ουν τελειοι γενεσθαι οφειλομεν ως ο πατηρ βουλεται (*Strom.*  
7.88.6) [All]

TEXT: ... ως ο πατηρ υμων ο εν τοις ουρανοις τελειος ...

---

Lac. A C e (Or) Ath

ως **ⲛ B E L f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582 UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did**] ωσπερ D Δ Θ Π Ω 892  
TR [NA: a b k]

ο εν τοις ουρανοις (Δ) Θ Π Ω b k TR] ο ουρανιος **ⲛ B E L f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup>**  
33 892 1582 a UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did; εν ουρανοις D

-----  
υμων **ⲛ B D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did**]   
ημων Or

**Matt 6:2–3**

εαν ποιησης, φησιν, ελεημοσυνην μηδεις γινωσκετω (*Strom.* 4.138.2)  
[All]

---

Lac. A C e (Or) Ath (Did)

**Matt 6:6**

ει γαρ εν τω ταμειω μυστικως προσευχεσθαι τω θεω δικαιον  
(*Paed.* 3.82.3) [All]

ει δε εν τω ταμειω ευχη, ως ο κυριος εδιδαξε (*Strom.* 1.34.1) [All]

εν αυτω τω ταμειω της ψυχης (*Strom.* 7.49.7) [All]

Lac. A C (33) e Did

### Matt 6:16–18

και εαν νηστευσης, αλειψαι, ινα ο θεος μονος γινωσκη (*Strom.* 4.138.2) [All]

Lac. A C e Or Ath Did

### Matt 6:19

μη θησαυριζετε (τοινυν) υμιν θησαυρους επι της γης, οπου σης και βρωσις αφανιζει και κλεπται διορυσσουσι και κλεπτουσι (*Strom.* 4.33.4) [C]

θησαυριζων επι της γης οπου σης και βρωσις αφανιζει (*Strom.* 3.56.2) [Ad]\*

λεγων ειρηκεναι τον σωτηρα επι γης μη θησαυριζειν οπου σης και βρωσις αφανιζει (*Strom.* 3.86.3) [Ad]\*

Lac. A C e Ath (Did)

σης και βρωσις  $\aleph$  B D E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$   $f^1$   $f^{13}$  33 892 1582 k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] erugo et tineia (=βρωσις και σης) a b [Lac. Did]

αφανιζει  $\aleph$  B E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$   $f^1$   $f^{13}$  33 892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] αφανιζουσιν D k; αφανιζουσι Or [Lac. Did]

θησαυριζετε  $\aleph$  B E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$   $f^1$   $f^{13}$  33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did] θησαυρισετε D

υμιν  $\aleph$  B D E L  $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$   $f^1$   $f^{13}$  33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did] εν υμιν  $\Delta$

καί<sup>2</sup>] add οπου **Σ** B D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or [Lac. Did]

**Matt 6:20**

θησαυρους εν ουρανω, οπου μητε σης μητε βρωσις αφανιζει μητε  
κλεπται διορυσσουσι (*Quis div.* 13.3) [Ad]\*

εν ουρανω θησαυριζει τα χρηματα ... ου σης ου ληστης (*Paed.* 3.34.3)  
[All]

---

Lac. A C (D) e (Or) Ath (Did)

σης μητε / ουτε βρωσις **Σ** B E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 k TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] erugo neque tinea (=βρωσις ουτε σης) a b<sup>14</sup> [Lac. D Or Did]

-----  
ουρανω **Σ** B D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or<sup>pt</sup>  
Did] ουρανοις a Or<sup>pt</sup>

**Matt 6:24**<sup>15</sup>

τι δε ουδεις δυναται δυσι δουλευειν κυριοις, θεω και μαμωνα  
(*Strom.* 4.30.4) [Ad]\*

ουδεις γαρ δυναται δυσι κυριοις δουλευειν, θεω και μαμωνα  
(*Strom.* 7.71.6) [Ad]\*

---

Lac. A C D e Or Ath

---

<sup>14</sup> Since the distinction in Classical Greek between the negative particles ου and μη and their compounds is not consistent in later Hellenistic Greek, no significance is attached to Clement's use of μητε instead of ουτε in his adaptation of Matt 6:20. See Herbert W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), 608–9; Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (2nd ed.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 281.

<sup>15</sup> These references are most likely taken from Matt 6:25 rather than Luke 16:13, because, unlike the manuscript tradition of Luke, they do not include οικητης after ουδεις. While οικητης is found in the text of Matt 6:25 in manuscripts L Δ 1071, the late date of these manuscripts indicates a likely harmonization with Luke.

ουδεις  $\aleph$  B E  $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$   $f^1$   $f^{13}$  33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did] ουδεις  
οικετης L  $\Delta$

-----  
κυριοις δουλευειν  $\aleph$  B E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$   $f^1$   $f^{13}$  33 892 1582 a b k TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Did] δουλευειν κυριοις Clem<sup>pt</sup>

θεω  $\aleph$  B E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$   $f^1$   $f^{13}$  33 892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did]  
Domino (=κυριω) κ

**Matt 6:32<sup>16</sup>**

οιδεν γαρ ο πατηρ υμων οτι χρηζετε τουτων απαντων: + (*Strom.*  
4.34.6) [C]

-----  
Lac. A C D e Or Ath Did

υμων  $\aleph$  a b k] υμων ο ουρανιος  $\aleph^c$  B E  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$   $f^1$   $f^{13}$  33 892 1582  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; ο ουρανιος L

-----  
γαρ B E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$   $f^1$   $f^{13}$  33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] add ο θεος  $\aleph$

**Matt 6:33<sup>17</sup>**

+ ζητετε δε πρωτον την βασιλειαν του ουρανων<sup>18</sup> και την  
δικαιοσυνην (ταυτα γαρ μεγαλα, τα δε μικρα και περι τον βιον)  
ταυτα προστεθισεται υμιν (*Strom.* 4.34.6) [Ad]\*

ζητετε πρωτον την βασιλειαν των ουρανων, και ταυτα παντα  
προστεθισεται υμιν (*Paed.* 2.120.2)

---

<sup>16</sup> Though this reference shares some similarity with Luke 12:30, it most likely refers to Matt 6:32. This conclusion is indicated by its continuous connection to a larger reference that clearly has Matt 6:33 in mind.

<sup>17</sup> Clement's use of πρωτον in both references, and the use of δικαιοσυνην in *Paed.* 2.120.1 suggests that this reference refers to Matt 6:33, not Luke 12:31.

<sup>18</sup> Clement's references to Matt 6:33 suggest another common tradition in the early church. Like Clement, Justin has the reading βασιλειαν του ουρανων (*Apol.* 15.16), and his text is identical to Clement's reference in *Paed.* 2.120.2, except for the omission of πρωτον (Bellinzoni, *Sayings of Jesus*, 90–91).



Lac. A C D e Or Ath

-----  
 την βασιλειαν ... δικαιοσυνην **Σ** Ε Λ Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 (a)  
 (b) (k) TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did<sup>pe</sup>] δικαιοσυνην ... βασιλειαν B Did<sup>pe</sup>

του ουρανων ] omit **Σ** B Did<sup>pe</sup>; του θεου Ε Λ Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892  
 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did<sup>pe</sup>

### Matt 6:34

(λεγει) μη<sup>19</sup> μεριμνατε περι της αυριον αρκετον γαρ τη ημερα η κακια  
 αυτης (*Paed.* 1.17.2) [Ad]<sup>\*20</sup>

μη γαρ μεριμνατε (φησι) περι της αυριον (*Paed.* 1.98.4) [Ad]\*

---

Lac. A C D e Or Ath (Did)

-----  
 μεριμνατε ] μεριμνησητε **Σ** B Ε Λ Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup> Did [NA: a b k]

\*\*\*\*\*

περι της Did] εις την **Σ** B Ε Λ Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k  
 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

### Matt 7:6

(φησιν) εμπροσθεν των χοιρων τους μαργαριτας βαλλειν, μη ποτε  
 καταπατησωσι τοις ποσι και στραφεντες ρηξωσιν υμας (*Strom.*  
 1.55.3) [Ad]\*

---

<sup>19</sup> It is extremely difficult to determine the presence or absence of introductory conjunctions and particles in a Father's text, particularly when there is only a single reference. While ουν is absent in two separate references, Clement's references are still too loose to determine his text at this point. For this reason, it has not been cited in the apparatus as agreeing with the Old Latin MSS a b. Contrary to Ehrman's conclusion, it is unlikely that the absence of ουν in Didymus's text is genetically significant, since it only occurs in a single brief adaptation (see Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind*, 50).

<sup>20</sup> Since Clement's adaptation omits a clause from the middle of this quotation, it is impossible to determine whether his text includes the conjunction γαρ after αρκετον (Ω).

των δε αγιων μεταδιδοναι τοις κυσιν απαγορευεται (*Strom.* 2.7.4) [All]

---

Lac. A D e (Or) (Ath)

καταπατησωσι  $\aleph$  E  $\Delta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>1</sup> 892 1582 a b k TR Did<sup>pt</sup>  
καταπατησουσιν B C L  $\Theta$  f<sup>13</sup> 33 UBS<sup>4</sup> Did<sup>pt</sup> [Lac. Or Ath]

-----  
ρηξωσιν  $\aleph$  B E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
ρηξουσιν 33 [Lac. Or Ath]

\*\*\*\*\*

μαργαριτας Or Ath<sup>pt</sup> Did<sup>pt</sup>] add υμων  $\aleph$  B C E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup>  
33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Ath<sup>pt</sup> Did<sup>pt</sup>

### Matt 7:13

(ακηκοασι γαρ δια της εντολης) οτι πλατεια και ευρυχωρος οδος  
απαγει εις την απωλειαν και πολλοι οι διερχομενοι δι αυτης  
(*Strom.* 4.34.1) [Ad]\*\*

(την δε εναντιαν) την εις απωλειαν (φερουσαν) πλατειαν και  
ευρυχωρον (*Strom.* 5.31.1) [Ad]

τον δευτερον δε επι των τη ευρυχωρω και πλατεια οδω ουκ  
εμμενοντων (*Strom.* 2.68.1) [All]

---

Lac. A D (33) e Or Ath

πλατεια  $\aleph$  a b k Did<sup>pt</sup>] add η πυλη  $\aleph$  c B C E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33<sup>vid</sup>  
892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did<sup>pt</sup>

πολλοι  $\aleph$  ] add εισιν  $\aleph$  c B C E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did

-----  
οδος ] η οδος  $\aleph$  B C E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did  
[Na: a b k; Lac. 33]

**Matt 7:14**

στενή (γὰρ τῶν) καὶ τεθλιμμένη ἡ ὁδὸς (κυρίου) (*Strom.* 4.5.3) [All]

(παλιν αὐτὸν δύο ὁδοὺς ὑποτίθεμενον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. . . μεν  
καλούντων) στενὴν καὶ τεθλιμμένην (*Strom.* 5.31.1) [All]

διὰ στενῆς καὶ τεθλιμμένης τῆς κυριακῆς ὁδῶς (*Strom.* 6.2.3) [All]

---

Lac. A D (33) e Ath

**Matt 7:15**

λυκοὺς δὲ ἄλλους ἀλλήγορεῖ προβάτων κωδικοῖς ἡμφιεσμένους  
(*Protr.* 4.3) [All]

λυκοὶ οὗτοι ἀρπαγῆς προβάτων κωδικοῖς ἐγκεκρυμμένοι (*Strom.*  
1.40.5) [All]

---

Lac. A D (33) e Or Ath Did

**Matt 7:21**

οὐ γὰρ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι κυριε κυριε εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν  
τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἀλλ' ὁ ποίων τὸ θελημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου (*Quis div.*  
29.6) [C]

οὐ πᾶς ἀρα ὁ λέγων κυριε κυριε εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν  
θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ὁ ποίων τὸ θελημα τοῦ θεοῦ (*Strom.* 7.74.8) [Ad]

---

Lac. A D e (Or) Ath

μοι ⲛ B E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] με Did

τῶν οὐρανῶν ⲛ B E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 (a) (b) (k) TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] τῶν θεοῦ Clem<sup>pt</sup>

τὸ θελημα ⲛ<sup>c</sup> B E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] τὰ  
θεληματὰ ⲛ<sup>c</sup> [Lac. Or]

του πατρος μου **ⲛ** B E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 (a) (b) (k) TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] των θεου Clem<sup>pt</sup> [Lac. Or]

**Matt 8:12**

(καθο κακεινο ειρηται ...) βληθησονται εις το σκοτος το εξωτερων:  
εκει εσται ο κλαυθμος και ο βρυγμος των οδοντων (*Paed.* 1.91.1)  
[Ad]\*

---

Lac. A D e Or Ath (Did)

-----  
βληθησονται ] εκβληθησονται (-σεσθε Did<sup>pt</sup>) **ⲛ**<sup>c</sup> B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω  
f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; εξελευσονται **ⲛ**<sup>c</sup> Did<sup>pt</sup> (exient) k  
(ibunt) a b

**Matt 9:29**

(το λεχθεν) γενηθητω κατα την πιστιν σου (*Paed.* 1.29.3) [Ad]

(και παλιν:) κατα την πιστιν σου γενηθητω σοι (*Strom.* 2.49.1) [Ad]

(ο γουν σωτηρ φησι:) γενηθητω σου κατα την πιστιν (*Exc.* 9.1) [Ad]

TEXT: ... κατα την πιστιν ... γενηθητω ...

---

Lac. A (33) e Or Ath Did

**Matt 10:5**

εις οδον εθνων μη απελθητε και εις πολιν Σαμαρειτων μη εισελθητε ...  
(ο κυριος λεγει) (*Strom.* 3.107.1) [C]

---

Lac. A e Ath Did

πολιν **ⲛ** B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or]  
civitatis (=πολεσιν) a b

Σαμαρειτων **ⲛ** B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or]  
Σαμαριτανων D a b k

-----  
 εθνων  $\aleph^c$  B E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$   $f^1$   $f^{13}$  33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did]  
 omit  $\aleph^c$

απελθητε  $\aleph$  B E L  $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$   $f^1$   $f^{13}$  33 892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did]  
 εισελθητε  $\Delta$ ; ieritis (=ελθητε) k

εισελθητε  $\aleph$  B E L  $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$   $f^1$   $f^{13}$  33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did]  
 απελθητε  $\Delta$

**Matt 10:10**

δει γαρ και τον εργατην τροφης αξιουσθαι (*Strom.* 2.94.3) [Ad]\*

-----  
 Lac. A e Or Ath (Did)

τροφης  $\aleph$  B C D E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Omega$   $f^1$   $f^{13}$  33 1582 k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did] μισθου  
 Π 892 a b

**Matt 10:16**

μειξας ουν τη περιστερα τον οφιν τελειως αμα και ευσυνειδητως βιοι  
 (*Strom.* 7.82.6) [All]

-----  
 Lac. A e Or Ath

**Matt 10:20**

ει δε το πνευμα του πατρος εν ημιν μαρτυρει (*Strom.* 4.73.4) [All]<sup>21</sup>

-----  
 Lac. A e Ath Did

<sup>21</sup> Clement's allusion to Matt 10:20 reveals the following variant in 10:20. This variant is not included in the textual analysis because the nature of Clement's allusion makes it impossible to know whether his affinity with D is significant or merely accidental.

πατρος D Or] πατρος υμων  $\aleph$  B C E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$   $f^1$   $f^{13}$  33 892 1582 a b k  
 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

**Matt 10:23**

(επαν δ εμπανιν ειπη,) οταν διωκωσιν υμας εν τη πολει ταυτη  
φευγετε εις την αλλην (*Strom.* 4.76.1) [C]<sup>22</sup>

---

Lac. A e (Ath) Did

διωκωσιν  $\aleph$  B C E L Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR USB<sup>4</sup> Or Ath]  
διωκουσιν D Δ Θ f<sup>13</sup>

την αλλην C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω TR] την ετεραν  $\aleph$  B f<sup>1</sup> 33 892 1582  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Ath; ετεραν f<sup>13</sup> [NA: a b k]

**Matt 10:24**

ουδεις γαρ μαθητης υπερ τον διδασκαλον, + (*Strom.* 2.77.4) [Ad]\*

---

Lac. A e Ath Did

διδασκαλον B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Or] add αυτου  $\aleph$  f<sup>13</sup>

**Matt 10:25**

+ αρκετον δε εαν γενωμεθα ως ο διδασκαλος (*Strom.* 2.77.4) [Ad]

αλλ αρκετον γαρ τω μαθητη γενεσθαι ως ο διδασκαλος, (λεγει ο  
διδασκαλος) (*Strom.* 6.114.5) [Ad]

---

Lac. A e (Or) Ath Did

---

<sup>22</sup> Since Clement's quotation ends with αλλην and is not part of a continuous quotation, it is impossible to know whether he had the shorter or longer version of the text. While Clement may have been unaware of the longer version, he also might have chosen simply not to quote the rest of the passage. For this reason, the following variant has not been included in the apparatus.

την αλλην / ετεραν  $\aleph$  B C E Δ Π Ω 33 892 k TR] add εαν δε εν τη αλλη  
διωκουσιν υμας φευγετε εις την αλλην D a b; add καν εκ ταυτης  
εκδιωξουσιν υμας ... ετεραν L; add καν εκ ταυτης διωκωσιν υμας ... ετεραν  
Θ; add καν εκ ταυτης διωκωσιν υμας... αλλην f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582; add καν εκ ταυτης  
διωκωσιν ... αλλην Or<sup>pe</sup>; add καν εν τη ετερα διωκωσιν ... αλλην Or<sup>pe</sup>

**Matt 10:27**<sup>23</sup>

ο ακουετε εις το ους (φησιν ο κυριος) κηρυξατε επι των δωματων  
(*Strom.* 1.56.2) [Ad]\*

ο δε ακουετε εις το ους ... επι των δωματων (φησι) κηρυξατε (*Strom.*  
6.124.5) [Ad]\*

TEXT: ... ακουετε εις το ους κηρυξατε επι των δωματων

---

Lac. A e Ath Did

ακουετε **Σ B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or]**  
ηκουσατε f<sup>1</sup> 1582

κηρυξατε **Σ B C E Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR USB<sup>4</sup>]**  
κηρυσσεται D Θ Or; κηρυχθησετε L

δωματων **Σ B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or]** add  
υμων f<sup>1</sup> 1582

-----  
ακουετε εις το ους ] εις το ους ακουετε **Σ B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup>  
33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or**

**Matt 10:32**

πας ουν οστις εαν ομολογηση εν εμοι εμπροσθεν των ανθρωπων,  
ομολογησω καγω εν αυτω εμπροσθεν του πατρος μου του εν  
ουρανοις (*Strom.* 4.70.3) [Ad]\*

---

Lac. A a e (33) Ath (Did)

καγω εν αυτω **Σ B C E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33<sup>vid</sup> 892 1582 k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Or Did]** καγω αυτον D b; αυτον καγω L

---

<sup>23</sup> The presence of κηρυξατε, which is distinct to the manuscript tradition of Matthew, suggests the following references are to Matt 10:27 rather than Luke 12:2.

εν<sup>3</sup> ⲛ D E L Δ Θ Π f<sup>1</sup> 1582 TR Or<sup>pt</sup>] add τοις B C Ω f<sup>13</sup> 892 UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Or<sup>pt</sup> [NA: b k; Lac. 33 Did]

-----  
εμοι ⲛ B C D L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit E; me  
(=ε-με) b [Lac. 33]

\*\*\*\*\*

εαν ομολογηση Or<sup>pt</sup> Did<sup>vid</sup>] οστις ομολογησει ⲛ B C D E L Δ Θ  
Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 b (k) TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or<sup>pt</sup>

### Matt 10:37

ο γαρ φιλων πατερα η μητερα υπερ εμε ... ουκ εστι μου αξιος (*Strom.*  
7.93.5) [C]<sup>24</sup>

-----  
Lac. A e (Or) Ath (Did)

-----  
πατερα η μητερα ⲛ B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Did] matrem aut patrem (=μητερα η πατερα) k [Lac. Or]

### Matt 10:39

ο γαρ ευρων την ψυχην αυτου απολεσει αυτην και ο απολεσας  
ευρησει αυτην (*Strom.* 4.27.2) [Ad]\*

-----  
Lac. A e Ath Did

-----  
ο ... και ⲛ<sup>c</sup> B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Or] omit ⲛ<sup>\*</sup>

<sup>24</sup> It is impossible to determine whether Clement knew only of the shorter version of Matt 10:37 as found in B and D. Clement may not have cited the longer version because he was unaware of its existence or because his point was already made with the portion cited. In any case, Clement's reading is of interest since it places some doubt on the explanation that attributes the omission in B and D as an example of homoeoteleuton. The variant is listed below but has not been included in the analysis of Clement's text due to the uncertainty of his knowledge of it.

αξιος D B Did<sup>vid</sup>] add και ο φιλων υιον η θυγατερα υπερ εμε ουκ εστιν  
μου αξιος ⲛ C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TRUBS<sup>4</sup> Or



και ο **Ⲛ** B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] ο  
δε D; omit και **Ⲛ**<sup>\*</sup>

απολεσας ] add την ψυχην αυτου ενεκεν εμου **Ⲛ** B C D E L Δ Θ Π  
Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or

ευρων **Ⲛ** B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or]  
invenit (=ευρισκει) a b; invenerit (=ευρησης) k

#### Matt 10:41

ος γαρ αν δεξηται (ψησι) προφητην εις ονομα προφητου μισθον  
προφητου, λημψεται, και ος αν δεξηται δικαιον εις ονομα  
δικαιου, μισθον δικαιου λημψεται + (*Strom.* 4.36.4) [Ad]

ο δεχομενος δικαιον η προφητην εις ονομα δικαιου η προφητου τον  
εκεινων μισθον λημψεται + (*Quis div.* 31.4) [All]

---

Lac. A e Or Ath Did

-----  
και ... λημψεται **Ⲛ** A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit D<sup>25</sup>

#### Matt 10:42

+ και ος αν δεξηται ενα των μαθητων τουτων των μικρων, τον  
μισθον ουκ απολεσει (*Strom.* 4.36.4) [Ad]\*

+ ο δε μαθητην ποτισας εις ονομα μαθητου ποτηριον ψυχρου υδατος  
τον μισθον ουκ απολεσει (*Quis div.* 31.4) [All]\*

---

Lac. A (a) e (Or) Ath Did

μικρων **Ⲛ** B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
ελαχιστων D b k [Lac. a Or]

---

<sup>25</sup> Though Clement adapts the text from ος δεχομενος to ος αν δεξηται, it is clear he does not follow D in omitting this reading.

εις ονομα μαθητου **Σ** B C D L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 k TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] in nomine meo (=εις ονομα μου) a b; omit E

τον μισθον **Σ** B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] ο  
μισθος D a b k [Lac. Or]

δεξιηται] ποτιση **Σ** B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 b k TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> [Lac. a Or]

ψυχρου υδατος] υδατος ψυχρου D b Or; omit υδατος **Σ** B C E L Δ  
Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> (33) 892 1582 k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

# **Matt 11:12**<sup>26</sup>

οι γαρ αρπαζοντες την βασιλειαν βιασται (*Strom.* 5.16.7) [Ad]\*

ουδε των καθευδοντων και βλακευοντων εστιν η βασιλεια του θεου  
αλλ οι βιασται αρπαζουσιν αυτην (*Quis div.* 21.3) [Ad]\*

Lac. A (a) e Or Ath Did

οι D] omit Clem<sup>pt</sup> **Σ** B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
[NA: a b k]

του θεου] των ουρανων **Σ** B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582  
b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [Lac. a]

<sup>27</sup>βιασται **Σ**<sup>c</sup> B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] βιαζετε **Σ**<sup>\*</sup>

<sup>26</sup> While the corrected text of Sinaiticus has the distinctively Matthaean phrase βιασται αρπαζουσιν αυτην added to the end of Luke 16:16, it is more probable that Clement is referring to Matt 11:12. Since the phrase βιασται αρπαζουσιν αυτην is a variant found only in the corrected text of Sinaiticus, it most likely represents a conflation with Matt 11:12 and not the original text. Moreover, Clement's use of the article οι with βιασται is a characteristic shared only with the text of Codex Bezae in Matt 11:12.

<sup>27</sup> Clement's text reveals the following variant in Matt 11:12. Since the variant is most likely the result of itacism, the distinction is not included in the apparatus.

βιασται B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] βιαστε **Σ**<sup>c</sup>

**Matt 11:18**

ηλθεν (φησιν) Ιωαννης μητε εσθιων μητε πινων και λεγουσι:  
δαιμονιον εχει. + (*Strom.* 3.52.4) [Ad]

---

Lac. A e Or Ath (Did)

**Matt 11:19**

+ ηλθεν ο υιος του ανθρωπου εσθιων και πινων, και λεγουσιν: ιδου  
ανθρωπος φαγος και οينوποτης, φιλος τελωνων και αμαρτωλος  
(*Strom.* 3.52.4) [C]\*\*

ηλθεν γαρ (φησιν) ο υιος του ανθρωπου, και λεγουσιν: ιδου  
ανθρωπος φαγος και οينوποτης, τελωνων φιλος (*Paed.* 2.32.4) [Ad]<sup>28</sup>

---

Lac. A e Or Ath Did

φιλος τελωνων ⲛ L f<sup>13</sup> a b] τελωνων φιλος<sup>29</sup> B C D E Δ Θ Π  
Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 892 1582 k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

-----  
αμαρτωλος ] αμαρτωλων ⲛ B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582  
a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

**Matt 11:27**<sup>30</sup>

ουδεις εγνω τον υιον ει μη ο πατηρ, λεγων, ουδε τον πατερα ει μη ο  
υιος (*Paed.* 1.88.2) [Ad]

---

<sup>28</sup> Marcovich inserts the phrase εσθιων και πινων solely on the basis of the New Testament passage.

<sup>29</sup> While Clement's adaption of Matt 11:19 passage shares this reading, it is uncertain whether it accurately represents his text. Since his reference clearly reveals he modified this passage, it is better to identify his reading with his more exaction citation found in *Strom.* 3.52.4.

<sup>30</sup> These references appear to be from Matt 11:27 rather than Luke 10:22 because they contain either τον υιον or ουδε τον πατερα instead of the distinctly Lukan τις εστιν ο υιος or τις εστιν ο πατηρ.

ουδεις γαρ εγνω τον υιον ει μη ο πατηρ, ουδε τον πατερα ει μη ο υιος  
και ω<sup>31</sup> αν ο υιος αποκαλυψη (*Strom.* 1.178.2) [Ad]\*

---

Lac. A e Or Did

-----  
εγνω ] γινωσκει C; επιγινωσκει **Ⲛ B D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892**  
1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [NA: a b k]

\*\*\*\*\*

ο υιος αποκαλυψη Ath] βουληται ο υιος αποκαλυσαι **Ⲛ B C D**  
**E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>**; βουλεται ο υιος  
αποκαλυσαι L; βουληθη ο υιος αποκαλυσαι 33

#### Matt 11:28

δευτε προς με παντες οι κοπιωντες και πεφορτισμενοι, καγω  
αναπαυσω υμας + (*Protr.* 120.5) [C]

(λεγει) δευτε προς με παντες οι κοπιωντες και πεφορτισμενοι, καγω  
αναπαυσω υμας (*Paed.* 1.91.2) [C]

---

Lac. A (33) e

πεφορτισμενοι **Ⲛ B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33<sup>vid</sup> 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>**  
Or Ath Did] πεφορτισμενοι εστε D a b k

-----  
προς με **Ⲛ B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>**  
Or<sup>pt</sup>] omit Or<sup>pt</sup>

#### Matt 11:29

+ αρατε τον ζυγον μου εφ υμας και μαθετε απ εμου, οτι πραυς ειμι  
και ταπεινος τη καρδια, και ευρησετε αναπαυσιν ταις ψυχαις  
υμων + (*Protr.* 120.5) [C]

---

<sup>31</sup> The following variant in Matt 11:27 is omitted since it is likely the result of itacism. ω **Ⲛ B C D E Δ Π f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>**] ο L Θ Ω 892 Ath

αράτε (φησιν) αφ υμων τον βαρυν ζυγον και λαβετε τον πραον (η  
 γραφη φησι) (*Strom.* 2.22.5) [Ad]

(ο κυριος) αράτε τον ζυγον μου (φησιν) + (*Strom.* 5.30.3) [C]

---

Lac. A e (33) Ath

-----  
 απ εμου  $\aleph^c$  B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33<sup>vid</sup> 892 1582 a b k TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did] omit  $\aleph^*$

υμων  $\aleph$  B C D E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] ημων L  
 [Lac. 33]

#### Matt 11:30

+ ο γαρ ζυγος μου χρηστος και το φορτιον μου ελαφρον εστιν (*Protr.*  
 120.5) [C]

+ οτι χρηστος εστι και αβαρης (*Strom.* 5.30.3) [Ad]\*

ουτω τοινυν ημας ευλαβως προσιεναι πειρωμενους εκδεξεται ο  
 χρηστος του κυριου ζυγος (*Strom.* 2.126.3) [All]

---

Lac. A (33) e Or Ath

χρηστος  $\aleph$  B C D Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did]  
 χριστος E L [Lac. 33]

-----  
 μου<sup>2</sup>  $\aleph$  B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit k  
 [Lac. 33]

#### Matt 12:36

(γεγραπται) ος αν λαληση λογον αργον, αποδωσει λογον κυριω εν  
 ημερα κρισεως, + (*Paed.* 2.50.2) [Ad]\*

---

Lac. A e (Or) (Ath) Did

αν λαληση<sup>32</sup> / εαν λαλησωσιν E (L) Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 TR (Or);  
 εαν λαλησουσιν C Θ 33; λαλησουσιν ⋈ B (D) a b k UBS<sup>4</sup> [Lac. Ath]

-----  
 αποδωσουσιν ⋈ B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Ath]  
 δωσουσι 892 [NA: a b k; Lac. Or]

**Matt 12:37**

+ (αυτις τε) εκ του λογου σου δικαιωθηση (φησιν), και εκ του λογου  
 σου καταδικασθηση (*Paed.* 2.50.2) [Ad]

Lac. A e Ath

και ⋈ B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did] η D a

καταδικασθηση ⋈ B C D E Δ Θ Π f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or (-  
 ζεται Did<sup>pt</sup>) κατακριθηση (L) Ω 33 (-νεται Did<sup>pt</sup>) [NA: a b k]

-----  
 δικαιωθηση ⋈ B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
 Or] δικαιουται Did; justificaveris (=δικαιωθης) k

εκ του λογου<sup>2</sup> / των λογων σου ⋈ B C D E L Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892  
 1582 b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did] omit a

λογου<sup>2</sup> / λογων ⋈ B C D E L Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
 Or Did] add εργαων Θ

σου<sup>2</sup> B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did]  
 omit ⋈; suis (=αυτου) b [Lac. a]

**Matt 12:50<sup>33</sup>**

αδελφοι μου γαρ (φησιν ο κυριος) και συγκληρονομοι οι ποιουντες  
 το θελημα του πατρος μου (*Ecl.* 20.3) [Ad]

<sup>32</sup> Though Clement's use of λαληση is singular rather than plural, his use of the subjunctive mood indicates that his text supports this reading. Both L and Or read αν instead of εαν, but the distinction is not significant.

<sup>33</sup> The inclusion of the distinctly Matthaean phrase θελημα του πατρος indicates that these referenes are from Matt 12:50 instead of Mark 3:35.

αλλα και υιους και αδελφους και συγκληρονομους τους επιτελουντας  
το θελημα του πατρος (*Quis div.* 9.2) [All]

---

Lac. A (Or) Ath Did

**Matt 13:13**

δια τουτο (φησιν ο κυριος) εν παραβολαις αυτοις λαλω, οτι  
βλεποντες ου βλεπουσι και ακουοντες ουκ ακουουσι και ου  
συνιασι (*Strom.* 1.2.3) [C]

---

Lac. A Or Did (Ath)

αυτοις λαλω **Σ** B C E Δ Π Ω 892 e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] λαλω αυτοις Θ f<sup>1</sup>  
f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582 a b k; λαλει αυτοις D; λαλω L [Lac. Ath]

οτι **Σ** B C E L Δ Π Ω 33 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] ινα D Θ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 a b e k  
[Lac. Ath]

ου βλεπουσι **Σ** B C E L Δ Π Ω 33 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Ath] μη  
βλεπωσιν D Θ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 a b e k

ουκ ακουουσι **Σ** B C E L Δ Π Ω 33 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] μη ακουωσιν  
D Θ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 a b e k [Lac. Ath]

-----  
και ου συνιασι ] ουδε συνιουσι **Σ** B C E L Δ Π Ω 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>;  
ουδε συνιωσιν 33; και μη συνιωσιν μηποτε επιστρεψωσιν D Θ f<sup>1</sup>  
f<sup>13</sup> 1582 a b (e); et non intellegant ne forte convertantur (=και μη  
συνιωσιν βια επιστεψωσιν?) k [Lac. Ath]

**Matt 13:25**

επεσπαρη τα ζιζανια προς του των ζιζανιων οικειου γεωργου  
(*Strom.* 6.67.2) [All]

καθαπερ τω πυρω τα ζιζανια, προς του κυριου προφητικως ειρητο  
(*Strom.* 7.89.4) [All]

---

Lac. A (Or) Did

**Matt 13:33**

(φησι) γαρ: ομοια εστιν η βασιλεια των ουρανων ζυμη, ην λαβουσα  
 γυνη ενεκρυψεν εις αλευρου σατα τρια, εως ου εξυμωθη ολον  
 (*Strom.* 5.80.8) [C]<sup>34</sup>

Lac. A Or Ath Did

ενεκρυψεν **ⲛ B C D E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> ]** εκρυψεν L  
 f<sup>1</sup> 1582 [NA: a b e k]

-----  
 εις **ⲛ B D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> ]** εν C<sup>35</sup> [NA:  
 a b e k]

**Matt 13:34**

(λεγουσιν γουν οι αποστολοι περι του κυριου οτι) παντα εν  
 παραβολαις ελαλησεν και ουδεν ανευ παραβολης ελαλει αυτοις  
 (*Strom.* 6.125.1) [Ad]<sup>\*36</sup>

Lac. A (Or) Ath Did

ουδεν **ⲛ<sup>\*</sup> B C Δ Θ f<sup>13</sup> UBS<sup>4</sup> ]** ουκ **ⲛ<sup>c</sup> D E L Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 892 1582 a b**  
 e k TR Or

ελαλει **ⲛ<sup>c</sup> B C D E L Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>**  
 Or] ελαλησεν **ⲛ<sup>\*</sup> Δ**

<sup>34</sup> Clement's text is likely from Matt 13:33 rather than Luke 13:20 because it contains the phrase βασιλεια των ουρανων, which is replaced in Luke with βασιλεια των θεου.

<sup>35</sup> The reading of C here is uncertain. The independent examination of C by Tischendorf, Tregelles, and, more recently, Swanson led each of them to cite the reading as εν. R. W. Lyon's examination, however, led him to conclude that C contains no variant at this point. See R. W. Lyon, "A Re-examination of Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus," *NTS* 5 (1958-59): 260-72. Whether Lyon's assessment is correct, the reading is of no consequence to the examination of Clement's text, because no other control witness supports the reading.

<sup>36</sup> The following variant from Matt 13:34 has been omitted since it is likely an itacism.

ελαλει **ⲛ<sup>c</sup> B C D Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or]** ελαλη E ; ηλαλη  
 Θ; αιλαλει L



**Matt 13:35** (cf. Ps 77:2)

(η προφητεία περι αυτου φησιν:) ανοιξει εν παραβολαις το στομα  
αυτου και εξερευξεται τα απο καταβολης κοσμου κεκρυμμενα  
(*Strom.* 5.80.7) [Ad]\*

---

Lac. A Or Ath Did

καταβολης κοσμου **κ**<sup>c</sup> C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
καταβολης **κ**<sup>c</sup> B f<sup>1</sup>1582 e k

**Matt 13:38**

αγρος γαρ ο κοσμος (*Paed.* 2.104.3) [Ad]

---

Lac. A Or Ath (Did)

**Matt 13:43**

λαμψαντες ως ο ηλιος (*Ecl.* 56.4) [Ad]\*

---

Lac. A Ath  
λαμψουσιν D f<sup>13</sup> a b e k Or] εκλαμψουσιν **κ** B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup>  
33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did

**Matt 13:47**

(εν τω ευαγγελιω παραβολην λεγουσαν,) ομοια εστιν η βασιλεια των  
ουρανων ανθρωπω σαγηνην εις θαλασσαν βεβληκοτι + (*Strom.*  
6.95.3) [Ad]

---

Lac. A Ath

**Matt 13:48**

+ και του πληθους των εαλωκοτων ιχθυων την εκλογην των  
αμεινονων ποιουμενω (*Strom.* 6.95.3) [All]

---

Lac. A (Or) Ath Did

**Matt 15:11**

ουδε το εισιοντα<sup>37</sup> κοινοι τον ανθρωπον, αλλα τα εξιοντα (φησι) του  
στοματος (*Paed.* 2.8.4) [Ad]

ου γαρ τα εισερχομενα εις το στομα κοινοι τον ανθρωπον, αλλα η  
περι της ακρασιας διαληψις κενη (*Paed.* 2.16.3) [Ad]\*

ου τα εισερχομενα εις το στομα κοινοι τον ανθρωπον, αλλα τα  
εξερχομενα δια του στοματος εκεινα κοινοι τον ανθρωπον  
(*Strom.* 2.50.2) [Ad]\*

TEXT: ου τα εισερχομενα εις το στομα κοινοι τον ανθρωπον, αλλα  
τα εξερχομενα του στοματος εκεινα κοινοι τον ανθρωπον

Lac. A k (Or) (Ath) Did

ου **Ⲛ B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Ath]**  
add παν D

στομα **Ⲛ<sup>c</sup> B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>**  
Or] add τουτο **Ⲛ<sup>⋄</sup>** [Lac. Ath]

κοινοι<sup>1</sup> **Ⲛ B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]**  
κοινωνει D

εκεινα κοινοι τον ανθρωπον ] τουτο κοινοι τον ανθρωπον **Ⲛ B C**  
**E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>;** coinquinat hominem (=κοινοι  
ανθρωπον) a e; εκεινο κοινωνει τον ανθρωπον D; omit f<sup>1</sup> 1582  
[Lac. Or Ath]

\*\*\*\*\*

τα εισερχομενα Or<sup>pt</sup> Ath] το εισερχομενον **Ⲛ C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup>**  
**f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or<sup>pt</sup>;** το ερχομενον B

τα εξερχομενα E Or<sup>pt</sup> Ath] το εκπορευμενον **Ⲛ B C D L Δ Θ Π Ω**  
**f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or<sup>pt</sup>**

<sup>37</sup> On the basis of the passage in the New Testament and elsewhere in Clement, Marcovich adds εις το στομα.

**Matt 15:19**

εκ γαρ της καρδιας εξερχονται διαλογισμοι (*Strom.* 2.50.2) [C]

---

Lac. A b k (33) (Or) Ath (Did)

-----  
 εκ γαρ της καρδιας εξερχονται  $\aleph^c$  B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892  
 1582 a e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] εξερχονται  $\aleph^*$ ; omit 33 [Lac. Or]

**Matt 16:17**

καθαπερ ο Πετρος, ον και εμακαρισεν, οτι αυτω σαρξ και αιμα ουκ  
 απεκαλυψε την αληθειαν, αλλ η<sup>38</sup> ο πατηρ αυτου ο εν τοις  
 ουρανοις (*Strom.* 6.132.4) [Ad]\*

---

Lac. A k (Or) Ath (Did)

εν τοις ουρανοις  $\aleph$  C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 892 1582 (a) (b) (e) TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup> Or<sup>pt</sup>] ουρανιος f<sup>13</sup> Or<sup>pt</sup>; εν ουρανοις B (a) (b) (e) [Lac. Did]

\*\*\*\*\*

αλλ η ο πατηρ Or<sup>pt</sup>] αλλ ο πατηρ  $\aleph$  B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33  
 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or<sup>pt</sup> Did

**Matt 16:26**

τι γαρ ωφελειται ανθρωπος, εαν τον κοσμον ολον κερδηση, την δε  
 ψυχην αυτου ζημιωθη; η τι δωσει ανθρωπος ανταλλαγμα της  
 ψυχης αυτου; (*Strom.* IV. 34.4) [C]

---

Lac. A k Ath Did

---

<sup>38</sup> Sylvie Raquel does not include the extra η in Origen's citation of Matt 16:17 (*Comm. Jo.* 32.355) as a genuine variant. She concludes that it is either a "flaw of memory or due to an oral tradition that accompanied the verse (ειρηται versus γεγραπται)" (see Raquel, "Text of the Synoptic Gospels," 187). However, since Clement also includes the extra η as part of his citation, it is listed above. Clement and Origen's use of the citation may point to the presence of a common textual tradition among some of the Alexandrian fathers.

ωφελεται C D E Δ Π Ω a b TR] ωφεληθησεται **κ** B L Θ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33  
892 1582 e UBS<sup>4</sup> Or

ολον **κ** B C D E L Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] hunc  
mundum (=τουτον κοσμον) b; omit Θ e

κερδηση **κ** B C E Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b (e) TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] κερδη  
D; κερδησει L; καιερδηση Θ

**Matt 17:2**

ου τα μεν ιματια ως φως ελαμψεν, το προσωπον δε ως ο ηλιος (*Exc.*  
12.3) [Ad]

---

Lac. A k (Or) Ath Did

ο **κ** B C D E L Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] omit Θ  
[NA: a b e]

**Matt 17:6**

πως ουν την μεν οψιν την πρωτεινην ιδοντες ουκ εξεπλαγησαν, την δε  
φωνην ακουσαντες επεσον<sup>39</sup> επι γην; (*Exc.* 5.1) [All]

---

Lac. A k Or Ath Did

**Matt 17:9**

μηδενι ειπητε (*Exc.* 5:4) [C]

(διο και λεγει αυτοις ο σωτηρ:) μηδενι ειπητε ο ειδετε (*Exc.* 5:2) [Ad]

---

Lac. A k (Or) Ath Did

---

<sup>39</sup> While the reading επεσον is found in manuscripts L Δ Π and f<sup>1</sup>, the loose nature of this allusion makes it unwise to attach any textual significance to it.

**Matt 17:20**

(φησιν) εαν εχητε πιστιν ως κοκκον σιναπεως, μεταστησετε το ορος  
(*Strom.* 2.49.1) [Ad]

---

Lac. A k (Or) Ath Did

-----  
 κοκκον ꝛ B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] κοκκος  
 D [NA: a b e]

**Matt 18:3**

εαν μη στραφητε και γενησθε ως τα παιδια ταυτα, ου μη εισελθητε εις  
την βασιλειαν των ουρανων (*Paed.* 1.12.4) [Ad]

(ουδ αν ειπη) ην μη γενησθε ως τα παιδιον ταυτα, ουκ εισελευσεσθε  
εις την βασιλεια του θεου (*Paed.* 1.16.2) [Ad]

(τουτο γαρ ην το ειρημενον) εαν μη στραφεντες γενησθε ως τα παιδια  
(*Strom.* 4.160.2) [Ad]

καν μη γενησθε ως τα παιδια, ταυτα ουκ εισελευσεσθε (φησιν) εις την  
βασιλειαν των ουρανων: (*Strom.* 5.13.4) [Ad]

(λεγων) ως τα παιδια αυτους γενεσθαι δειν (*Strom.* 5.30.3) [Ad]

ην γαρ μη αυθις ως τα παιδια γενησθε και αναγεννηθητε, ως φησιν η  
γραφη, τον οντως οντα πατερα ου μη απολαβητε, ουδ ου μη  
εισελευσεσθε ποτε εις την βασιλειαν των ουρανων (*Prot.* 82.4) [All]

ουτως ουν επιστραφεντας ημας αυθις ως τα παιδια γενεσθαι  
βουλεται (*Strom.* 3.88.1) [All]

TEXT: ... εαν μη στραφητε και γενησθε ως τα παιδια, ου μη  
εισελθητε εις την βασιλειαν των ουρανων

---

Lac. A C (33) k Or Ath Did

-----  
 τα παιδια ꝛ B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
 infans iste (=το παις τουτος) e [Lac. 33]

**Matt 18:4**

(ΕΙΠΩΝ:) ΟΣ ΕΑΝ ΕΑΥΤΟΝ ΤΑΠΕΙΝΩΣΗ ΩΣ ΤΟ ΠΑΙΔΙΟΝ ΤΟΥΤΟ, ΟΥΤΟΣ  
ΜΕΙΖΩΝ<sup>40</sup> ΕΣΤΙΝ ΕΝ ΤΗ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ ΤΩΝ ΟΥΡΑΝΩΝ (*Paed.* 1.16.1) [Ad]<sup>\*41</sup>

Lac. A C (33) k Ath Did

ΕΑΥΤΟΝ **Ⲛ B D E Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or**] αὐτον L Δ  
[NA: a b e; Lac. 33]

ΕΣΤΙΝ **Ⲛ B D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or**] erit  
(=εσται) a b

-----  
ΤΑΠΕΙΝΩΣΗ ] ΤΑΠΕΙΝΩΣΕΙ **Ⲛ B C D E L Δ Θ Π f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 a b e**  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or [Lac. 33]

**Matt 18:10**

ΟΙ ΔΕ ΔΙΑ ΠΑΝΤΟΣ ΤΟ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΒΛΕΠΟΥΣΙΝ (*Exc.* 10.6) [Ad]

(ΟΤΑΝ ΟΥΝ ΕΙΠΗ Ο ΚΥΡΙΟΣ,) ΜΗ ΚΑΤΑΦΡΟΝΗΣΗΤΕ ΕΝΟΣ ΤΩΝ ΜΙΚΡΩΝ ΤΟΥΤΩΝ:  
ΑΜΗΝ ΛΕΓΩ, ΥΜΙΝ ΤΟΥΤΩΝ ΟΙ ΑΓΓΕΛΟΙ ΤΟ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ  
ΔΙΑ ΠΑΝΤΟΣ ΒΛΕΠΟΥΣΙΝ (*Exc.* 11.1) [Ad]<sup>\*</sup>

ΤΟ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΟΡΩΣΙΝ ΟΙ ΑΓΓΕΛΟΙ ΤΟΥΤΩΝ ΤΩΝ ΜΙΚΡΩΝ  
(*Exc.* 23.4) [Ad]

ΜΗ ΚΑΤΑΦΡΟΝΗΣΗΤΕ (ΛΕΓΩΝ) ΕΝΟΣ ΤΩΝ ΜΙΚΡΩΝ ΤΟΥΤΩΝ: ΤΟΥΤΩΝ ΓΑΡ ΟΙ  
ΑΓΓΕΛΟΙ ΔΙΑ ΠΑΝΤΟΣ ΒΛΕΠΟΥΣΙ ΤΟ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΜΟΥ ΤΟΥ  
ΕΝ ΟΥΡΑΝΟΙΣ (*Quis div.* 31.1) [Ad]<sup>\*</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Due to Clement's adaptation of this passage, it is likely that his agreement with Δ listed below is merely accidental and not genetically significant. For this reason it is listed below but not included in the textual analysis.

ΜΕΙΖΩΝ Δ] Ο ΜΕΙΖΩΝ **Ⲛ B C D E L Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or**  
[NA: a b e]

<sup>41</sup> The following variants in Matt 18:4 are not listed in the apparatus, since they are most likely the result of itacism.

ΕΑΥΤΟΝ **Ⲛ B D E Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or**] ΕΑΥΤΩΝ Θ  
ΑΥΤΟΝ Δ] ΑΥΤΩΝ L  
ΤΑΠΕΙΝΩΣΗ Ω TR] ΤΑΠΕΙΝΩΣΕΙ **Ⲛ B C D E L Δ Θ Π f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 a b e**  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or [Lac. 33]

των μικρων δε κατα την γραφην και ελαχιστων τους αγγελους τους  
ορωντας τον θεον (*Strom.* 5.91.3) [All]\*

TEXT: ... μη καταφρονησητε ενος των μικρων τουτων: λεγω, υμιν ...  
οι αγγελοι ... δια παντος βλεπουσιν το προσωπον του πατρος  
μου του εν ουρανοις

---

Lac. A C k (Or) Ath (Did)

των μικρων τουτων  $\aleph$  B E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Or<sup>vid</sup>] τουτων των μεικρων των πιστευοντων εις εμε D a b;  
τουτων των μικρων L [Lac. Did]

ουρανοις  $\aleph$  B E L Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 (a) (b) (e) TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did<sup>pt</sup>]  
τοις ουρανοις D 33 892 (a) (b) (e) Did<sup>pt</sup>; ουρανους Δ

-----  
δια παντος βλεπουσιν  $\aleph$  B D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did] vident semper (=βλεπουσιν παντος) e

#### Matt 18:20

τινες δε οι δυο και τρεις υπαρχουσιν εν ονοματι Χριστου  
συναγομενοι, παρ οις μεσος εστιν ο κυριος (*Strom.* 3.68.1) [Ad]

---

Lac. A C k (Ath) (Did)

-----  
και ] omit  $\aleph^*$ ; η  $\aleph^c$  B D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Ath Did

παρ οις ] παρ οις ουκ D; omit e; εκει  $\aleph$  B E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33  
892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Ath Did

#### Matt 18:22

αφεις εβδομηκοντακις επτα (*Strom.* 7.85.2) [All]\*

---

Lac. A C k Or Ath (Did)

επτα **ⲛ** B E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did] επτακις  
D a e; et septies (=και επτακις) b

**Matt 19:3**

ει εξεστιν απολυσαι γυναικα Μωσεως επιτρεψαντος; (*Strom.* 3.47.2)  
[Ad]\*

---

Lac. A (33) k Ath Did

εξεστιν **ⲛ**\* B L] add ανθρωπω **ⲛ**<sup>c</sup> C D E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892  
1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or

-----  
γυναικα ] την γυναικα **ⲛ** B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or [NA: a b e]

**Matt 19:4**

υμεις δε ουκ ανεγνωτε οτι τω πρωτοπλαστω ο θεος ειπεν: + (*Strom.*  
3.47.2) [Ad]

---

Lac. A (33) k (Ath) Did

**Matt 19:5**

+ εσεσθε οι δυο εις σαρκα μιαν; (*Strom.* 3.47.2) [Ad]

---

Lac. A k (33) Or Did

**Matt 19:9** (cf. Matt 5:32)

ουκ απολυσεις γυναικα πλην ει μη επι λογω πορνειας (*Strom.*  
2.145.3) [Ad]\*

---

Lac. A k (Or) Ath Did



λογω/λογου<sup>42</sup> πορνείας B D f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582 a b e Or] πορνεία ⋈ C  
E L Δ Θ Π Ω 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

**Matt 19:10**

εαν ουτως η η αιτια της γυναικος, ου συμφερει τω ανθρωπω  
γαμησαι, + (*Strom.* 3.50.1) [Ad]

---

Lac. A k Ath Did

**Matt 19:11**

+ (τοτε ο κυριος εφη:) ου παντες χωρουσι τον λογον τουτον· + (*Strom.*  
3.50.1) [C]

---

Lac. A k (Or) Ath Did

τουτον ⋈ C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> 33 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit B f<sup>1</sup> 892  
1582 e Or

**Matt 19:12**

+ εισι γαρ ευνουχοι οιτινες εγεννηθησαν ουτως, και εισιν ευνουχοι  
οιτινες ευνουχισθησαν υπο των ανθρωπων, και εισιν ευνουχοι  
οιτινες ευνουχισαν εαυτους δια την βασιλειαν των ουρανων: ο  
δυναμενος χωρειν χωρειτω (*Strom.* 3.50.1) [C]

τοις χωρειν δυναμενοις (*Strom.* 1.13.1) [All]

καλον γαρ δια την βασιλειαν των ουρανων ευνουχιζειν εαυτον  
πασης επιθυμιας (*Strom.* 3.59.4) [All]

αλλ οι μεν ευνουχισαντες εαυτους απο πασης δια την βασιλειαν των  
ουρανων (*Strom.* 3.99.4) [All]

TEXT: εισι γαρ ευνουχοι οιτινες εγεννηθησαν ουτως, και εισιν

---

<sup>42</sup> Although Clement uses the dative rather than the genitive case of λογος, his adaptation is included here, since it still clearly indicates that his text supports this reading.

ευνουχοι οιτινες ευνουχισθησαν υπο των ανθρωπων, και εισιν  
ευνουχοι οιτινες ευνουχισαν εαυτους δια την βασιλειαν των  
ουρανων: ο δυναμενος χωρειν χωρειτω

Lac. A k (Π) (Or) Ath Did

γαρ <sup>κ<sup>c</sup></sup> B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or]  
omit <sup>κ<sup>\*</sup></sup>

οιτινες ] add εκ κοιλιας μητρος <sup>κ</sup> B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33  
1582 a e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or; add εκ κοιλιας μητρος αυτω b 892

ευνουχισαν <sup>κ</sup> B C D E L Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
ευνουχισθησαν Δ

την <sup>κ</sup> B C D E L Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] των Δ [Lac.  
Π a b e]

#### Matt 19:13

προσηνεγκαν τε αυτω (φησι) παιδια εις χειροθεσιαν ευλογιας,  
κωλυοντων δε των γνωριμων + (*Paed.* 1.12.3) [All]<sup>\*43</sup>

Lac. A Π k (Or) Ath Did

προσηνεγκαν / προσηνεχθησαν<sup>44</sup> <sup>κ</sup> B C D L 33 892 a b e UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Or] προσηνεχθη E Δ Θ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 TR

#### Matt 19:14

+ ειπεν ο Ιησους αφετε τα παιδια και μη κωλυετε αυτα ελθειν προς  
με:<sup>45</sup> των γαρ τοιουτων εστιν η βασιλεια των ουρανων (*Paed.*

<sup>43</sup> This is most likely an allusion to Matt 19:13, since it is immediately followed by a reference to Matt 19:14.

<sup>44</sup> While Clement's allusion contains the active rather than the passive voice of the aorist verb, the use of the third-person plural indicates his support of his reading.

<sup>45</sup> Clement's text reveals the following variant in Matt 19:14. Since the distinction between με and εμε is minor, it has not been included as part of the textual analysis.

με B C D E Θ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] εμε <sup>κ</sup> L Δ [NA: a b e]

1.12.3) [C]<sup>46</sup>

---

Lac. A Π k (Or) Ath Did

ΕΙΠΕΝ Β Ε Δ Θ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] add αυτοις & C D L  
f<sup>13</sup> 892 [Lac. Or]

ΚΩΛΥΕΤΕ & B C E L Δ Θ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or]  
ΚΩΛΥΣΗΤΕ D f<sup>13</sup>

-----  
ΤΑ ΠΑΙΔΙΑ & B C D E L Δ Θ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or]  
eos (=αυτους) b

και & B C D E L Δ Θ Ω f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] omit f<sup>1</sup>

και ... με & B C D E L Δ Θ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or]  
venire ad me et nolite prohibere eos (=ελθειν προς με και μη  
κωλυετε αυτους) e

#### Matt 19:17

ΟΤΙ ΕΙΣ ΑΓΑΘΟΣ, Ο ΠΑΤΗΡ (*Strom.* 5.63.8) [Ad]\*

---

Lac. A Π k (Or) Ath Did

ΕΙΣ & D L Θ f<sup>1</sup> 892 a b e UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] ουδεις C E Δ Ω f<sup>13</sup> 33 TR; omit  
B [Lac. 1582<sup>47</sup>]

#### Matt 19:19

Ο ΓΑΡ ΤΟΙΟΥΤΟΣ ΤΕΛΕΙΟΣ Ο ΤΟ ΑΓΑΠΗΣΕΙΣ ΤΟΝ ΠΛΗΣΙΟΝ ΣΟΥ ΩΣ ΣΕΑΥΤΟΝ  
ΠΛΗΡΩΣΑΣ (*Paed.* 2.120.4) [Ad]\*<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> The word order and the use of και after παιδια indicate that this reference is to Matt 19:14 rather than Mark 10:14 or Luke 18:16.

<sup>47</sup> While Codex 1582 is extant at this point, its text is largely unreadable. Due to this difficulty, it is excluded from the apparatus.

<sup>48</sup> Although this passage has several parallels, it is most likely from Matt 19:19 because the presence of τελειος connects it to the saying of Jesus in Matt 19:21.

ο γαρ πεπληρωκει το αγαπησεις τον πλησιον σου ως σεαυτον  
(*Strom.* 3.55.2)<sup>49</sup> [Ad]\*

---

Lac. A Π k Ath Did

σεαυτον ⲛ B C D E L Δ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] εαυτον  
Θ f<sup>13</sup> Or

### Matt 19:21

ει θελεις τελειος γενεσθαι (*Quis div.* 10.1) [C]

πωλησον σου τα υπαρχοντα (λεγει κυριος) και πτωχοις δος, και  
δευρο ακολουθει μοι (*Paed.* 2.36.2) [Ad]

ει θελεις τελειος γενεσθαι, πωλησας τα υπαρχοντα δος πτωχοις  
(*Strom.* 3.55.2) [Ad]

πωλησον σου τα υπαρχοντα και δος πτωχοις, και δευρο ακολουθει  
μοι (*Strom.* 4.28.6) [Ad]

πωλησον τα υπαρχοντα σου (*Quis div.* 11.1) [Ad]

πωλησαι παντα τα υπαρχοντα (*Quis div.* 14.6) [Ad]

TEXT: ... ει θελεις τελειος γενεσθαι, ... πωλησον σου τα υπαρχοντα  
και δος πτωχοις, ... και δευρο ακολουθει μοι

---

Lac. A Π k (Or) Ath Did

<sup>50</sup>γενεσθαι ⲛ<sup>\*</sup>] ειναι ⲛ<sup>c</sup> B C D E L Δ Θ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or

υπαρχοντα ⲛ B C D E L Δ Θ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or]  
omnia (=παντα) b e

---

<sup>49</sup> Since a quotation Matt 19:21 precedes this passage and refers specifically to the young man who came to Jesus, it is most likely a reference to Matt 19:19.

<sup>50</sup> Since the following variant in Matt 19:21 is most likely the result of itacism, the distinction is not included in the apparatus. γενεσθαι ] γενεσθε ⲛ<sup>\*</sup>

πτωχοις  $\aleph$  C E L  $\Delta$   $\Omega$   $f^1 f^{13}$  33 892 1582 TR Or] τοις πτωχοις B  
D  $\Theta$  UBS<sup>4</sup> [NA: a b e]

**Matt 19:23**

τους πλουσιους ... τους δυσκολως εισελευσομενους εις την βασιλειαν  
(*Quis div.* 18.1) [Ad]\*

---

Lac. A Π k (Or) Ath Did

τους πλουσιους τους δυσκολως / πλουσιους δυσκολως  $\aleph$  B C D  
L  $\Theta$   $f^1 f^{13}$  33 892 1582 a b UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] δυσκολως πλουσιους E  $\Delta$   $\Omega$  e  
TR<sup>51</sup>

**Matt 21:16**

ουδεποτε ανεγνωτε οτι εκ στοματος νηπιων και θηλαζοντων  
κατηρτισω αινον; (*Paed.* 1.13.1) [C]

---

Lac. A (33) (a) k (Or) Ath Did

οτι B C E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$  Π  $\Omega$   $f^1 f^{13}$  33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] omit  $\aleph$  D b  
e [Lac. a]

-----  
κατηρτισω  $\aleph$  B C D E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$  Π  $\Omega$   $f^1 f^{13}$  33 892 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] καταρτεισω D

**Matt 21:22**

παντα οσα εαν αιτησησθε εν τη προσευχη πιστευοντες, λημψεσθε  
(φησιν) (*Paed.* 3.92.4) [C]<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> Though Clement's use of the article with both nouns is unique, the order of both nouns is still significant for determining his textual affinities.

<sup>52</sup> Since the following variants in Matt 21:22 are most likely the result of itacism, they have not been included in the apparatus.

αιτησησθε] αιτησησθαι L  
λημψεσθε / ληψεσθε  $\aleph$  B C E Π  $\Omega$   $f^1 f^{13}$  1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] ληψεσθαι /  
ληψεσθαι D L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$  33 892 [Lac. A]

---

Lac. A k Ath Did

εαν / αν **Σ** B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR USB<sup>4</sup> Or] omit  
D a b e

αιτησησθε L] αιτησητε **Σ** B C D E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b  
e TR USB<sup>4</sup> Or

#### Matt 22:14

πολλοι γαρ κλητοι, ολιγοι δε εκλεκτοι (*Strom.* 5.17.5) [C]

πολλους μεν τους κλητους, ολιγους δε τους εκλεκτους αιγιτομενος  
(*Strom.* 1.92.3) [All]

---

Lac. A k Ath Did

εκλεκτοι **Σ** B C D E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] οι εκλεκτοι L f<sup>1</sup>  
892 1582; omit 33 [NA: a b e]

-----  
Omit *in toto* 33

κλητοι ] εισιν κλητοι **Σ** B C D E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> (a) (b) (e) Or TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or; εισιν οι κλητοι L f<sup>1</sup> 892 1582 (a) (b) (e)

#### Matt 22:36

φησιν ουν διδασκαλος, τις η μεγαστη των εντολων ηρωτημενος: (*Quis  
div.* 27.3) [All]

---

Lac. A k 1582 (Or) Ath Did

#### Matt 22:40

ολος ο νομος και οι προφηται κρεμανται (*Paed.* 3.88.1) [C]

εν ταυταις (λεγει) ταις εντολαις ολον τον νομον και τους προφητας  
κρεμασθαι τε και εξηρησθαι (*Strom.* 2.71.1) [Ad]

εν ταυταις (φησι) ταις δυσιν εντολαις ολον τον νομον και τους  
προφητας κρεμασθαι (*Strom.* 5.97.1) [Ad]\*

TEXT: εν ταυταις ταις δυσιν εντολαις ολος ο νομος και οι προφηται  
κρεμανται

---

Lac. A C 1582 k Or Ath Did

και οι προφηται κρεμανται Ε Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> TR] κρεμανται και οι  
προφηται ⲛ B D L Θ 33 892 a b e UBS<sup>4</sup>

-----  
ολος ⲛ<sup>c</sup> B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit ⲛ<sup>\*</sup>

**Matt 23:5**

ουκουν πλατυνειν τα φυλακτηρια (*Strom.* 1.49.1) [All]

---

Lac. A C (33) k Or Ath Did

**Matt 23:8**

εις γαρ ο διδασκαλος (*Strom.* 1.12.3) [All]\*

---

Lac. A C (33) k Or Ath Did

ο διδασκαλος ⲛ<sup>c</sup> B 33 892 UBS<sup>4</sup>] ο καθηγητης ⲛ<sup>\*</sup> D E L Δ Θ Π Ω  
f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 TR [NA: a b e]

**Matt 23:8–9**

(ει δε) εις διδασκαλος εν ουρανοις, (ως φησιν η γραφη) (*Paed.* 1.17.3) [All]

(φησιν ο λογος) μη ειπητε εαυτοις διδασκαλον επι της γης (*Strom.*  
2.14.3) [All]

(οθεν εικοτως ειρηται:) μη ειπητε εαυτοις διδασκαλον επι της γης  
(*Strom.* 6.58.2) [All]

---

Lac. A C (33) k Or Ath Did

**Matt 23:9**

εις μεν ουν ο πατηρ υμων ο εν τοις ουρανοις ... μη καλεσητε ουν υμιν  
επι της γης πατερα (φησιν) (*Strom.* 3.87.4) [Ad]\*

μη καλεσητε ουν εαυτοις πατερα επι της γης: δεσποται γαρ επι της  
γης, εν δε ουρανοις ο πατηρ (*Ecl.* 20.3) [Ad]\*

ακουε του σωτηρος ... μη καλει σεαυτω πατερα επι γης (*Quis div.*  
23.2) [Ad]

TEXT: ... πατερα μη καλεσητε υμιν επι της γης, εις ... ο πατηρ υμων  
ο εν τοις ουρανιος

Lac. A C (33) k Or Ath Did

υμιν D Θ a b e] υμων Ⲭ B E L Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
[Lac. 33]

ο πατηρ υμων D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 a b e TR] υμων ο πατηρ  
Ⲭ B 33 892 UBS<sup>4</sup>

ο εν τοις ουρανιος E Π Ω (a b e) TR] ο εν ουρανοις D Δ Θ f<sup>1</sup> 1582  
(a b e); ο ουρανιος Ⲭ B L f<sup>13</sup> 33<sup>vid</sup> 892 UBS<sup>4</sup>

καλεσητε Ⲭ B D E L Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]   
καλεσθε Δ

**Matt 23:25**

(παλιν τοις αυτοις φησιν:) ουαι υμιν, οτι καθαριζετε το εξω του  
ποτηριου και της παροψιδος, ενδοθεν δε γεμουσιν ακαθαρσιας. +  
(*Paed.* 3.48.1) [Ad]\*

Lac. A b k Or Ath (Did)

εξω D] εξωθεν Ⲭ B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
[NA: a e; Lac. Did]



παροψιδος  $\aleph$  B C D E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Omega$   $f^1 f^{13}$  33 892 1582 TR a e UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
add του πινακος Π [Lac. Did]

ενδοθεν ] εσωθεν  $\aleph$  B C D E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$  Π  $\Omega$   $f^1 f^{13}$  33 892 1582 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> NA: a e; Lac. Did]

γεμουσιν  $\aleph$  B C D E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$  Π  $\Omega$   $f^1 f^{13}$  33 892 1582 a TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Did] pleni estis (=γεμετε) e

ακαθαρσιας ] ακρασιας  $\aleph$  B D L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$  Π  $f^1 f^{13}$  33 892 1582 a e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Did; αδικιας C E  $\Omega$

#### Matt 23:26

+ καθαρισον πρωτον το ενδον του ποτηριου, ινα γενηται και το  
εξωθεν καθαρων (Paed. 3.48.1) [Ad]

Lac. A b k Or Ath Did

ποτηριου D  $\Theta$   $f^1$  1582 a e UBS<sup>4</sup>] add και της παροψιδος  $\aleph$  B C E  
L  $\Delta$  Π  $\Omega$   $f^{13}$  33 892 TR

το εξωθεν D] το εκτος  $\aleph^c$  B C E L  $\Theta$  Π  $\Omega$   $f^1 f^{13}$  33 892 1582 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>; το εντος  $\aleph^c$ ; εκτος  $\Delta$  [NA: a e]

ενδον ] εντος  $\aleph$  B C D E L  $\Theta$   $\Omega$   $f^1 f^{13}$  33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>;  
εσωθεν  $\Delta$  Π [NA: a e]

καθαρων ] αυτου καθαρων B D E  $\Theta$   $f^1 f^{13}$  1582 UBS<sup>4</sup> a e; αυτων  
καθαρων  $\aleph$  C L  $\Delta$  Π  $\Omega$  33 892 TR

**Matt 23:27**

ουαι (γαρ) υμιν, γραμματεεις και Φαρισαιοι υποκριται (φησιν ο κυριος), οτι ομοιοι εστε ταφοις κεκονιαμενοις: εξωθεν<sup>53</sup> ο ταφος φαίνεται ωραιος, ενδον δε γεμει οσπεων νεκρων και πασης ακαθαρσιας (*Paed.* 3.47.4) [C]\*

---

Lac. A (b) k Or Ath (Did)

ομοιοι εστε<sup>54</sup>/ ομοιοαζετε B f<sup>1</sup> 1582] παρομοιοαζετε **κ** C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did [NA: a e; Lac. b]

κεκονιαμενοις **κ**\* D] add οιτινες **κ**<sup>c</sup> B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [Lac. b Did]

ο ταφος φαίνεται ωραιος D] φαινονται ωραιοι **κ** B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; parent hominibus speciosa (=φαίνεται ανθρωποις ωραιος) a b e; φαινεσθε τοις ανθρωποις δικαιοι 33 [Lac. Did]

γεμει D] γεμουσιν **κ** B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did

-----  
 οτι **κ** B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] τι Did [Lac. b]

ενδον δε (a) (b) (e)<sup>55</sup>] εσωθεν Did; εσωθεν δε **κ** B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 (a) (b) (e) TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [Lac b]

πασης ακαθαρσιας **κ** B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did] omnes inmunditiae (=παντες ακαθαρσαι) e

---

<sup>53</sup> Since the use of particle *μεν* is not genetically significant, the following variant from Matt 23:27 is not included in the textual analysis.

εξωθεν D Δ a] εξωθεν *μεν* **κ** B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 892 1582 e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; *μεν* εξωθεν f<sup>13</sup> [Lac. b Did]

<sup>54</sup> The variant reading *ομοιοι εστε* is most likely a scribal error derived from *ομοιοαζετε* rather than an independent reading or an adaptation from *παρομοιοαζετε*.

<sup>55</sup> Though the Old Latin confirms the presence of the conjunction, it makes no distinction between *ενδον* and *εσωθεν*. For this reason, this variant is listed in the apparatus, but it does not affect the analysis of Clement's text.

**Matt 23:33**

(και τω ευαγγελιω δια Ιωαννου) οφεις (φησιν) γεννηματα εχιδνων  
(*Paed.* 1.80.1) [C]

---

Lac. A (a) k Ath (Did)

-----  
οφεις **ⲛ** B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did]  
omit b

**Matt 23:37<sup>56</sup>**

ον τροπον ορνις συναγει τα νοσσια υπο τας πτερυγας αυτης (*Paed.*  
1.14.4) [Ad]\*

(ως καν τω ευαγγελιω λεγων,) ποσακις ηθελησα συναγαγειν τα  
τεκνα σου, ον τροπον ορνις συναγει τα νοσσια αυτης υπο τας  
πτερυγας αυτης και ουκ ηθελησατε (*Paed.* 1.76.1) [Ad]\*

TEXT: ... ποσακις ηθελησα συναγαγειν τα τεκνα σου, ον τροπον  
ορνις συναγει τα νοσσια [αυτης / omit ] υπο τας πτερυγας αυτης  
και ουκ ηθελησατε

---

Lac. A k Ath (Did)

ορνις συναγει / επισυναγει **ⲛ** B D L Θ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did] επισυναγει ορνις C E Δ Π Ω TR

αυτης **ⲛ**<sup>\*</sup> D Δ 33 892 UBS<sup>4</sup>] εαυτης **ⲛ**<sup>c</sup> C E L Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 TR  
Or; omit Clem<sup>pe</sup> B Did [NA: a b e]

πτερυγας αυτης Δ a b e] πτερυγας **ⲛ** B C D E L Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33  
892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did

---

<sup>56</sup> While the following two verses are nearly parallel to Luke 13:34, the presence of the verb συναγω after ορνις indicates the reference is most likely to Matt 23:37, since the verb επισυναγω after ορνις is unique to the Matthaean tradition.

**Matt 24:35**

και αυτοις λεγει: η γη (φησι) παλαιωθησεται και ο ουρανος  
παρελευσεται (*Protr.* 78.4) [Ad]

---

Lac. A C k Or Ath Did

παρελευσεται **κ**<sup>c</sup> B D L 33 892 e UBS<sup>4</sup>] παρελευσονται E Δ Θ Π  
Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 a b TR; omit **κ**<sup>\*</sup>

-----  
ο ουρανος **κ**<sup>c</sup> B D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
omit **κ**<sup>\*</sup>

**Matt 25:1–2**

ταυτη τοι και αι των φρονιμων παρθενων λαμπαδες αι νυκτωρ  
ανημμεναι (*Strom.* 5.17.3) [All]

ας απεικασεν το ευαγγελιον ταις ηγιασμεναις παρθενοις ταις  
προσδεχομεναις τον κυριον (*Strom.* 7.72.5) [All]

---

Lac. A (33) (a) e k (Or) Ath (Did)

**Matt 25:26**

πονηρε δουλε ειπεν και οκνηρε + (*Strom.* 1.3.2) [C]

---

Lac. e k Or Ath Did

πονηρε δουλε **κ** B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
δουλε πονηρε A a b

**Matt 25:27**

+ εδει σε βαλειν το αργυρια μου τοις τραπεζιταις, και ελθων εγω  
εκομισαμην αν το εμον (*Strom.* 1.3.2) [C]

---

Lac. e k Or Ath Did

το αργυριον  $\aleph^c$  A C D E L Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b TR] τα  
αργυρια  $\aleph^*$  B Θ UBS<sup>4</sup>

ελθων εγω εκομισαμην αν  $\aleph$  B C D E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582 (a)  
(b) TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] ελθων αν εγω εκομισαμην L 892 (a) (b); εγω ελθων  
εκομισαμην αν A

-----  
σε ] σε ουν  $\aleph$  B C L Θ 33 892 UBS<sup>4</sup>; ουν σε A D E Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup>  
1582 a b TR

**Matt 25:30**

επι τουτοις ο αχρειος δουλος εις το εξωτερον εμβληθησεται σκοτος  
(*Strom.* 1.3.2) [Ad]<sup>57</sup>

-----  
Lac. (C) e k Or Ath Did

-----  
εμβληθησεται ] εκβαλετε  $\aleph$  A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> (33) 892  
1582 UBS<sup>4</sup>; εκβαλλετε TR; βαλεται εξω D [NA: a b]

**Matt 25:33**

και τα αρνια δε μου (οταν λεγη) σπητω εκ δεξιων (*Paed.* 1.14.2) [All]

ο γαρ ιστας τους μεν εκ δεξιων τους δε εξ ευωνυμων (*Paed.* 1.71.3) [All]

-----  
Lac. C e k Or Ath (Did)

**Matt 25:34**

δευτε, οι ευλογημενοι του πατρος μου, κληρονομησατε την  
ητοιμασμενην υμιν βασιλειαν απο καταβολης κοσμου + (*Quis*  
*div.* 30.2) [C]

<sup>57</sup> The context of this reference to Matt 25:26–27 suggests it is from Matt 25:30, rather than the parallel passages in Matt 8:12 or 22:13.



συνηγαγετε  $\aleph$  A B D E L  $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$   $f^1$   $f^{13}$  33 892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
 περιεβαλετε  $\Delta$  [Lac. Or Ath]

**Matt 25:36**

+ γυμνος και περιεβαλετε με (*Strom.* 3.54.3) [C]

+ γυμνος και περιεβαλετε με, ασθενης και επεσκεψασθε με, εν φυλακη  
 ημην και ηλθετε προς με (*Paed.* 3.93.4) [Ad]

+ γυμνος ημην και ενεδυσατε με, ησθηνησα και επεσκεψασθε με, εν  
 φυλακη ημην και ηλθετε προς με + (*Quis div.* 30.2) [Ad]

+ αμφιεννυναι τον γυμνον (*Quis div.* 13.6) [All]

TEXT: γυμνος και περιεβαλετε με, [ησθηνησα / ασθενης] και  
 επεσκεψασθε με, εν φυλακη ημην και ηλθετε<sup>58</sup> προς με

Lac. C (a) e k (Or) Ath Did

ησθηνησα  $\aleph$  A B D E L  $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$   $f^1$   $f^{13}$  33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
 ασθενης Clem<sup>pt</sup> b; ησθηνησαι  $\Delta$  [Lac. a Or]

-----  
 με<sup>2</sup> A B D E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$   $f^1$   $f^{13}$  33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] εμε  $\aleph$  [NA: a b]

<sup>58</sup> In his textual analysis of Cyril of Jerusalem, Roderic Mullen argues that the variation between the aorist forms ηλθετε ( $\Pi$   $\Omega$   $f^1$  892 TR Or) and ηλθατε ( $\aleph$  A B D E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $f^{13}$  33 UBS<sup>4</sup>) are genetically significant (see Mullen, *Cyril of Jerusalem*, 103). Mullen bases his conclusion on the fact that all Byzantine control witnesses in his study except A,  $\Omega$ ,  $\Theta$  attest to ηλθετε, while all the Primary and Secondary Alexandrian witnesses support ηλθατε. While his conclusion is possible, it seems unlikely. When  $\Delta$  is added as one of the Byzantine witnesses, the division of the Byzantine witnesses clearly favors ηλθατε. The fact that Clement and Origen also attest ηλθετε can be seen as a further indication that ηλθετε was not merely Byzantine. For these reasons, it seems best to leave the distinction out of the apparatus and to consider the readings only a result of an orthographic peculiarity.

**Matt 25:37**

+ τότε αποκριθισονται αυτω οι δικαιοι λεγοντες, κυριε ποτε σε  
ειδομεν πεινωντα και εθρεψαμεν, η διψωντα και εποτισαμεν +  
(*Quis div.* 30.3) [C]

---

Lac. C (a) e k Or Ath Did

-----  
αυτω **§** A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit f<sup>13</sup>

οι δικαιοι **§** A B D E L Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit Δ

πεινωντα ... εποτισαμεν **§** A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit 33 [Lac. a]

**Matt 25:38**

+ ποτε δε ειδομεν σε ξενον και συνηγαγομεν, η γυμνον και  
περιεβαλομεν; + (*Quis div.* 30.3) [C]

---

Lac. C (a) e k Or Ath Did

ειδομεν σε D Θ] σε ειδομεν **§** A B E L Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 b TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [Lac. a]

-----  
ποτε δε **§** A B D E L (Δ) Θ (Π) Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit 33 [Lac. a]

η **§** A B E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] και D

**Matt 25:39**

+ η ποτε σε ειδομεν ασθενουντα και επεσκεψαμεθα η εν φυλακη και  
ηλθομεν προς σε + (*Quis div.* 30.3) [C]

---

Lac. C e k Or Ath Did

η ποτε D a b] omit η **§** A B E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>



ασθενουντα B D Θ UBS<sup>4</sup>] ασθενη **Σ** A E L Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892  
1582 a b TR

-----  
(δε) σε ειδομεν **Σ** A B D E L Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
δε ειδομεν σε Θ; omit b

και επεσκεψαμεθα] omit **Σ** A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582  
a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

### Matt 25:40

εφ οσον δε (φησιν) ενι τουτων εποιησατε των ελαχιστων, εμοι  
εποιησατε (Paed. 3.30.3) [C]

(επιφερει) εφ οσον εποιησατε ενι τουτων των ελαχιστων, εμοι  
εποιησατε (Strom. 3.54.3) [C]

+ αποκριθεις ο βασιλευς ερει αυτοις, αμην λεγω υμιν, εφ οσον  
εποιησατε ενι τουτων των αδελφων μου των ελαχιστων, εμοι  
εποιησατε (Quis div. 30.4) [C]

εφ οσον εποιησατε τοις μικροις τουτοις, εμοι εποιησατε (Paed. 3.93.5)  
[Ad]

ο γαρ ενι τουτων των ελαχιστων πεποιηκατε, εμοι πεποιηκατε  
(Strom. 2.73.1) [Ad]

TEXT: ... αποκριθεις ο βασιλευς ερει αυτοις, αμην λεγω υμιν, εφ  
οσον εποιησατε ενι τουτων των αδελφων μου των ελαχιστων,  
εμοι εποιησατε

---

Lac. C e k (Or) Ath Did

-----  
ο βασιλευς ερει αυτοις **Σ** A B E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] ερει αυτοις ο βασιλευς D; rex dicit illis (= βασιλευς λεγει  
αυτοις) a b [Lac. Or]

των αδελφων μου **Σ** A D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit B [Lac. Or]

**Matt 25:41**

και το πυρ (δε προσκοπείτε) ο ητοιμασεν ο κυριος τω διαβολω και  
τοις αγγελοις αυτου (*Prottr.* 83.2) [Ad]\*

παλιν εκ των εναντιων τους ταυτα μη παρασχοντας αυτοις εις το πυρ  
εμβαλλει το αιωνιον; (*Quis div.* 30.5) [All]

---

Lac. C e k (Or) Ath (Did)

ο ητοιμασεν D f<sup>1</sup> 1582 a b] το ητοιμασμενον **Σ Α Β Ε Λ Δ Θ Π Ω**  
f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did

-----  
ο κυριος ] ο πατηρ μου D f<sup>1</sup> 1582 a b] omit **Σ Α Β Ε Λ Δ Θ Π Ω** f<sup>13</sup>  
33 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did

**Matt 26:23**

ος αν εμβαψηται μετ εμου (λεγων) εις το τρυβλιον, ουτος με  
παραδωσει (*Paed.* 2.62.4) [Ad]

---

Lac. e k (Or) Ath Did

μετ εμου εις D] μετ εμου εν C E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 TR Or; μετ  
εμου την χειρα εν **Σ Α Β Λ** 33 892 a b UBS<sup>4</sup>

το τρυβλιον D a b] τω τρυβλιω **Σ Α Β C Ε Λ Δ Θ Π Ω** f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33  
892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or

-----  
εμβαψηται ] ενβαπτομενος D; εμβαψας **Σ Α Β C Ε Λ Δ Θ Π Ω** f<sup>1</sup>  
f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or; intingit (=εμβαπτει) a b

**Matt 26:27**

και ευλογησεν γε τον οινον, ειπων: λαβετε, πιετε: + (*Paed.* 2.32.2)  
[Ad]

---

Lac. e k Or Ath Did

**Matt 26:28**

+ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΜΟΥ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΑΙΜΑ ... ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΛΛΩΝ ΕΚΧΥΝΝΟΜΕΝΟΝ ΕΙΣ ΑΦΕΣΙΝ  
ΑΜΑΡΤΙΩΝ (*Paed.* 2.32.2) [C]<sup>59</sup>

Lac. e k Or Ath Did

-----  
ΤΟΥΤΟ ... ΑΙΜΑ ] ΤΟΥΤΟ ΓΑΡ ΕΣΤΙ ΤΟ ΑΙΜΑ ΜΟΥ ⋈ A B C D E L Δ Θ  
Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; ΤΟΥΤΟ ΕΣΤΙ ΤΟ ΑΙΜΑ ΜΟΥ f<sup>1</sup> b

ΠΕΡΙ ⋈ A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] ΥΠΕΡ  
D [NA: a b]

**Matt 26:29**

ΟΥ ΜΗ ΠΙΩ ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΓΕΝΗΜΑΤΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΜΠΕΛΟΥ ΤΑΥΤΗΣ, ΜΕΧΡΙΣ ΑΝ ΠΙΩ ΑΥΤΟ  
ΜΕΘ ΥΜΩΝ ΕΝ ΤΗ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΜΟΥ (*Paed.* 2.32.3) [Ad]<sup>60</sup>

Lac. e k Or Ath Did

-----  
ΠΙΩ<sup>1</sup> ] add απ αρτι ⋈ A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

ΜΕΘ ΥΜΩΝ ] ΜΕΘ ΥΜΩΝ ΚΑΙΝΟΝ ⋈ A B D E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 a b  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; ΚΑΙΝΟΝ ΜΕΘ ΥΜΩΝ C L f<sup>1</sup> 33

<sup>59</sup> While this verse is similar to readings in Mark 14:23, the use of *πιετε* before this reference seems to indicate Clement has the text of Matthew in mind.

<sup>60</sup> The previous references to Matt 26:27–28 suggest this passage is mostly likely from Matt 26:29 and not the parallel passage in Mark 14:25. The loose nature of Clement's adaptation makes it impossible to determine whether the following variants are genetically significant. For this reason, they are listed here but not included in the textual analysis.

ΤΟΥ Δ 892] ΤΟΥΤΟΥ ⋈ C L (a) (b); ΤΟΥΤΟΥ ΤΟΥ ⋈<sup>c</sup> A B D E Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33  
1582 (a) (b) TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
ΠΙΩ<sup>2</sup> D Θ] ΠΙΝΩ ⋈ A B C E L Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

**Matt 27:46**

(ὥς ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ) ἡλι ἡλι (ἀντι τοῦ) θεε μου, θεε μου (Ecl. 57.3) [C]

---

Lac. C e k (Or) Ath Did

<sup>61</sup>ἡλι ἡλι A D E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] ἐλωει ἐλωει  
 ⲛ B 33; ἀηλι ἀηλι L [Lac. Or]

**Matt 27:52**

ναὶ μὴν καὶ σώματα φησὶ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πολλὰ τῶν κεκοιμημένων  
 ἀνεστᾶσθαι (*Strom.* 6.47.1) [All]

---

Lac. e k Ath Did

**Matt 28:19**

διὰ τοῦτο φησὶν ὁ Πέτρος εἰρηκεναὶ τὸν κύριον τοῖς ἀποστόλοις· ἐὰν  
 μὲν οὖν τις θέλῃ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ μετανοήσας διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος μου  
 πιστεῦν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, ἀφεθήσονται αὐτῷ αἱ ἁμαρτίαι. μετὰ δὲ  
 δώδεκα ἔτη ἐξέλθετε εἰς τὸν κόσμον, μὴ τις εἴπῃ· οὐχ ἡκουσαμεν  
 (*Strom.* 6.43.3) [All]<sup>62</sup>

---

Lac. C L k (Or) (Did)

## THE GOSPEL OF MARK

**Mark 8:38**

ὅς γάρ ἀν ἐπαισχυνθῇ με ἡ τοὺς ἐμούς λόγους ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ  
 μοιχαλίδι καὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου  
 ἐπαισχυνθήσεται αὐτόν, ὅταν ἐλθῇ ἐν τῇ δοξῇ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ  
 μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ (*Strom.* 4.70.2) [C]

---

Lac. Ψ e Ath Did

<sup>61</sup> The following variant from Matt 27:46 is likely due to itacism and is not included in the apparatus. ἡλι ἡλι A Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] ἡλει ἡλει D E Δ Θ f<sup>1</sup> 1582

<sup>62</sup> While the first part of this text has some allusion to Matt 28:19, the second half appears to refer to anagrapha of Jesus (see Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 5.18.14).

ταυτη **Σ** A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
omit a k Or

-----  
γαρ **Σ** A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Or] δε D

αν / εαν **Σ** B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
UBS<sup>4</sup>; omit A [NA: a b k]

επαισχυνθη με **Σ** B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b k  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] επαισχυνθη μεν A; επεσχυνθησεται εμε D

η ] και **Σ** A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b k TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or

τη<sup>2</sup> **Σ** A B C D E L Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 (a) (b) (k) TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] add πονηρα και Θ

αυτου<sup>1</sup> **Σ** A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b k TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit Or

αυτου<sup>2</sup> ] των αγιων **Σ** A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892  
1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or

### Mark 9:29

τα τοιαυτα ευχη κατορθουνται (*Ecl.* 15.1) [All]

Lac. (33) e Or Ath Did

### Mark 10:17

εκπορευομενου αυτου εις οδον προσελθων τις εγονυπετει λεγων:  
διδασκαλε αγαθε, τι ποιησω, ινα ζων αιωνιον κληρονομησω; +  
(*Quis div.* 4.4) [L]<sup>63</sup>

<sup>63</sup> According to Clement, the verses identified above as Mark 10:17–31 from *Quis div.* 4 are from the Gospel of Mark. He notes a similar account can be found in the other “accepted” Gospels, albeit with minor variation: ταυτα μεν εν τω κατα Μαρκον ευαγγελιω γεγραπται και εν τοις αλλοις δε πασιν τοις ανωμολογημεναις

Lac. L 33 e Or Ath Did

εις οδον  $\aleph$  B C D E  $\Delta$   $\Psi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>1</sup> 579 892 1582 b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] add ιδου  
τις πλουσιος A  $\Theta$   $\Pi$  f<sup>13</sup>; omit a k

τις b k] εις  $\aleph$  B C D E  $\Delta$   $\Psi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>1</sup> 579 892 1582 a TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; omit A  
 $\Theta$   $\Pi$  f<sup>13</sup>

λεγων D  $\Theta$  f<sup>13</sup> a b] omit  $\aleph$  A B C E  $\Delta$   $\Pi$   $\Psi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>1</sup> 579 892 1582 k  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

ινα  $\aleph$  A B C D E  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit  $\Psi$  579

-----  
προσελθων ] προσδραμων  $\aleph$  A B C D E  $\Delta$   $\Pi$   $\Psi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892  
1582 (a) (b) TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; δραμων  $\Theta$ ; omit k

εγονυπετει ] και γονυπετησας αυτον επηρωτα αυτον  $\aleph$  A B C E  
 $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Psi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>1</sup> 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; γονυπετησας αυτον επηρωτα  
αυτον  $\Delta$ ; και γονυπετων αυτον ηρωτα αυτον D; και γονυπετων  
αυτον επηρωτα αυτον f<sup>13</sup>; genibus prostratus rogabat eum (=τα  
γονατα γονυπετησας επηρωτα αυτον?) a; adgeniculans rogans  
eum (=γονυπετων επερωτων αυτον?) b; genibus obsecrans illum  
... interrogabat (=τα γονατα δεομενος αυτον ... επηρωτα?) k

ποιησω  $\aleph$  A B C D E  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$  f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
ποιησας  $\Psi$

ολιγον μεν ισως εκασταχου των ρηματων εναλλασσει παντα δε την αυτην της  
γνωμης συμφωνιαν επιδεικνυται (*Quis div.* 5.1). Textual scholars have questioned  
the use of lemmata as an accurate indication of a Father's text (e.g. Fee, "The Use of  
Greek Patristic Citations," 355). The particular problem involves the possibility that  
later scribes may have been tempted to alter a large block-quotation to conform with  
the form of the text more familiar to them. While the possibility of such scribal  
tampering should not be overlooked, there is no indication that it is a concern here.  
If a scribe had altered Clement's text of Mark 10, one would expect the text to bear a  
close affinity to a particular text-type; this is not the case. On the contrary, Clement's  
lemmata are quite loose. The fact that his quotations at times vary between an  
adaptation and allusion of the text indicates Clement was likely loosely quoting the  
passage from memory. This situation is discussed more fully on p. 236 below and in  
the following footnotes to the apparatus in Mark 10.

**Mark 10:18**

+ ο δε Ιησους λεγει: τι με αγαθον λεγεις; ουδεις αγαθος ει μη εις ο θεος. + (*Quis div.* 4.5) [L]<sup>64</sup>

---

Lac. L 33 e (Or) Ath Did

λεγει a k] ειπεν αυτω **Σ** A B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892  
1582 b TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [Lac. Or]

αγαθον λεγεις k] λεγεις αγαθον **Σ** A B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup>  
579 892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or

-----  
Ιησους **Σ** A B C D E Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
omit Δ; add intuens illum (=εμβλεψας αυτον) a [Lac. Or]

μη εις ο θεος **Σ** A B C E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Or] μονος εις θεος D; unus solus Deus (=εις μονος θεος) a (b);  
unus Dominus (=εις κυριος) k

**Mark 10:19**

+ τας εντολας οιδας: μη μοιχευσης, μη φονευσης, μη κλεψης, μη  
ψευδομαρτυρησης, τιμα τον πατερα σου και την μητερα. + (*Quis*  
*div.* 4.5) [L]

---

Lac. L (Ω) 33 e Or Ath Did

οιδας **Σ** A B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
custodi (=τηρει) b k; add ait quae (=λεγει ποιας) a

μη μοιχευσης μη φονευσης A E Θ Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> a b TR] μη φονευσης μη  
μοιχευσης **Σ**<sup>c</sup> B C Δ Ψ 579 892 UBS<sup>4</sup>; μη μοιχευσης μη πορνευσης  
D k; μη μοιχευσης f<sup>1</sup> 1582; μη φονευσης **Σ**<sup>\*</sup>

ψευδομαρτυρησης B Δ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 1582] add μη αποστερησης  
**Σ** A C D E Θ Ω 892 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> Outside of its context here, this verse is indeterminable.

σου **Ⲱ** A B C E Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit D  
579 [Lac. Ω]

μητέρα A B D E Δ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] add σου **Ⲱ** C  
Θ a b k [Lac. Ω]

**Mark 10:20**

+ ο δε αποκριθεις λεγει αυτω: παντα ταυτα εφυλαξα εκ νεοτητος μου.  
+ (*Quis div.* 4.6) [L]

Lac. L Ω 33 e (Or) Ath Did

ο δε αποκριθεις A (C) D E Θ Π f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 (b) k TR] ο δε **Ⲱ** B Ψ  
579 892 UBS<sup>4</sup>; qui respondens (=ος αποκριθεις) a; omit Δ [Lac. Or]

λεγει αυτω b] εφη αυτω διδασκαλε **Ⲱ** B C Δ Ψ 579 892 UBS<sup>4</sup>;  
ειπεν αυτω διδασκαλε A D E Θ f<sup>13</sup> a TR; ειπεν αυτω f<sup>1</sup> 1582;  
dixit magister (=ειπεν διδασκαλε) k; ειπεν Π [Lac. Or]  
παντα ταυτα D Θ b k Or] ταυτα παντα **Ⲱ** A B C E Δ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup>  
579 892 1582 a TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

εφυλαξα A D 892 Or] εφυλαξαμην **Ⲱ** B C E Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>13</sup> 579 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>; εποιησα f<sup>1</sup> 1582 [NA: a b k]

μου **Ⲱ** A B C D E Δ Ψ f<sup>1</sup> 579 892 1582 b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] add τι επι  
υστερω Θ Π f<sup>13</sup> a [Lac. Or]

**Mark 10:21**

+ ο δε Ιησους εμβλεψας ηγαπησεν αυτον και ειπεν: εν σοι υστερει: ει  
θελεις τελειος ειναι, πωλησον οσα εχεις και διαδος πτωχοις, και  
εξεις θησαυρον εν ουρανω, και δευρο ακολουθει μοι. + (*Quis div.*  
4.6) [L]<sup>65</sup>

Lac. L (Ω) 33 e (Or) Ath Did

<sup>65</sup> This verse has clear marks of being a conflation of Matt 19:21; Mark 10:21; and Luke 18:22. Clement's text also reveals the following variant in Mark 10:21. Since the variant is most likely the result of itacism, the distinction is not included in the apparatus. ακολουθει rel] ακολουθη Ω



Ιησους **Σ** B C D E Δ Θ Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit  
A Π [Lac. Ω Or]

ειπεν / ειπεν αυτω **Σ** A B C D E Δ Ψ f<sup>1</sup> (579) 892 1582 b k TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>; ειπεν αυτω ει θελεις τελειος ειναι Θ Π; ait illi (=λεγει  
αυτω) a; λεγει αυτω ει θελεις τελειος ειναι f<sup>13</sup>[Lac. Ω Or]

εν σοι A D E Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 a b k TR Or] εν σε B C Δ Θ Π 579 892  
UBS<sup>4</sup>; επι εν σε **Σ** [Lac. Ω]  
διαδος πτωχοις f<sup>13</sup> (a) (k)] dos πτωχοις A B E Δ Π Ψ Ω 579;  
dos τοις πτωχοις **Σ** C D Θ f<sup>1</sup> 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [NA: b; Lac. Or]

και<sup>4</sup> **Σ** A B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω 579 892 b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] add αρας  
τον σταυρον f<sup>1</sup> 1582 a; αρας τον σταυρον σου f<sup>13</sup> [Lac. Or]

μοι **Σ** B C D Δ Θ Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b k UBS<sup>4</sup>] add αρας τον  
σταυρον A E Π Ω TR [Lac. Or]

-----  
εμβλεψας ] add αυτω **Σ** A B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a  
b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [Lac. Ω Or]

ηγαπησεν αυτον και **Σ** A B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 a k TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or<sup>vid</sup>] osculates est eum et (=κατεφιλησεν αυτον ετ) b; omit  
579 [Lac. Ω]

ει θελεις τελειος ειναι ] omit **Σ** A B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579  
892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [Lac. Or]

πωλησον οσα εχεις ] υπαγε οσα εχεις πωλησον **Σ** A B C D E Δ  
Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b k TR [Lac. Or]

### Mark 10:22

+ ο δε στυγνασας επι τω λογω απηλθε λυπουμενος: ην γαρ εχων  
κρηματα πολλα και αγρους. + (*Quis div.* 4.7) [L]

απηλθε στυγνος και κατηφης (*Quis div.* 20.1) [Ad]

επι τω λογω **Ⲱ** A B C E Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
 επι τουτων λογω (D) Θ f<sup>13</sup> a (b) (k)

κρηματα πολλα **Ⲱ** A B C E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup>] πολλα κρηματα D a b k

και αγρους b k] omit **Ⲱ** A B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892  
 1582 a TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

-----  
 στυγνασας **Ⲱ** A B C E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
 εστυгнаσεν D [NA: a b k]

### Mark 10:23

+ περιβλεψαμενος δε ο Ιησους λεγει τοις μαθηταις αυτου: πως  
 δυσκολως οι τα χρηματα εχοντες εισελευσονται εις την βασιλειαν  
 του θεου. + (*Quis div.* 4.8) [L]

Lac. L Ω 33 e Or Ath Did

λεγει **Ⲱ**<sup>c</sup> A B D E Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] ελεγεν  
**Ⲱ**<sup>c</sup> C; ειπεν Δ k

-----  
 περιβλεψαμενος δε ] και περιβλεψαμενος **Ⲱ** A B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ  
 f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

τα **Ⲱ** A B D E Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit C [NA: a b k]  
 εισελευσονται ... του θεου<sup>66</sup> Ψ] εις την βασιλειαν του θεου  
 εισελευσονται **Ⲱ** A B C D E Δ Θ Π f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

### Mark 10:24<sup>67</sup>

+ οι δε μαθηται εθαμβουντο επι τοις λογοις αυτου. παλιν δε ο Ιησους  
 αποκριθεις λεγει αυτοις: τεκνα, πως δυσκολον εστι τους  
 πεποιθοτας επι χρημασιν εις την βασιλειαν του θεου εισελθειν: +  
 (*Quis div.* 4.9) [L]

<sup>66</sup> The agreement between Clement and Ψ is not listed as a significant variant. The loose nature of Clement's quotations in Mark makes it highly uncertain if readings with singular support are anything more than accidental.

<sup>67</sup> The OL MSS a b invert vv. 24 and 25.

Lac. L (Ω) 33 e Or Ath Did

μαθηται **Σ** A B C E Π Ψ f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] add αυτου D Δ Θ  
f<sup>1</sup> 1582 a b k [Lac. Ω]

αποκριθεις λεγει αυτοις **Σ** A B C D E Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 a b TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] αποκριθεις ειπεν αυτοις Δ Θ Ψ 892; respondens dicit  
(=αποκριθεις λεγει) k; omit 579

τεκνα **Σ** B C D Δ Θ Ω f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] τεκνια A Ψ f<sup>1</sup> 1582 a  
b; omit E Π k

τους πεποιθοτας επι χρημασιν A C (D) E (Θ) Π Ω (f<sup>1</sup>) (f<sup>13</sup>) 579  
892 1582 (b) (TR)] omit **Σ** B Δ Ψ k UBS<sup>4</sup>; [qui] pecunias habent vel  
confidentes in eis (=ος] χρηματα εχουσιν η πεποιθοτας εν αυτοις) a

παλιν δε ο Ιησους ] ο δε Ιησους παλιν **Σ** B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup>  
f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 a (b) (k) TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; ο δε A; omit 579

εις την βασιλειαν του θεου εισελθειν **Σ** A B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup>  
579 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] εισελθειν εις την βασιλειαν του θεου f<sup>13</sup>

### Mark 10:25

+ ευκολως δια της τρυμαλιας της βελονης καμηλος εισελευσεται η  
πλουσιος εις την βασιλειαν του θεου. + (*Quis div.* 4.9) [L]<sup>68</sup>

Lac. L 33 e Or Ath Did

της τρυμαλιας B E Ω 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] τρυμαλιας **Σ**<sup>c</sup> A C Δ Θ Π Ψ  
f<sup>1</sup> 579 1582; τρηματος **Σ**<sup>i</sup>; τρυμαλιδος D; τρυπηματος f<sup>13</sup> [NA: a b k]

η πλουσιος D f<sup>13</sup>] η πλουσιον **Σ** A B C E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω (f<sup>1</sup>) 579 892  
1582 b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [NA: a]

<sup>68</sup> Although this reference is part of Clement's larger lemmata of Mark 10, it shares more of the characteristics of an allusion than the traditional lemma. If it were not included within the larger lemmata of Mark, it would be impossible to identify its source.

της βελονης ] βελονης f<sup>13</sup>; της ραφιδος B E Ω TR UBS<sup>4</sup>;  
 ραφιδος ⲛ A C D Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> 579 892 1582 [NA: a b k]

εισελευσεται ] διελευσεται D; εισελθειν ⲛ A E Δ Θ Ψ Ω 579 k  
 TR; διελθειν B C Π f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 b; intravit (=εισηλθεν ?) a

θεου ⲛ A B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
 ουρανων 579

**Mark 10:26**

+ οι δε περισσως εξεπλησσοντο και ελεγον: τις ουν δυναται σωθηναι  
 + (*Quis div.* 4.9) [L]

περισσως εξεπλησσοντο (*Quis div.* 20.4) [C]

---

Lac. L 33 e Or Ath Did

και ελεγον ] λεγοντες προς αυτον και ⲛ B C Δ Ψ 892; λεγοντες  
 προς εαυτους και A D E Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 1582 a b (k) TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

ουν ] omit ⲛ A B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b k TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup>

**Mark 10:27<sup>69</sup>**

+ ο δε εμβλεψας αυτοις ειπεν: ο τι παρα<sup>70</sup> ανθρωποις αδυνατον,  
 παρα θεω δυνατον. + (*Quis div.* 4.9) [L]

---

Lac. L 33 e Or Ath Did

ειπεν ⲛ<sup>a</sup> a k] λεγει ⲛ<sup>c</sup> A B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 b  
 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> This lemma has more of the characteristics of an adaptation than a precise quotation.

<sup>70</sup> The following variant is not included in the apparatus, since it is not genetically significant.

παρα<sup>1</sup> ⲛ A B C D E Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] add μεν Θ  
 f<sup>13</sup> [NA: a b k]

ανθρωποις **ⲛ** A B C E Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 579 892 1582 (a) k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
add τουτο D f<sup>13</sup>; ανθρωπος τουτο Θ b

αδυνατον [εστιν<sup>71</sup>] D a b k] αδυνατον αλλ ου παρα (τω) θεω **ⲛ**  
(A) B C E Δ Θ (Π) Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 (TR) UBS<sup>4</sup>

παρα [δε τω] θεω δυνατον D (a) (b) (k)] παντα γαρ δυνατα  
παρα (τω) θεω (**ⲛ**) B (C) Θ (892) (UBS<sup>4</sup>); παντα γαρ δυνατα  
εστιν παρα τω θεω A E Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> 1582 TR; παντα γαρ δυνατα τω  
θεω 579; omit Δ Ψ f<sup>1</sup>;

-----  
ο δε<sup>72</sup>] δε A D E Θ Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 (k) TR] omit **ⲛ** B C Δ Ψ f<sup>1</sup>  
1582 (a) UBS<sup>4</sup>; et (=και) (b)

εμβλεψας **ⲛ** A B C D E Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b k TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] αποκριθεις Θ

ο τι] omit **ⲛ** A B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b k TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>

### Mark 10:28

+ ηρξατο<sup>73</sup> ο Πετρος λεγειν αυτω: ιδε ημεις αφηκαμεν παντα και  
ηκολουθησαμεν σοι. + (*Quis div.* 4.10) [L]

Lac. L 33 e Or Ath Did

<sup>71</sup> While εστιν is not part of Clement's citation, it is clear that he shares the characteristics of this reading and not the other.

<sup>72</sup> Although part of a continuous quotation, the loose nature of Clement's citation makes it impossible to determine whether his text includes the introductory conjuncton δε or if it was added along with his inclusion of the definition article ο.

<sup>73</sup> As mentioned previously, it is extremely difficult to determine the presence or absence of introductory conjunctions and particles in a Father's text. This is even more the case, since Clement has already been shown to inconsistent in his transmission of them (e.g., Mark 10:23, 27). For this reason, it is unwise to attempt to determine his textual affinity on the basis of his omission of και in Mark 10:28. For this reason, the following variant is not included in the textual analysis.

ηρξατο **ⲛ** A B C E Δ Θ Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 UBS<sup>4</sup>] και ηρξατο  
D a b k TR; ηρξατο δε Π

ο Πέτρος λεγειν αυτω A (D) E Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 (a) (b) (k) TR]  
 λεγειν ο Πέτρος αυτω Ⲙ B C Δ Ψ UBS<sup>4</sup>; αυτω λεγειν ο Πέτρος f<sup>1</sup>  
 1582; λεγειν αυτω ο Πέτρος Θ

ηκολουθησαμεν Ⲙ A E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 TR]  
 ηκολουθηκαμεν B C D UBS<sup>4</sup>] [NA: a b k]

σοι A B C D E Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] add τι  
 αρα εσται ημιν Ⲙ b; σου Δ

-----  
 ιδε ] ιδου Ⲙ A B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
 [NA: a b k]

παντα και Ⲙ A B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 k TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit et (=και) a; add nostra (=ημων) b

### Mark 10:29

αποκριθεις δε Ιησους: αμην υμιν λεγω, ος αν αφη τα ιδια και γονεις  
 και αδελφους και χρηματα ενεκεν εμου και ενεκεν του  
 ευαγγελιου, + (*Quis div.* 22.1) [Ad]<sup>74</sup>

+ αποκριθεις δε ο Ιησους:<sup>75</sup> αμην υμιν λεγω, ος αν αφη τα ιδια και  
 γονεις και αδελφους και χρηματα ενεκεν εμου και ενεκεν του  
 ευαγγελιου, + (*Quis div.* 4.10) [L]

Lac. L (Ω) 33 e Or Ath Did

<sup>74</sup> Though Clement's references to Mark 10:29 are somewhat loose, it should be pointed out that he cites the passage almost identically in two different contexts. The first reference occurs as part of Clement's lemmata of Mark 10 and the other as an isolated reference latter in the work. While one of the references is categorized as a lemma due to its location, it is by nature better classified as an adaptation. As noted previously, the loose nature of Clement's lemmata of Mark and the identical appearance of some of those references elsewhere in his work suggest that Clement quoted the passage from memory. This same phenomena also occurs in Clement's reference to Mark 10:30. For a discussion of how the relation of Clement's lemmata of Mark and the question of whether this passage can be taken as an accurate reflection of Clement's text of Mark, see the discussion on p. 236.

<sup>75</sup> Stählin inserts the emendation [λεγει]. While this addition makes the text read easier to read, I have chosen to omit it, since there is no such textual tradition among New Testament manuscripts.

αποκριθεις A C D E Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 a b (k)] εφη B Δ 892  
UBS<sup>4</sup>; εφη αυτοις Ψ 579; εφη αυτω ⋈

Ιησους ⋈ B D Δ 579 892 UBS<sup>4</sup>] add ειπεν A C E Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582  
a k TR; add ait (=λεγει) b; omit Ψ

εμου και ενεκεν ⋈<sup>c</sup> C E Δ Π Ψ f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 a b k UBS<sup>4</sup>] εμου η  
ενεκεν D Θ f<sup>1</sup> 1582; εμου και A B TR; omit ⋈<sup>c</sup> [Lac. Ω]

-----  
υμιν λεγω ] λεγω υμιν ⋈ A B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892  
1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

ος ... χρηματα ] ουδεις εστιν ος αφηκεν οικιαν η αδελφους η  
αδελφας η μητερα η πατερα η τεκνα η αγρους B Θ UBS<sup>4</sup>; ουδεις  
εστιν ος αφηκεν οικιαν η αδελφους η αδελφας η πατερα η μητερα  
η τεκνα η αγρους ⋈ f<sup>1</sup> 1582; ουδεις εστιν ος αφηκεν οικιαν η  
αδελφους η αδελφας η πατερα η μητερα η γυναικα η τεκνα η  
αγρους E Π (Ψ) f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 TR; οτι ουδεις εστιν ος αφηκεν οικιαν  
η αδελφους η αδελφας η πατερα η μητερα η γυναικα η τεκνα η  
αγρους A; ουδεις εστιν ος αφηκεν η αδελφους η αδελφας η  
μητερα η τεκνα η αγρους D a; ουδεις εστιν ος αφηκεν οικιαν η  
αδελφους η αδελφας η μητερα η πατερα η γυναικα η τεκνα η  
αγρους C; ουδεις εστιν ος αφηκεν οικιαν η αδελφους η αδελφας  
η μητερα η πατερα η αγρους Δ; nemo est qui reliquerit aut fratres  
aut sorores aut matrem aut filios (=ουδεις εστιν ος αφηκεν η  
αδελφους η αδελφας η μητερα η τεκνα) b; nemo est qui reliquerit  
domum aut fratres aut sororem et matrem et filios (=ουδεις εστιν ος  
αφηκεν οικιαν η αδελφους η αδελφην η μητερα και τεκνα και  
τεκνα) k [Lac. Ω]

### Mark 10:30

+ αποληψεται εκατονταπλασιονα (*Quis div.* 22.1) [Ad]

+ αποληψεται εκατονταπλασιονα νυν εν τω καιρω τουτω αγρους και  
χρηματα και οικιας και αδελφους εχειν μετα διωγμων εις που; εν  
δε τω ερχομενω ζωη[ν] εστιν αιωνιος. + (*Quis div.* 4.10) [L]<sup>76</sup>

<sup>76</sup> Barbara Aland notes that, with the exception of this citation, "where Clement improves the clarity of the difficult sentence," the remaining differences from his

νυν δε εν τω καιρω τουτω αγρους και χρηματα και οικιας και  
αδελφους εχειν μετα διωγμων εις που; (*Quis div.* 25.1) [Ad]<sup>77</sup>

μετα διωγμων (*Quis div.* 25.3) [C]

TEXT: ... αποληψεται εκατονταπλασιονα νυν εν τω καιρω τουτω  
αγρους και χρηματα και οικιας και αδελφους εχειν μετα  
διωγμων εις που; εν δε τω ερχομενω ζωην εστιν αιωνιος

Lac. (L) (Ω) 33 e (Or) Ath Did

αποληψεται a] απολαβη ⲛ f<sup>1</sup> 1582 b; λαβη A B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ  
f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; relinquet (=καταλειπει?) k [Lac. L Ω Or]

νυν ⲛ A B C E Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit D a  
k [Lac. L Ω Or]

-----  
εν τω καιρω τουτω ⲛ A B C E Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit k [Lac. L Ω Or]

αγρους ... εχειν] οικιας και αδελφους και αδελφας και μητερας  
και τεκνα και αγρους B E Δ Ψ Ω f<sup>13</sup> TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; οικιας και  
αδελφους και αδελφας και μητερα και τεκνα και αγρους A C Θ;  
ος δε αφηκεν οικειαν και αδελφας και αδελφους και μητερα και  
τεκνα και αγρους D a; οικιας και αδελφους και αδελφας και  
πατερα και μητερα και τεκνα και αγρους Π f<sup>1</sup> 579 892 1582; omit  
ⲛ k; οικιας και αδελφους και αδελφας και μητερα και πατερα και  
τεκνα και αγρους ⲛ<sup>c</sup>; qui autem reliquerit domum et parentes et  
sorores et fratres (= ος δε αφηκεν οικιαν και γονεις και αδελφας  
και αδελφους) b [Lac. L Or]

διωγμων ⲛ<sup>c</sup> A B C E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] διωγμου D; add in isto saeculo (= εν τουτω αιωνι) k; omit  
ⲛ [Lac. L Or]

εις που] omit ⲛ A B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> [Lac. L Or]

exemplar "have to do with banalities" ("Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri,"  
120; see also ch. 2 n. 21).

<sup>77</sup> See n. 74 above.



εν δε ] και εν τω αιωνι **Σ** A B C E (L) Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892  
1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; εν τω αιωνι D; saeculi autem (=αιωνος δε) k; in  
saeculo (=εν τω αιωνι) a (b) [Lac. Or]

εστιν αιωνιος ] αιωνιαν B; αιωνιον **Σ** A C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup>  
579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; αιωνιον λημψεται D (a) (b) (k) [Lac. Or]

**Mark 10:31**

+ εσονται οι πρωτοι εσχατοι και οι εσχατοι πρωτοι (*Quis div.* 4.10) [L]

---

Lac. 33 e Or Ath Did

οι<sup>2</sup> B C E Ψ Ω f<sup>13</sup> 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit **Σ** A D L Δ Θ Π f<sup>1</sup> 579 1582  
[NA: a b k]

-----  
εσονται ] πολλοι δε εσονται **Σ** A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892  
1582 a b k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; πολλοι δε εσθησονται 579

οι<sup>1</sup> ] omit **Σ** A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
[NA: a b k]

## THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

**Luke 1:20**

και τουτο ην ο ηνισσετο η Ζαχαριου σιωπη (*Protr.* 10.1) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> (Or) Ath Did

**Luke 1:67**

Ζαχαριας γαρ ο Ιωαννου πατηρ και προ του παιδος προφητευειν εν  
τοις ευαγγελις λεγεται (*Strom.* 1.136.2) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Or Ath Did

**Luke 2:1**

εγεννηθη δε ο κυριος ημων τω ογδω και εικοστω ετει, οτε πρωτον  
εκελευσαν απογραφας γενεσθαι επι Αυγουστου (*Strom.* 1.145.1) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Or (Ath) Did

**Luke 2:7**

ην αυτος εσπαργανωσεν ο κυριος αιματι τιμιω. ω των αγιων  
λοχευματων, ω των αγιων σπαργανων: (*Paed.* 1.42.2) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> C Or (Ath) Did

**Luke 2:10**

ο σωτηρ ωφθη κατιων τοις αγγελοις, διο και ευηγγελισαντο αυτον  
(*Exc.* 18.1) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> C (33) (Or) Ath Did

**Luke 2:49**

τοτε εν τοις του πατρος γενησεται (*Protr.* 82.25) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Or Ath Did

**Luke 3:1**

(εν τω ευαγγελιω τω κατα Λουκαν γεγραπται ουτως:) ετει δε<sup>78</sup>  
πεντεκαιδεκατω επι Τιβεριου Καισαρος + (*Strom.* 1.145.2) [Ad]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> (33) (Or) Ath Did

---

<sup>78</sup> Due to the difficulty in determining the presence or absence of introductory conjunctions and particles in a Father's text, the presence of δε is not cited in the apparatus as a variant reading with B and others against Ψ f<sup>13</sup>.

-----  
 ΠΕΝΤΕΚΑΙΔΕΚΑΤΩ **Σ** A B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33<sup>vid</sup> 579 892 1582  
 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] ΠΕΝΤΕΔΕΚΑΤΩ L [NA: a b e]

**Luke 3:2**

+ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ρημα κυριου επι<sup>79</sup> Ιωαννην τον Ζαχαριου υιον (*Strom.*  
 1.145.2) [Ad]\*

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> (33) (Or) Ath Did

τον **Σ** A B C D E L Δ Π Ψ Ω 33 579 892 UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] add του Θ f<sup>1</sup>  
 f<sup>13</sup> 1582 TR [NA: a b e]

-----  
 κυριου ] θεου **Σ** A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b e  
 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or [Lac. 33]

Ζαχαριου υιον **Σ** A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582  
 b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] filium Zachariae (= υιον Ζαχαριου) a

**Luke 3:13**

τοις δε τελωναις μηδεν<sup>80</sup> πλεον πρασσειν παρα τα διατεταγμενα  
 (*Paed.* 3.91.2) [Ad]\*

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Or Ath Did

<sup>79</sup> Manuscripts Δ and Θ replace the preposition επι with προς against all other witnesses. It is not included in the apparatus since it is of no genetic significance.

<sup>80</sup> The distinction in the following variant between μηδεν and μηθεν is minor and does not appear to be genetically significant. For this reason it is not included in the analysis.

μηδεν **Σ** B C D E L Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] μηθεν A Δ Θ  
 [NA: a b e]

πλεον πρασσειν<sup>81</sup>/ πλεον πρασσετε D a b e] πλεον κ A B C E L  
Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

-----  
τα διατεταγμενα ] το διατεταγμενον κ A B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup>  
f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; δια διατεταγμενον L

**Luke 3:14**

και τοις μεν στρατευομενοις δια Ιωαννου παραγγελλει αρκεισθαι  
μονοις τοις οψωνιοις (*Paed.* 3.91.2) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Or Ath Did

**Luke 3:22**

(αυτικα γουν βαπτιζομενω τω κυριω απ ουρανων επηχησε φωνη  
μαρτυς ηγαπημενου) υιος μου ει συ αγαπητος, εγω σημερον  
γεγεννηκα σε (*Paed.* 1.25.2) [C]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>75</sup>) C Or Ath Did

υιος μου ει συ [αγαπητος]<sup>82</sup> ... σε D (a) (b) Or<sup>83</sup>] συ ει ο υιος μου  
ο αγαπητος εν σοι ευδοκησα<sup>84</sup> κ B Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 (e)  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] συ ει ο υιος μου ο αγαπητος εν σοι ηυδοκησα A E L Δ Ψ  
579 (e) TR [Lac. P<sup>75</sup>]

---

<sup>81</sup> Clement's use of *πρασσειν* in his adaptation of Luke 3:13 indicates his knowledge of the verb *πρασσετε* after *πλεον* as attested to in Codex Bezae and the Old Latin. Additional evidence for this conclusion is seen in Clement's inclusion of the dative article with *τελωναι*. This parallels the distinctive use of the dative form of *αυτοις* by D instead of *αυτους*.

<sup>82</sup> Though Clement adds *αγαπητος* his reading is still cited here as part of the longer quotation, since he is clearly aware of this unique reading in Codex Bezae.

<sup>83</sup> Raquel does not indicate Origen's attestation of this reading, but Origen's knowledge of it is certainly indicated by his statements in *Comm. Jo.* 1.29 and *Cels.* 1.41. It has, therefore, been included.

<sup>84</sup> Though the difference between *ευδοκησα* and *ηυδοκησα* only centers around the use of the temporal augment, both forms are listed separately, since some manuscript groupings clearly follow one more than another. The distinction, however, has no affect on the textual analysis, since both variants disagree with Clement. Generally speaking, the use of the temporal augment (*ηυ*) was preferred in the Attic period, while *ευ* was preferred later. See BDF §67.

αγαπητος ] ο αγαπητος **Σ** **A** **B** **C** **E** **L** **Δ** **Θ** **Π** **Ψ** **Ω** <sup>f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup></sup> 33 579  
892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; omit **D** **a** **b** [NA: **e**; Lac. P<sup>75</sup>]

**Luke 3:23**

ην δε Ιησους ερχομενος επι το βαπτισμα ως ετων λ (*Strom.* 1.145.2) [Ad]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> **C** Or Ath Did

ην δε Ιησους **D**] και αυτος ην Ιησους **Σ** **B** **L** **Ψ** 33 UBS<sup>4</sup>; και  
αυτος ην ο Ιησους **A** **E** **D** **Θ** **Π** **Ω** <sup>f<sup>1</sup></sup> 892 1582 TR; et ipse Iesus erat  
(=και αυτος (ο) Ιησους ην) **a** **b** **e**; και αυτος ο Ιησους <sup>f<sup>13</sup></sup>; omit 579

ως **D** <sup>f<sup>13</sup></sup>] ωσει **Σ** **A** **B** **E** **L** **Δ** **Θ** **Π** **Ψ** **Ω** <sup>f<sup>1</sup></sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>;  
omit 579 [NA: **a** **b** **e**]

**Luke 4:13**

και απεστη απ αυτου εις καιρον (*Ecl.* 53.2) [Ad]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> **C** (33) Ath (Did)

καιρον / καιρου **Σ** **A** **B** **E** **L** **Δ** **Θ** **Π** **Ψ** **Ω** <sup>f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup></sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did] χρονου **D** [NA: **a** **b** **e**]

**Luke 4:19**

(γεγραπται ουτως) ενιαυτον δεκτον κυριου κηρυξαι απεστειλεν με  
(*Strom.* 1.145.3) [Ad]

ενιαυτος κυριου δεκτος (*Strom.* 5.37.4) [All]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> **C** sy<sup>c</sup> Or Ath Did

**Luke 5:21**

θεω γαρ μονω δυνατον αφεσιν αμαρτιων παρασχεσθαι (*Quis div.*  
39.5) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Or Ath Did

**Luke 5:31**

οι υγιαινωντες ου χρηζουσιν ιατρου (*Paed.* 1.83.2) [Ad]<sup>\*85</sup>

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Or Ath Did

υγιαινωντες Ⲱ A B C D E L Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] ισχυοντες Ψ f<sup>13</sup>; υπαινωντες Δ

**Luke 6:22**

και μακαριοι εστε, οταν οι ανθρωποι μισησωσιν υμας, οταν  
αφορισωσιν, οταν εκβαλωσι το ονομα υμων ως πονηρον ενεκα  
του υιου του ανθρωπου (*Strom.* 4.41.3) [Ad]<sup>\*86</sup>

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>75</sup>) C Or Ath Did

εστε P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
εσεσθε Θ b e

μισησωσιν Ⲱ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
μισησουσιν D Δ 579 [NA: a b e; Lac. P<sup>75</sup>]

αφορισωσιν D P<sup>75vid</sup>] add υμας Ⲱ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33  
579 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup> The presence of the term οι υγιαινωντες is distinctive to Luke and suggests that Clement's citation is from Luke and not the similar accounts in Matt 9:12 and Mark 2:17.

<sup>86</sup> The following variants from Luke 6:22 are most likely the result of itacism.  
εστε P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ B D E Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] εσται A L

οι ανθρωποι μισησωσιν υμας ] μεισησουσιν υμας οι ανθρωποι  
D Δ 579 (a) (e)] μισησωσιν υμας οι ανθρωποι Ⲙ A B E L Θ Π Ψ  
Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 (a) (e) TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; vos oderint homines (=υμας  
μεισησουσιν / μισησωσιν οι ανθρωποι) b [Lac. P<sup>75</sup>]

οταν<sup>3</sup> ] και Ⲙ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>; et cum (+ και οταν) a [Lac. P<sup>75</sup>]

εκβαλωσι ] add και ονειδισωσιν D a b; ονειδισωσιν και  
εκβαλωσιν Ⲙ A B E L Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 (e) TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>; ονειδισουσιν και εκβαλωσιν Δ (e) [Lac. P<sup>75</sup>]

ενεκα P<sup>75</sup> Ⲙ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
ενεκεν D [NA: a b e]

**Luke 6:27**

ηδη δε αγαπαν τους εχθρους κελευει + (*Paed.* 3.92.3) [All]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C Or Ath Did

**Luke 6:28**

και τους καταρωμενους ημας ευλογειν προσευχεσθαι τε υπερ των  
επηρεαζοντων ημας + (*Paed.* 3.92.3) [All]

τους ευλογειν μεμαθηκοτας τους καταρωμενους (*Strom.* 2.2.2) [All]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (Or) Ath Did

**Luke 6:29**

τω τυπτοντι σε εις την σιαγονα παρεχε και την αλλην (*Protr.* 108.5) [C]

+ τω τυπτοντι σε (φησι) εις την σιαγονα παρεχε και την αλλην, και  
εαν αρη σου τις τον χιτωνα, μη κωλυσης και το ιματιον (*Paed.*  
3.92.3) [Ad]\*

τω τυπτοντι την σιαγονα παραθειναι την ετεραν τω το ιματιον  
αιροντι και του χιτωνος παραχωρειν (*Strom.* 4.61.2) [Ad]

τω αιροντι το ιματιον και τον χιωνα προσδιδοναι (*Strom.* 4.77.3) [Ad]

TEXT: τω τυπτοντι σε εις την σιαγονα παρεχε και την αλλην και ...  
του αιροντος ... το ιματιον και τον χιωνα μη κωλυσης

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>75</sup>) C (Or) Ath Did

εις  $\aleph^*$  D Θ 892 Or] επι P<sup>75</sup>  $\aleph^c$  A B E L Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582  
a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

την σιαγονα  $\aleph^c$  A B D L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] την δεξιαν σιαγονα  $\aleph^*$  E 579 [Lac. P<sup>75</sup>]

παρεχε P<sup>75</sup>  $\aleph^c$  A B E L Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] add  
αυτω D 579 a b e; στρεψον αυτω f<sup>13</sup>

χιωνα  $\aleph$  B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
add σου A a e [Lac. P<sup>75</sup> Or]

-----  
και<sup>1</sup> P<sup>75</sup>  $\aleph$  A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 579 1582 b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] omit a

μη κωλυσης P<sup>75</sup>  $\aleph$  B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] remitte tunicam<sup>87</sup> (=αφες χιωνα) e [Lac. Or]

### Luke 6:30

παντι<sup>88</sup> τω αιτουντι σε διδου (*Quis div.* 31.9) [C]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>75</sup>) C Or Ath Did

<sup>87</sup> The Old Latin here appears to represent a harmonization with the parallel passage in Matt 5:40.

<sup>88</sup> The difficulty of determining the presence or absence of introductory conjunctions and particles in a Father's text based on a single reference makes it impossible to know with certainty whether Clement's text followed the Primary Alexandrian witness  $\aleph$  B in omitting δε.



τω A D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582 TR] omit P<sup>75vid</sup> ⋈ B 579 892  
UBS<sup>4</sup> [NA: a b e]

σε P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit e

διδου P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] δος 33

**Luke 6:31**

καθως θελετε ινα ποιωσιν υμιν οι ανθρωποι, ποιειτε αυτοις<sup>89</sup> (*Paed.*  
3.88.1) [C]<sup>90</sup>

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) (P<sup>75</sup>) C Or Ath Did

υμιν ⋈ B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
υμας A 579 [Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup>]

ανθρωποι P<sup>75vid</sup> B 579 a b UBS<sup>4</sup>] add και υμεις ⋈ A D E L Δ Θ Π  
Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 (892) 1582 TR; vos illis (=υμεις αυτοις) e [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

ποιωσιν P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] ποιουσιν A [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

**Luke 6:35**

(ο αυτος παλιν ομολογησει λογος,) οτι αυτος χρηστος εστιν επι τους  
αχαριστους και πονηρους + (*Paed.* 1.72.2) [C]

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) (P<sup>75</sup>) C (33) Or Ath (Did)

<sup>89</sup> It is impossible to know for certain whether Clement follows the shorter version of this verse found in D that ends with αυτοις or the longer version that adds ομοιως. Due to this difficulty, this reading is not included in the apparatus.

<sup>90</sup> This citation is taken from Luke 6:31 rather than Matt 7:12 because the presence of the conjunction καθως and the omission of the adverb ουτως are distinctive to Luke.

αχαριστους και πονηρους P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>13</sup> 33 579  
892 a e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did] πονηρους και αχαριστους f<sup>1</sup> 1582; gratos et  
malos (=χαριστους και πονηρους) b [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

**Luke 6:36**

+ (και προσετι) γινεσθε οικτιρμονες (λεγων) καθως ο πατηρ υμων  
οικτιρμων εστιν (*Paed.* 1.72.2) [C]<sup>91</sup>

γινεσθε (φησιν ο κυριος) ελεημονες και οικτιρμονες, ως ο πατηρ υμων  
ο ουραnios οικτιρμων εστιν (*Strom.* 2.100.4) [Ad]

TEXT: γινεσθε οικτιρμονες καθως ο πατηρ υμων οικτιρμων εστιν

---

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) C Or Ath Did

γινεσθε P<sup>45vid</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ B D L f<sup>1</sup> 33 1582 a b e UBS<sup>4</sup>] add ουν A E Δ Θ  
Π Ψ Ω f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 TR<sup>92</sup>

καθως P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ B L Ψ f<sup>1</sup> 579 1582] add και A D E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> 33  
892 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

υμων P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
add ο ουραnios ⳑ<sup>c</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

**Luke 6:37**

μη κρινε (τοινυν), ινα μη κριθης· + (*Quis div.* 33.4) [Ad]<sup>\*93</sup>

---

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) (33) Or Ath Did

ινα μη A D Ψ a e] και ου μη P<sup>45vid</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup>  
579 892 1582 b TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [Lac. 33]

---

<sup>91</sup> The following variant from Luke 6:36 is most likely the result of itacism.

γ[ε]ινεσθε P<sup>45vid</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ B D E Δ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] γεινεσθαι  
A L Θ

<sup>92</sup> It seems likely that the introductory conjunction ουν is absent from Clement's text, since he quotes the passage twice without it. In addition, the fact that the first of the two references is part of a longer citation makes it unlikely that Clement would omit it for quotation purposes.

<sup>93</sup> This citation is most likely from Luke 6:37 rather than Matt 7:1, since it is part of a larger citation that contains the distinctive elements of Luke 6:38.

-----  
 κριθης / κριθητε P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892  
 1582 a TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; iudicabitur (=κριθησεται) b; iudicetur  
 (=κρινηται) e [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

### Luke 6:38

+ ω μετρω μετρεις τουτω και αντιμετρηθησεται σοι· μετρον καλον,  
 πεππισμενον και σεσαλευμενον, υπερεκχυνομενον, αποδοθησεται  
 σοι (*Quis div.* 33.4) [Ad]\*

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) (P<sup>75</sup>) (33) Or Ath (Did)

ω (γαρ) μετρω ⋈ B D L f<sup>1</sup> 33 892 1582 e UBS<sup>4</sup> Did] τω (γαρ)  
 αυτω μετρω ω P<sup>45vid</sup> A C E (Δ) Θ Π Ψ f<sup>13</sup> α b TR [Lac. P<sup>75</sup> 579]

πεππισμενον και σεσαλευμενον A C E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892  
 TR] omit και P<sup>45vid</sup> P<sup>75vid</sup> ⋈<sup>c</sup> B L (a) b UBS<sup>4</sup>; σεσαλευμενον  
 πεππισμενον D f<sup>1</sup> 1582; πεππιασμενον και σεσαλευμενον ⋈;  
 σεσαλευμενον e [Lac. Did]

υπερεκχυνομενον P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75vid</sup> ⋈ B L D 1582 UBS<sup>4</sup> a b e] και  
 υπερεκχυνομενον A C E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 TR [Lac. 33  
 Did]

αντιμετρηθησεται ⋈ A C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 a TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup> Did] μετρηθησεται B b e [Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> 33 579]

### Luke 6:43

το γαρ ουκ εστι δενδρον καλον ποιουν καρπον σαπρον ουδε μην  
 δενδρον σαπρον ποιουν καρπον καλον (*Paed.* 2.45.1) [Ad]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> Or Ath Did

καρπον σαπρον ⋈ A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup>] καρπους σαπρους D a b e; καρπον καλον 579 [Lac. P<sup>75</sup>]

καρπον καλον P<sup>75</sup> Ⲭ A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] καρπους καλους D a b e; καρπον σαπρον 579

-----  
μην ] omit A C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω 33 a e TR; παλιν P<sup>75</sup> Ⲭ B L f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup>  
579 892 1582 b UBS<sup>4</sup>

#### Luke 6:44

και ημεις μεν εξ ακανθων τρυγωμεν σταφυλην και συκα απο βατων  
(*Paed.* 2.74.4) [All]<sup>\*94</sup>

-----  
Lac. P<sup>45</sup> Or Ath Did

τρυγωμεν / τρυγωσιν σταφυλην A E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> 1582 a b (e) TR]  
σταφυλην τρυγωσιν P<sup>75</sup> Ⲭ B C D 33 579 892 UBS<sup>4</sup>; σταφυλας  
τρυγωσιν L Ψ f<sup>13</sup>

-----  
βατων / βατου P<sup>75vid</sup> Ⲭ<sup>c</sup> A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892  
1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] βλαστου Ⲭ<sup>\*</sup>

#### Luke 6:45

ο γαρ<sup>95</sup> αγαθος ανθρωπος εκ του αγαθου θησαυρου της καρδιας  
προφερει το αγαθον, τον δε πονηρον ο γαρ κακος εκ του κακου  
θησαυρου<sup>96</sup> προφερει το κακον, οτι εκ περισσευματος της  
καρδιας το στομα λαλει (*Quis div.* 17.2) [Ad]<sup>\*97</sup>

<sup>94</sup> While Clement uses a different form of the verb τρυγαω, his word order indicates his textual affinity.

<sup>95</sup> As noted previously, it is difficult to determine on the basis of a single reference whether a Father's text includes introductory conjunctions or particles. For this reason, Clement's inclusion of γαρ is not included in the apparatus.

<sup>96</sup> Clement's text reveals the following variant. Due to the nature of Clement's adaptation, one should not place much significance on his singular agreement with the Old Latin MSS b. The variant is listed here for information purposes only.

<sup>97</sup> This reference is to Luke 6:45 rather than Matt 12:35 because it contains several words that are distinct to the manuscript tradition of Luke (e.g., προφερει το αγαθον instead of εκβαλλει αγαθα).

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) (P<sup>75</sup>) Or Ath (Did)

καρδιας<sup>1</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ B 579 UBS<sup>4</sup> Did] add αυτου A C (D) E L Δ Θ Π Ψ  
Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

προφερει<sup>1</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ (Ω) f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] προσφερει L 579 [NA: a b e; Lac. P<sup>45</sup> Did]<sup>98</sup>

θησαυρου<sup>2</sup> b] omit P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ B D L f<sup>1</sup> 579 892 1582 a UBS<sup>4</sup>; add της  
καρδιας αυτου A C E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>13</sup> 33 e TR [Lac. P<sup>45</sup> Did]

περισσευματος P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B D E Δ Π Ψ Ω 33 UBS<sup>4</sup>] του  
περισσευματος C L Θ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 TR [NA: a b e; Lac. P<sup>45</sup>  
Did]

της καρδιας<sup>2</sup> C E L Δ Θ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR] καρδιας P<sup>75</sup>  
⋈ A B D Π Ψ UBS<sup>4</sup>] [NA: a b e; Lac. P<sup>45</sup> Did]

το στομα λαλει (⋈) C 579 (a) (b)] λαλει το στομα αυτου P<sup>45vid</sup> P<sup>75vid</sup>  
A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; καλει το στομα αυτου  
D; add malum (=πονηρον) e; λαλει το στομα 892 [Lac. Did]

-----  
αγαθου θησαυρου P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582  
892 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did] add αυτου D [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

το<sup>1</sup> ⋈ A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did]  
omit D [NA: a b e; Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup>]

αγαθον P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did] bona (=αγαθα) e [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

κακος ] πονηρος P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ B D L Ψ f<sup>1</sup> 579 892 1582 a b UBS<sup>4</sup>;  
πονηρος ανθρωπος ⋈<sup>c</sup> A C E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> 33 e TR [Lac. P<sup>45</sup> Did]

<sup>98</sup> This same variant appears after the second use of προφερει in Luke 6:45. It is not included in the textual analysis since that nature of Clement's textual affinities is already indicated by the previous variant.

κακου ] πονηρου P<sup>75</sup> **Σ** A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892  
1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [NA: a b e; Lac. P<sup>45</sup> Did]

κακου ] πονηρον P<sup>75</sup> **Σ** A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892  
1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; mala (=πονηρα) b [NA: a e; Lac. P<sup>45</sup> Did]

οτι εκ ] εκ γαρ P<sup>75</sup> **Σ** A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892  
1582 (b) TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; ex (=εκ) a, de (=εκ) e [Lac. P<sup>45</sup> Did]

### Luke 6:46

τι με λεγετε, κυριε κυριε, (φησι) και ου ποιειτε α λεγω (*Strom.* 4.43.3)  
[C]

(ο κυριος λεγει) τι με λεγετε, κυριε κυριε, και ου ποιειτε α λεγω  
(*Strom.* 7.110.1) [C]

τι με λεγετε, κυριε κυριε, και ου ποιειτε α λεγω (*Quis div.* 29.6) [C]

---

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) Or Ath

λεγετε D Did] καλειτε P<sup>75</sup> **Σ** A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579  
892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

α **Σ** A C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Did] ο P<sup>75</sup> B e [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

-----  
τι δε με **Σ** A B C D E L Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a (b) e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> (Did); τι με δε Δ [Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup>]<sup>99</sup>

### Luke 7:25

(τω ευαγγελιω λεγει) ιδου οι εν ιματισμω ενδοξω και εν τρυφη  
διαγοντες εν τοις βασιλειασι εισι (*Paed.* 2.109.3) [C]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (33) Or Ath Did

---

<sup>99</sup> Though the conjunction δε is missing from all three of Clement's references to Luke 6:46, its absence is minor and of no genetic significance to the textual analysis.

εν<sup>2</sup> a b] omit P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 589 892 1582 e  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]

διαγοντες D Π] υπαρχοντες P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B E L Δ Θ Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892  
1582 (b) e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; superabundant (περισσευοντες) a [Lac. 33]

-----  
εν<sup>1</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
omit 579

βασιλεις P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] regum (=βασιλειω) e [Lac 33]

### Luke 7:28

(και Ιωαννης) ο μειζων εν γεννητοις γυναικων προφητης (*Paed.*  
1.24.4) [C]<sup>100</sup>

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C Or Ath (Did)

προφητης A D E Δ Θ Ψ Ω f<sup>13</sup> (892) TR] omit P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ B L Π f<sup>1</sup> 33  
579 1582 a b e UBS<sup>4</sup> Did

-----  
ο ] omit P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Did [NA: a b e]

ο μειζων ... γυναικων P<sup>75</sup> (Ⲱ) A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579  
892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did] in natis mulierum maior (=εν  
γεννητοις γυναικων μειζων) e

γεννητοις P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ<sup>c</sup> A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did] γεννηται Ⲱ<sup>\*</sup>

### Luke 7:37–38

οιδ οτι αλαβαστρον μυρου παρα το δειπνον το αγιον κομισασα η  
γυνη τους ποδας ηλειφεν του κυριου και ησεν αυτον (*Paed.*  
2.61.1) [All]

<sup>100</sup> This section of Luke 7:28 in Codex Bezae is placed at the end of verse 26.

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C Or Ath Did

αλαβαστρον μυρου **ⲛ** A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a  
b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] μυρου αλαβαστρον D [Lac. P<sup>75</sup>]

### Luke 9:62

ουδεις γαρ εις τα οπισω βλεπων και επιβαλλων την χειρα αυτου επ  
αροτρον ευθετος τη βασιλεια του θεου (*Strom.* 7.93.6) [C]

και μηκετι βλεπειν εις τα οπισω (*Quis div.* 39.6) [All]

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) (33) (Or) Ath (Did)

εις τα οπισω βλεπων και P<sup>45vid</sup> D a (b) e] και βλεπων εις τα  
οπισω P<sup>75</sup> **ⲛ** A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33<sup>vid</sup> 579 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>;  
και στραφεις εις τα οπισω 892 Or Did

επιβαλλων P<sup>45vid</sup> P<sup>75</sup> A D L Θ a e] επιβαλων **ⲛ** B C E Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup>  
f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did; βαλων Or; mittit (=επιβαλλει) b

χειρα αυτου P<sup>45</sup> **ⲛ** A C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 e TR]  
omit αυτου P<sup>75</sup> B f<sup>1</sup> 1582 a b UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did

ουδεις εις τα οπισω βλεπων και επιβαλλων χειρα αυτου επ  
αροτρον P<sup>45vid</sup> D a (b) e] ουδεις επιβαλων / επιβαλλων / βαλων  
την χειρα (αυτου) επ αροτρον και βλεπων (or στραφεις) εις τα  
οπισω P<sup>75</sup> **ⲛ** A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did

τη βασιλεια P<sup>75</sup> **ⲛ** B L f<sup>1</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] την  
βασιλειαν A C D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>13</sup> TR [Lac. P<sup>45</sup> Did]

ευθετος ] add εστιν **ⲛ**\* B L Δ f<sup>1</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e UBS<sup>4</sup> Or; add  
εστιν εις A C D E Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>13</sup> TR; add εστιν εν P<sup>75</sup> **ⲛ**<sup>c</sup> 579 [P<sup>45</sup>  
Did]



**Luke 10:4**

μη βασταζετε γαρ (ειπεν ο κυριος) βαλλαντιον, μη πηραν, μηδε  
υποδημα (*Paed.* 3.38.2) [Ad]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (33) (Or) Ath Did

**Luke 10:19**

επανω οφεων και σκορπιων περιπατειν (*Strom.* 4.26.5) [Ad]\*

---

Lac. (a) Ath

οφεων P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did] των οφεων P<sup>45</sup> D [NA: a b e]

-----  
σκορπιων P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did] των σκορπιων D [NA: a b e]

**Luke 10:21**

ναι, ο πατηρ, οτι ουτως ευδοκια εγενετο εμπροσθεν σου (*Paed.* 1.32.3) [C]<sup>101</sup>

αγαλλιασαμενος γουν εν τω πνευματι Ιησους, εξομολογουμαι σοι  
πατερ, (φησιν) ο θεος του ουρανου και της γης, οτι απεκρυψας  
ταυτα απο σοφων και συνετων, και απεκαλυψας αυτα νηπιοις  
(*Paed.* 1.32.2) [Ad]<sup>\*102</sup>

δια τουτο τα κεκρυμμενα απο σοφων και συνετων του νυν αιωνος  
απεκαλυφθη τοις νηπιοις (*Paed.* 1.32.3) [All]

---

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) Or Ath Did

---

<sup>101</sup> The context indicates this reference is to Luke 10:21, not the parallel passage in Matt 11:26.

<sup>102</sup> Although this passage is similar to Matt 11:25, the presence of the introductory phrase εν τω πνευματι Ιησους indicates the reference is to Luke 10:21 rather than Matt 11:25.

εν τῷ πνεύματι P<sup>45vid</sup> ⲛ D L 33 892 (a) (b) (e) UBS<sup>4</sup>] τῷ πνεύματι  
P<sup>75</sup> A B C E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 1582 TR

ευδοκία ἐγένετο P<sup>45vid</sup> P<sup>75</sup> B C L Ψ f<sup>1</sup> 33 579 892 b e UBS<sup>4</sup>] ἐγένετο  
ευδοκία ⲛ A D E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> 1582 TR; placuit (=ευδοκησεν) a

-----  
ἐξομολογουμεαι P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⲛ A B C D E L Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892  
1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] ἐξομολογησομαι Δ

ο θεος ] κυριε P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⲛ A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892  
1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

και της γης P<sup>75</sup> ⲛ A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a  
b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit P<sup>45</sup>

ταυτα P<sup>75</sup> ⲛ A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b (e)  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] αυτα Ψ [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

σοφων και συνετων P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⲛ A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579  
892 1582 a (b) TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] συνετων και σοφων D; sapientibus (=σοφον) e

αυτα P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⲛ A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>; αυτοις 579

### Luke 10:29

τις εστιν πλησιον; (*Quis div.* 28.2) [Ad]

-----  
Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) Or Ath Did

-----  
πλησιον ] ο πλησιον 33; μου πλησιον P<sup>75</sup> ⲛ A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ  
Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 (a) (b) (e) TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

### Luke 10:30

αλλα ανωθεν καταβαινοντα απο Ιερουσαλημ αγει τω λογω τινα εις  
Ιεριχω και τουτον δεικνυσιν υπο ληστων συγκεκενητημενον,  
ερριμμενον ημιθνητα επι της οδου, + (*Quis div.* 28.3) [All]

-----  
Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) Or Ath Did

**Luke 10:31**

+ υπο ιερεως παροδευομενον, + (*Quis div.* 28.3) [All]

---

Lac. (Or) Ath Did

**Luke 10:32**

+ υπο Λευιτου παρορωμενον, + (*Quis div.* 28.3) [All]

---

Lac. (Or) Ath Did

**Luke 10:33**

+ υπο δε του Σαμαρειτου του εξωνειδισμενου και αφωρισμενου  
κατελευμενον, ος ουχι κατα τυχην ως εκεινοι παρηλθεν, + (*Quis  
div.* 28.3) [All]

---

Lac. (Or) Ath Did

**Luke 10:34**

+ αλλ ηκε συνεσκευασμενος ων ο κινδυνευων εδειτο, οινον, ελαιον  
επιδεσμους, κτηνος, + (*Quis div.* 28.3) [All]

---

Lac. (Or) Ath Did

**Luke 10:35**

+ μισθον τω πανδοχει, τον μεν ηδη διδομενον, τον δε  
προσυπισχνουμενον. + (*Quis div.* 28.3) [All]

---

Lac. Or Ath Did

**Luke 10:36**

+ τις (εφη) τουτων γεγονε πλησιον τω τα δεινα παθοντι; + (*Quis div.* 28.4) [All]<sup>103</sup>

---

Lac. Or Ath Did

**Luke 10:37**

του δε αποκριναμενου οτι ο τον ελεον προς αυτον επιδειξαμενος: και συ τοινυν πορευθεις ουτω ποιει (*Quis div.* 28.4) [All]<sup>104</sup>

---

Lac. Or Ath Did

**Luke 10:39–40**

οποιον τι και προς την Μαρθαν ειπεν ο σωτηρ ασχολουμενην περι πολλα και περιελκομενην και ταρασσομενην διακονικως, την δε αδελφην αιτιωμενην, οτι το υπηρετειν απολιπουσα τοις ποσιν αυτου παρακαθηται μαθητικην αγουσα σχολην; + (*Quis div.* 10.6) [All]

---

Lac. (33) Or Ath Did

**Luke 10:41**

συ περι πολλα ταρασση; + (*Quis div.* 10.6) [Ad]\*

---

Lac. (33) Or Ath Did

---

<sup>103</sup> The loose nature of this allusion makes it impossible to know for certain whether Clement's text follows most manuscripts with τις or the reading of τινα in D and e.

<sup>104</sup> While Clement's text reveals the following variant, the loose nature of his allusion makes it impossible to determine if the reading is of any genetic significance. Because of this uncertainty, the variant is not included in the apparatus or textual analysis.

και συ A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
και σοι P<sup>75</sup> 8; add και P<sup>45</sup>

περι πολλὰ P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit D a b e

**Luke 10:42**

+ Μαρια<sup>105</sup> δε την αγαθην μεριδα εξελεξατο, και ουκ αφαιρεθησεται  
αυτης (*Quis div.* 10.6) [Ad]<sup>\*106</sup>

---

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) (33) Or Ath Did

αυτης ⋈ B D L 579 (a) (b) (e) UBS<sup>4</sup>] απ αυτης P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A C E Δ Θ  
Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

-----  
την αγαθην μεριδα εξελεξατο P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup>  
33 892 1582 (a) (b) e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] καλην μεριδα εξελεξατο P<sup>45</sup>;  
εξελεξατο την αγαθην μεριδα 579

εξελεξατο P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582  
a e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] add sibi (=εαυτη) b

και ] ητις P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; η D [NA: a b e]

**Luke 11:40**

εναντιουνται δε και τω Χριστω προς τους Φαρισαιους ειρηκοτι τον  
αυτον θεον και τον εκτος ημων και τον εσω ανθρωπον  
πεποιηκεναι (*Strom.* 3.34.2) [All]

---

Lac. Or Ath Did

---

<sup>105</sup> The following variant in Luke 10:42 is of no significance to the textual analysis.  
Μαρια ⋈ A C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>13</sup> 892 TR] Μαριαμ P<sup>75</sup> B f<sup>1</sup> 579 1582  
UBS<sup>4</sup>[NA: a b e; Lac. P<sup>45</sup> 33]

<sup>106</sup> While the textual tradition of Luke 10:42 is divided over the inclusion of δε (A C E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> 579 1582 TR) or γαρ (P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ B L Ψ f<sup>1</sup> UBS<sup>4</sup>), Clement's adaptation is too loose to take it as a certain indication of his text. Though his reference does occur within a longer reference, it is not part of a continuous citation. In addition, Clement's addition of the conjunction και later in the verse indicates a lack of precision with the conjunctions within the reference.

**Luke 11:43**

ουαι υμιν, Φαρισαιοι, (λεγων) οτι αγαπατε την πρωτοκαθεδριαν εν  
ταις συναγωγαις και τους ασπασμους εν ταις αγοραις (*Paed.*  
3.93.2) [C]

Lac. Or Ath Did

Φαρισαιοι & D] τοις Φαρισαιοις P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup>  
f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [NA: a b e]

συναγωγαις P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> & A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 579 892 1582  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] add και την πρωτοκλησιαν εν τοις δειπνοις f<sup>13</sup>

**Luke 12:8**

(ο κυριος ειρηκεν) λεγω δε υμιν, πας ος εαν ομολογηση εν εμοι  
εμπροσθεν των ανθρωπων, και ο υιος του ανθρωπου  
ομολογησει εν αυτω εμπροσθεν των αγγελων του θεου + (*Strom.*  
4.70.1) [C]<sup>107</sup>

Lac. C Ath (Did)

δε P<sup>75</sup> & A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Or] omit P<sup>45</sup> a b [Lac. Did]

υμιν P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] add οτι & D [Lac. Did]

ομολογηση P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> & E L Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or  
Did] ομολογησει A B D Δ f<sup>13</sup> (579) [NA: a b e]

<sup>107</sup> The following variants form Luke 12:8 are of no significance for determining Clement's textual affinities. The first variant concerns the inconsistent use of the particles αν and εαν in Greek, while the second is simply a case of itacism.

εαν Θ Ψ 579 Did<sup>pt</sup>] αν P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> & A B D E L Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did<sup>pt</sup> [NA: a b e]

ομολογηση P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> & E L Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did]  
ομολογησει A B D Δ f<sup>13</sup> (579) [NA: a b e]

εν αυτω P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Or] αυτον P<sup>45</sup> (a) (b) (c); εαυτον f<sup>13</sup> (a) (b) (c) [Lac. Did]

-----  
εν εμοι... ομολογησει P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892  
1582 a b (c) TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did] omit 579<sup>108</sup>

ομολογησει P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b c  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] ομολογηση Ω; omit 579 [Lac. Did]

των αγγελων P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ<sup>c</sup> A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a  
b c TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] omit Ⲱ<sup>\*</sup> [Lac. Did]

### Luke 12:9

+ τον δε αρνησαμενον με ενωπιον των ανθρωπων απαρνησομαι  
αυτον εμπροσθεν των αγγελων (*Strom.* 4.70.1) [Ad]<sup>\*</sup>

Lac. C Ath Did

omit *in toto* P<sup>45</sup> e

ενωπιον P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ B E L Δ Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or]  
εμπροσθεν A (D) Θ Π 892 [NA: a b]

εμπροσθεν (D)] ενωπιον P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579  
892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or [NA: a b]

-----  
απαρνησομαι αυτον ] απαρνηθησεται P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ<sup>c</sup> A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω  
f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or; απαρνησεται Ⲱ<sup>\*</sup>;  
αρνηθησεται D; negabo et ego eum (=αρνησομαι καγω αυτον ) b

των αγγελων P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] patre meo qui est in caelis (=του πατρος μου του εν  
ουρανοις) b

<sup>108</sup> This omission appears to be due to a homocoteleuton.

**Luke 12:11**

οταν δε φερωσιν υμας εις τας συναγωγας και τας αρχας και τας  
 εξουσιας, μη προμεριμνατε πως απολογηθητε η τι ειπητε: +  
 (*Strom.* 4.70.4) [C]

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) C Ath Did

φερωσιν D (b) Or] εισφερωσιν P<sup>45</sup> **Σ** B L f<sup>1</sup> 33 579 892 1582 (e)  
 UBS<sup>4</sup>; προσφερωσιν A Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>13</sup> (a) TR; προσφερουσιν E  
 (a); εις εισφερωσιν P<sup>75</sup>

εις **Σ** D f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 1582 b e] επι P<sup>75</sup> A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω 33 892 a  
 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

προμεριμνατε / προσμεριμνατε<sup>109</sup> D] μεριμνατε A E Δ Π Ω TR;  
 μεριμνησητε P<sup>75</sup> **Σ** B L Θ Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 UBS<sup>4</sup> Or [NA: a  
 b e; Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

πως D a b e] add η τι P<sup>75</sup> **Σ** A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892  
 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

τας συναγωγας και τας αρχας P<sup>75</sup> **Σ** A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup>  
 33 579 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] τας αρχας και τας  
 συναγωγας P<sup>45</sup>

εξουσιας P<sup>45</sup> **Σ** A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e  
 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] add μη μεριμνη P<sup>75</sup>

**Luke 12:12**

+ το γαρ αγιον πνευμα διδαξει υμας εν αυτη τη ωρα τι δει ειπειν  
 (*Strom.* 4.70.4) [Ad]<sup>\*110</sup>

<sup>109</sup> προμεριμνατε is grouped with προσμεριμνατε, since both affix a similar preposition to μεριμνατε and because Clement's text agrees with D in every other variant in the verse.

<sup>110</sup> Since the following variant from Luke 12:12 is most likely the result of itacism, it is not included in the apparatus.

διδαξει P<sup>75</sup> **Σ** B D E Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] διδαξη  
 A L Θ [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]



Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) C Ath Did

το γαρ αγιον πνευμα P<sup>45vid</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33  
579 892 1582 a TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] spiritus enim sanctus (=το γαρ  
πνευμα το αγιον) b e

-----  
διδαξει P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] docet (=διδασκει) e [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

τι ] α P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

#### Luke 12:15

(κατα λειψιν) φυλασσεσθε (τοινυν) απο πασης πλεονεξιας, οτι ουκ εν  
τω περισσευειν τινι τα υπαρχοντα εστιν η ζωη αυτου (*Strom.*  
4.34.3) [Ad]\*

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (33) Or Ath Did

πασης P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D L Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e UBS<sup>4</sup>] της  
E Δ TR

αυτου P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B L Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] αυτω  
E Ω f<sup>1</sup> 1582; omit D

-----  
ουκ P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Δ Θ Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] add εστιν Π

τα υπαρχοντα εστιν η ζωη<sup>111</sup>] η ζωη αυτου εστιν P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B E Δ Θ  
Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 (a) (b) (c) TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; ζωη αυτου εστιν L  
(a) (b) (c); εστιν η ζωη D; η ζωη αυτου Π

<sup>111</sup> While Clement's reading εστιν η ζωη has similarities with Codex Bezae, the larger context of the entire verse clearly shows that the agreement is accidental.

**Luke 12:16–18**

σαφως δε ο κυριος εν τω ευαγγελιω τον πλουσιον τον θησαυριζοντα  
εις τας αποθηκας και προς εαυτον λεγοντα: + (*Paed.* 2.125.2)  
[All]

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) C (33) (Or) Ath (Did)

**Luke 12:18**

τουτου την χωραν ευφορησαι λεγει εν τω ευαγγελιω ο κυριος, επειτα  
τους καρπους αποθεσθαι βουληθεντα, οικοδομησομενον  
αποθηκας μειζονας κατα την προσωποποιαν ειπειν προς  
εαυτον: + (*Strom.* 3.56.3) [All]

Lac. C (33) (Or) Ath (Did)

**Luke 12:19**

εχεις αγαθα πολλα αποκειμενα εις ετη πολλα: φαγε, πιε, ευφραινου  
+ (*Paed.* 2.125.2) [Ad]\*

+ εχεις αγαθα πολλα αποκειμενα σοι εις ετη πολλα: φαγε, πιε,  
ευφραινου + (*Strom.* 3.56.3) [Ad]\*

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) C (33) Ath (Did)

αποκειμενα<sup>112</sup> / κειμενα P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892  
1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or; omit D a b e [Lac. P<sup>45</sup> Did]

εις ... πιε P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did] omit D a b e [Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>)]

\*\*\*\*\*

αγαθα πολλα Did] πολλα αγαθα P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup>  
f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; omit πολλα Or [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

<sup>112</sup> αποκειμενα is grouped with κειμενα, since Clement's reading clearly stands in opposition to the omission of κειμενα in the Western tradition.

**Luke 12:20**

+ αφρονα (κεκληκεν) ταυτη γαρ τη νυκτι την ψυχην σου  
 παραλαμβανουσιν: α ουν ητοιμασας, τινος γενηται; (*Paed.*  
 2.125.2) [Ad]

+ αφρον (ουν εφη) ταυτη γαρ τη νυκτι την ψυχην σου απαιτουσιν απο  
 σου: α ουν ητοιμασας, τινι γενηται; (*Strom.* 3.56.3) [C]

αφρον γαρ (ουτως εφη) οτι τη νυκτι ταυτη απαιτουσι σου την ψυχην:  
 α δε ητοιμασας αυτη, τινι γενηται; (*Strom.* 4.34.2) [Ad]<sup>\*113</sup>

TEXT: ... αφρον,<sup>114</sup> ταυτη τη νυκτι την ψυχην σου απαιτουσιν απο  
 σου: α [ουν / δε] ητοιμασας, τινι γενηται;

---

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) (33) C (Or) (Ath) (Did)

απαιτουσιν **Σ A D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω** f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 a<sup>vid</sup> b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
 Or Did<sup>pt</sup>; αφαιρουσιν Did<sup>pt</sup> e; αιτουσιν P<sup>75</sup> B L 33 579; αιρουσιν  
 Did<sup>pt</sup> [Lac. P<sup>45</sup> Ath]

την ψυχην σου απαιτουσιν P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> **Σ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω** f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33  
 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did<sup>pt</sup>] απαιτουσιν την ψυχην σου D  
 579 Did<sup>pt</sup> [Lac. Ath]

ουν D a e] δε Clem<sup>pt</sup> P<sup>75</sup> **Σ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω** f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892  
 1582 b TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Ath Did [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

τινος D a b e] τινι Clem<sup>pt</sup> P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> **Σ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω** f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579  
 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Ath Did [Lac. 33]

---

<sup>113</sup> While the first half of this verse has some affinity to the reading in Codex D, the looseness of the adaptation, in contrast to the citation in the previous reading, makes its impossible to use this reading as the sole basis for an accurate reconstruction of Clement's text.

<sup>114</sup> Although Brogan includes the following variant from Luke 12:20 in his apparatus, it is not included here, since it is likely the result of itacism and does not appear to be genetically significant. In his study of Didymus, Ehrman also does not count this spelling difference as significant.

αφρον Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> 892 1582 Or Ath] αφρων P<sup>75</sup> **Σ A B D E L Δ Θ Ψ** f<sup>13</sup> 579 a b  
 e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did [Lac. P<sup>45</sup> 33]

-----  
 ταυτη P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ A B D E L Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e  
 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Ath Did] ταυτα Δ

γενηται ] εσται P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582  
 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Ath Did [Lac. 33]

### Luke 12:22

μη μεριμνατε (λεγων) τη ψυχη υμων τι φαγητε, μηδε τω σωματι υμων  
 τι ενδυσησθε + (*Paed.* 2.102.3) [C]<sup>115</sup>

δια τουτο λεγω, μη μεριμνατε τη ψυχη υμων τι φαγητε, μηδε τω  
 σωματι τι περιβαλητε + (*Strom.* 4.34.5) [Ad]<sup>\*116</sup>

TEXT: δια τουτο λεγω, μη μεριμνατε τη ψυχη υμων τι φαγητε,  
 μηδε τω σωματι [υμων / omit] τι ενδυσησθε

---

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) (33) C Or Ath Did

υμων<sup>1</sup> P<sup>45</sup> E Δ Ψ Ω <sup>117</sup>f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a e TR] omit P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ A B D L  
 Θ Π b UBS<sup>4</sup>; ημων 579<sup>118</sup>

υμων<sup>2</sup> B <sup>119</sup>f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582 a] omit Clem<sup>pt</sup> P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ A D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ  
 Ω 579 892 b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>115</sup> Though indeterminable by itself, this citation is most surely taken from Luke 12:22 rather than Matt 6:25, since it is immediately followed by distinct references to the text of Luke 12:23–31.

<sup>116</sup> The immediate connection of this verse to Luke 12:23 indicates it is taken from Luke 12:22 rather than Matt 6:25.

<sup>117</sup> A comparison of Lake's edition of f<sup>1</sup> with the collations by Swanson and the IGNTP on Luke indicates Lake's omission of υμων is inaccurate (see n. 119 below).

<sup>118</sup> Alfred Schmidtke's text of 579 reads υμων instead of ημων. While von Soden supports Schmidtke's reading, I have chosen to follow the reading of ημων supported by Swanson's collation and the IGNTP volume on Luke. Swanson's work has been highly reliable elsewhere in this study, so I assume that Schmidtke's text is mistaken.

<sup>119</sup> A comparison of Lake's edition of f<sup>1</sup> with the collations by Swanson and the IGNTP on Luke indicates Lake's omission of υμων is also inaccurate here (see n. 117 above).

λεγω ] add υμιν P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ B D L f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 UBS<sup>4</sup>; υμιν λεγω A E Δ Θ  
Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 1582 a b e TR [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

**Luke 12:23**

+ η γαρ ψυχη πλειων εστι της τροφης και το σωμα του ενδυματος +  
(*Paed.* 2.102.3) [C]<sup>120</sup>

+ η γαρ ψυχη πλειων εστι της τροφης και το σωμα του ενδυματος  
(*Strom.* 4.34.5) [C]<sup>121</sup>

---

Lac. C (33) Or Ath Did

γαρ P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ B D L Θ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 b e UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit P<sup>45</sup> A  
E Δ Π Ψ a TR<sup>122</sup>

σωμα P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] add plus (=πλειων) a b [Lac. 33]

**Luke 12:24**

+ κατανοησατε τους κορακας, οτι ου σπειρουσιν ουδε θεριζουσιν, οis  
ουκ εστι ταμειον και αποθηκη,<sup>123</sup> και ο θεος τρεφει αυτους. ουχ  
υμεις<sup>124</sup> διαφερετε των πτηνων; (*Paed.* 2.102.4) [C]

---

Lac. C (33) (a) Or Ath Did

---

<sup>120</sup> The absence of the negative particle ουχι from Matt 6:25 and the distinct references to the text of Luke 12:24–31 that follows this citation indicates it refers to Luke 12:23 rather than to Matt 6:25.

<sup>121</sup> The absence of the negative particle ουχι from Matt 6:25 indicates this reference is most probably to Luke 12:23 rather than to Matt 6:25.

<sup>122</sup> This γαρ was most likely part of Clement's text, since he cites this verse in exactly the same way twice.

<sup>123</sup> The distinction between the singular and plural number of αποθηκη in the following variant is of no textual significance for determining Clement's text.

αποθηκη P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] αποθηκαι P<sup>45</sup> (e)

<sup>124</sup> Marcovich adds μαλλον on the basis of the New Testament.

κατανοήσατε P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] add τα πετεινα του ουρανου P<sup>45</sup> D e

τους κορακας P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit D e; και τους κορακας P<sup>45</sup>

ου P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> A B E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] ουτε Ⲱ D  
L 579 892 e

ουδε P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> A B E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] ουτε Ⲱ D L  
579 892 [NA: a b e; Lac. 33]

αυτους P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 579 892 1582 b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] αυτα P<sup>45</sup> D f<sup>13</sup> [Lac. 33 a]

ουχ / ουχι υμεις διαφερετε D b e] ποσω μαλλον υμεις διαφερετε  
P<sup>45</sup> Ⲱ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; ποσω μαλλον  
διαφερετε υμεις 892; ποσω μαλλον διαφερετε P<sup>75</sup> [Lac. 33 a]

-----  
εστι P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] add ουτε D

και<sup>1</sup>] ουτε D (a) (b) (e); ουδε P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33  
579 892 1582 (a) (b) (e) TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

και ο P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] ο δε f<sup>13</sup>

### Luke 12:27

κατανοήσατε (λεγων) τα κρινα πως ουτε νηθει ουτε υφαινει: λεγω δε  
υμιν οτι ουδε Σολομων περιεβαλετο ως εν τούτων (*Paed.* 2.102.5) [C]

---

Lac. C Or Ath Did

κρινα P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] add agri (=του αγρου) a b e<sup>125</sup>

---

<sup>125</sup> The Old Latin appears to represent a harmonization with the parallel passage in Matt 6:28.

πως ουτε νηθει ουτε υφαινει D] πως αυξανει ου κοπια ουδε νηθει  
P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; πως  
αυξανουσιν ου κοπιωσιν ουδε νηθουσιν 579; quomodo non  
texunt neque neunt (=πως ουχ υφαινουσιν ουδε νηθουσιν) a;  
quomodo crescunt non laborant neque neunt neque texunt  
(=πως αυξανουσιν ου κοπιωσιν ουτε νηθουσιν ουτε υφαινουσιν)  
b; quomodo crescunt et florescunt neque laborant neque neunt  
(=πως αυξανουσιν και ανθει ουτε κοπιωσιν ουτε νηθουσιν) c

δε P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit P<sup>45</sup> a

οτι ⳑ A D L Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 b e] omit P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> B E Δ Θ Π Ω  
579 a TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

περιβαλετο P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ A B D L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a e  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] περιβαλλετο E 579 b<sup>126</sup>

-----  
Σολομων ] add εν παση τη δοξη αυτου P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ  
Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a<sup>vid</sup> e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; add εν τη δοξη αυτου P<sup>45</sup>;  
in omni illa gloria sua (=εν παση εκεινη τη δοξη αυτου) b

### Luke 12:28

ει δε τον χορτον σημερον εν αγρω<sup>127</sup> οντα και αυριον εις κλιβανον  
βαλλομενον ο θεος ουτως αμφιεννυσι, ποσω μαλλον υμας,  
ολιγοπιστοι + (*Paed.* 2.103.1) [C]<sup>128</sup>

Lac. C Or Ath Did

<sup>126</sup> Alfred Schmidtke's text of 579 reads περιβαλετο instead of περιβαλλετο. Since Swanson's collation, von Soden, and the IGNTP volume on Luke support the reading of περιβαλλετο, I assume Schmidtke's reading is mistaken.

<sup>127</sup> Marcovich transposes the phrase σημερον εν αγρω to εν αγρω σημερον without textual precedence.

<sup>128</sup> Though his reference closely resembles Matt 6:30, it is more likely a reference to Luke 12:28, since it is immediately preceded and followed by distinct references to Luke 12:23–31.

τον χορτον ... οντα Α Θ Ψ f<sup>13</sup> 33] τον χορτον σημερον εν τω  
 αγρω οντα Π f<sup>1</sup> 1582; τον χορτον εν τω αγρω σημερον οντα Ε Δ  
 Ω TR; εν αγρω τον χορτον οντα σημερον P<sup>75</sup> Ξ Β L 892 UBS<sup>4</sup>; εν  
 αγρω σημερον τον χορτον οντα P<sup>45</sup>; τον χορτον του αγρου  
 σημερον οντα D; εν αγρω τον οντα σημερον 579; faenum  
 quomodo hodie in agro (=τον χορτον πως σημερον εν τω αγρω) b;  
 faenum agri quod est hodie (=τον χορτον του αγρου ο εστιν  
 σημερον) c [Lac. a]

αμφιεννυσι Ξ Α Ε Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 TR] αμφιζει P<sup>45</sup>  
 P<sup>75</sup> Β D L 892 UBS<sup>4</sup> [NA: a b e]

-----  
 ει δε P<sup>45</sup> Ξ Α Β Δ Ε L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 (a) TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup>] ει τε P<sup>75</sup>; aut videte (= η ιδε) b; si enim (=ει γαρ) e

βαλλομενον P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ξ Α Β Δ Ε L Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a  
 b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] βαλομενον Θ

ποσω P<sup>75</sup> Ξ Α Β Δ Ε L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup>] add ουν P<sup>45</sup>; πολλω 579

υμας P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ξ Α Β Δ Ε L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
 υμεις 579<sup>129</sup> [NA: a b e]

### Luke 12:29

+ και υμεις μη ζητειτε τι φαγητε η τι πιητε<sup>130</sup> (*Paed.* 2.103.1) [C]

μη (γαρ) ζητειτε τι φαγητε η τι πιητε (ειπων επηγαγεν) και μη  
 μετεωριζεσθε (*Paed.* 2.103.3) [C]

(σημαινεται γαρ εκ της γραφης τουτο:) μη μεριμνατε ποια φαγητε η  
 πιητε· (*Paed.* 2.103.2) [Ad]<sup>\*131</sup>

<sup>129</sup> Alfred Schmidtke's text of 579 reads υμας instead of υμεις. Since both Swanson's collation and von Soden support the reading of υμεις, I have chosen to follow their reading and to assume that Schmidtke's reading is mistaken again.

<sup>130</sup> Clement's text reveals the following variant in Luke 12:29. Since the variant is most likely the result of itacism, it is not included in the apparatus. πιητε rel] πιετε Ψ

<sup>131</sup> Clement appears to be reflecting on the general meaning of Luke 12:29, a passage that he just cited.



Lac. C Or Ath Did

η P<sup>75</sup> A D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 a b TR] και P<sup>45</sup> Ⲛ B L 33 579  
892 e UBS<sup>4</sup>

-----  
μη<sup>1</sup> P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲛ<sup>c</sup> A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit Ⲛ<sup>\*</sup> [NA: a b e]

φαγητε P<sup>45</sup> Ⲛ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] φαγησθε P<sup>75</sup>; omit f<sup>13</sup>

πιητε P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲛ<sup>c</sup> A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] add μηδε τω σωματι Ⲛ<sup>\*</sup>

**Luke 12:30**<sup>132</sup>

ταυτα δε παντα τα εθνη του κοσμου ζητει (*Paed.* 2.103.4) [C]<sup>133</sup>

οιδε (φησιν) ο πατηρ υμων οτι χρηζετε<sup>134</sup> (*Paed.* 2.103.4) [C]

Lac. C Or Ath Did

του κοσμου P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲛ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit Ψ 579<sup>135</sup>; huius mundi (=τουτου του κοσμου) b e;  
saeculi (=του αιωνος) a

ζητει D a b] επιζητει P<sup>45</sup> A E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 892 1582 TR;  
επιζητουσιν P<sup>75</sup> Ⲛ B L f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 UBS<sup>4</sup>; faciunt (=ποiei) e

οιδε (γαρ) ο πατηρ υμων D a (b) e] υμων δε ο πατηρ οιδεν P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup>  
Ⲛ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

<sup>132</sup> The context indicates this passage refers to Luke 12:30 rather than Matt 6:32.

<sup>133</sup> Marcovich replaces δε with γαρ based solely on the New Testament.

<sup>134</sup> Marcovich adds τουτων based solely on the New Testament.

<sup>135</sup> A comparison of the collation of Alfred Schmidtke and Reuben Swanson reveals a disagreement on this reading. Schmidtke's text reads επιζητουσιν, while Swanson has επιζητει του κοσμου. Since von Soden and the IGNTP volume on Luke support Schmidtke's reading, I assume that Swanson's reading is most likely a mistake this time. Schmidtke's reading is followed here and in the following variant.

-----  
 ταυτα (γαρ) παντα P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⳨ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892  
 a e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] παντα γαρ παντα f<sup>1</sup> 1582; omit παντα b

χρηζετε P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⳨ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b  
 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] necessaria sunt (=αναγκαια εστιν) e

### Luke 12:31

ζητειτε γαρ (φησι) την βασιλειαν του θεου, και τα της τροφης  
 προστεθησεται υμιν (*Paed.* 2.103.5) [Ad]<sup>\*136</sup>

Lac. C Or Ath Did

ζητειτε D a] πλην ζητειτε P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⳨ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 579  
 892 1582 b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; πλην ζητειτε πρωτον f<sup>13</sup>

του θεου P<sup>45</sup> A E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582 b e TR] αυτου ⳨ B D L  
 Ψ 579 892 a UBS<sup>4</sup>; omit P<sup>75</sup>

-----  
 τα της τροφης ] ταυτα P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⳨<sup>\*</sup> B E L Ω 1582 892 a e UBS<sup>4</sup>; ταυτα  
 παντα ⳨<sup>c</sup> A D Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 b TR; αυτα Δ

### Luke 12:32

μη φοβεισθε, το μικρον ποιμνιον: υμιν γαρ ευδοκησεν ο πατηρ  
 παραδουναι την βασιλειαν των ουρανων (*Quis div.* 31.2) [Ad]

Lac. C Or Ath Did

-----  
 παραδουναι ] δουναι P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⳨ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579  
 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; του δουναι Ω [NA: a b e]

βασιλειαν των ουρανων ] βασιλειαν P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⳨ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ  
 Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

<sup>136</sup> The context and the absence of any reference to δικαιοσυνη indicate this is a reference to Luke 12:31 rather than Matt 6:33.

**Luke 12:33**

βαλλαντιον μη παλαιουμενον ... θησαυρος ανεκλειπτος εν ουρανω  
(*Strom.* 4.33.7) [Ad]

σοφιας δε θησαυροι ανεκλειπτοι (*Paed.* 3.87.3) [All]

---

Lac. C Or (Ath) Did

**Luke 12:35**

εστωσαν γαρ (φησιν) υμων αι οσφυες περιεζωσμεναι και οι λυχνοι  
καιομενοι + (*Paed.* 2.79.1) [C]

---

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) C Or Ath Did

υμων αι οσφυες P<sup>75</sup> **Ⲱ** E L Δ Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
αι οσφυες υμων A Θ Π a b e; υμων αι οσφυαις B; υμων η οσφυς  
D [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

-----  
εστωσαν P<sup>45vid</sup> P<sup>75</sup> **Ⲱ** A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b  
e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] εστω D

λυχνοι P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> **Ⲱ** A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] λυχλοι D

καιομενοι P<sup>45vid</sup> P<sup>75</sup> **Ⲱ** A B D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] οι καιομενοι L [NA: a b e]

**Luke 12:36**

+ και υμεις ομοιοι ανθρωποις προσδεχομενοις τον κυριον αυτων,  
ποτε αναλυσει<sup>137</sup> εκ των γαμων, ινα ελθοντος και κρουσαντος  
ανοιξωσιν ευθεως αυτω. + (*Paed.* 2.79.1) [C]

---

<sup>137</sup> Here the manuscript tradition of Clement also reads αναλυση in F.

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) C Or Ath Did

αυτων D Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582] εαυτων P<sup>45vid</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B E L Δ Θ  
Π Ψ TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [NA: a b e]

αναλυσει Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579<sup>1</sup> 892 1582 TR] αναλυση Clem<sup>pt</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D  
E L Δ Θ Π Ω 33 a b UBS<sup>4</sup>; venit (=ερχεται) e [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

ινα P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 b TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] et (=και) a e

-----  
γαμων P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] add αυτων f<sup>1</sup>

κρουσαντος P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] add αυτου A [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

ανοιξωσιν ευθεως ] ευθεως ανοιξωσιν P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω  
f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; ευθεως ανοιξουσιν D [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

### Luke 12:37

+ μακαριοι οι δουλοι εκεινοι, ους ελθων ο κυριος εγρηγοροτας ευρη  
(*Paed.* 2.79.1) [C]

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) C (a) Or Ath Did

ελθων ο κυριος P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] ο κυριος ελθων L Ψ 33 892 [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

ευρη D] ευρησει P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [NA: a b e; Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

-----  
οι P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
omit Δ [NA: a b e]

εγρηγοροτας ] γρηγορουτας P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33  
579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [NA: a b e; Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

**Luke 12:48**

ὦ πλείον ἐδοθη, οὗτος καὶ ἀπαιτηθήσεται (*Strom.* 2.147.4) [All]<sup>138</sup>

---

Lac. C a Or Ath Did

-----  
 ἐδοθη P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 b e TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup>] ἐδωκαν D

**Luke 12:49**

πυρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν (*Ecl.* 26.5) [C]

---

Lac. C a (Or) Ath

ἐπὶ P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B L Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did] εἰς  
 P<sup>45</sup> D E Δ Ω b e TR

**Luke 12:58**

μετὰ τοῦ ἀντιδικοῦ βαδίζων φίλος αὐτοῦ πειραθῆτι ἀπαλλαγῆναι<sup>139</sup>  
 (φησιν) (*Strom.* 3.36.1) [All]

---

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) C a Or Ath Did

---

<sup>138</sup> Clement's allusion to Luke 12:48 shares strong similarities to that of Justin reference to the same passage in *Apol.* 17.4. As Bellinzoni notes, this might suggest that the two were dependent on a common source, perhaps some "post-synoptic harmony of Luke 12:48a and 12:48b" (Bellinzoni, *Sayings of Jesus*, 75). Even if this were the case, it would shine no light on Clement's textual affinities, since his reading is not supported in the manuscript traditions of this passage.

<sup>139</sup> Clement's allusion reveals the following variant. Due to the loose nature of Clement's allusion, it is impossible to determine if his use of ἀπαλλαγῆναι shares any genetic significance with the similar reading in Codex Beza.

ἀπαλλαγῆναι D] ἀπηλλαχθαι P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ B E L Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; ἀπαλλαχθαι A Δ [NA: b e]

**Luke 13:32**

υπαγετε, ειπατε τη αλωπεκι ταυτη, ιδου, εκβαλλω δαιμονια και  
ιασεις αποτελω σημερον και αυριον, και τη τριτη τελειουμαι  
(*Strom.* 4.31.3) [C]

---

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) C (33) Or Ath (Did)

αποτελω P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ B L 33 UBS<sup>4</sup>] επιτελω A E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579  
892 1582 TR; αποτελουμαι D; ποιουμαι και P<sup>45</sup> [NA: a b e; Lac. Did]

τη τριτη P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
add ημερα B b e; die tertia (=τη ημερα τριτη) a [Lac. P<sup>45</sup> 33 Did]

-----  
ταυτη P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Did] illi (=εκεινη) b [Lac. 33]

εκβαλλω P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] εκβαλω Θ [Lac. P<sup>45</sup> 33 Did]

δαιμονια P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
τα δαιμονια L [NA: a b e; Lac. P<sup>45</sup> 33 Did]

τελειουμαι P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 a b TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] consummabor (=τελειωθησομαι) e; omit 579 [Lac. P<sup>45</sup> 33 Did]

**Luke 14:8**

οταν κληθης εις γαμους, μη κατακεισο εις την πρωτοκλισιαν (*Paed.*  
2.4.5) [Ad]<sup>\*</sup>

---

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) C (33) Or Ath Did

κληθης D] add υπο τινος P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579  
892 1582 b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; invitatus fuerit aliquis (=κληθη τις) a;  
invitati fueritis (=κληθητε) e [Lac. 33]

εις γαμους Ⲱ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit P<sup>75</sup> b; εις γαμον D [Lac. P<sup>45</sup> 33]

**Luke 14:10**

ἀλλ' ὅταν κληθῇς, εἰς τὸν ἐσχάτον τόπον ἀνατίπτε (*Paed.* 2.4.5) [Ad]

---

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) (33) C Or Ath Did

κληθῇς εἰς ... ἀνατίπτε D] κληθῇς πορευθεὶς ἀναπέσε<sup>140</sup> εἰς τὸν  
ἐσχάτον τόπον P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 1582 a b UBS<sup>4</sup>;  
κληθῇς πορευθεὶς ἀναπέσον εἰς τὸν ἐσχάτον τόπον 892 TR;  
invitatus fueris in nuptias in novissimum locum recumbe (=κληθῇς  
εἰς γάμους εἰς τὸν ἐσχάτον τόπον ἀνατίπτε) e [Lac. P<sup>45</sup> 33]

**Luke 14:12**

(πῇ δε-) ὅταν ποιῇς ἀριστον ἢ δειπνον + (*Paed.* 2.4.5) [C]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (33) Or Ath Did

-----  
ἢ P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] et  
(=καὶ) a [Lac. 33]

**Luke 14:13**

+ (καὶ παλιν:) ἀλλ' ὅταν ποιῇς δοχὴν, καλεῖ τοὺς πτωχοὺς (*Paed.*  
2.4.5) [C]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (33) Or Ath Did

ποιῇς δοχὴν A D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 TR] δοχὴν ποιῇς B  
579 892 UBS<sup>4</sup>; δοχὴν ποιήσης P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ; facies prandium (=ποιήσεις  
ἀριστον?) a; facis convivium (=ποιεῖς δοχὴν) b; feceris  
prandium (=ποίησης ἀριστον?) e [Lac. 33]

-----

---

<sup>140</sup> Clement's text reveals the following variant in Luke 14:10. Since the variant is most likely the result of itacism, the distinction is not included in the apparatus.

ἀναπέσε P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 UBS<sup>4</sup>] ἀναπέσαι L Δ

τους ] omit P<sup>75</sup> ⲛ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup> [NA: a b e; Lac. 33]

**Luke 14:15**

μακαριος ος φαγεται αρτον εν τη βασιλεια του θεου (*Paed.* 2.5.3)  
 [C]<sup>141</sup>

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (33) Or Ath Did

μακαριος ος A D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω 892 a b e TR] μακαριος οστις P<sup>75</sup>  
 ⲛ B L f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 1582 UBS<sup>4</sup>; omit ⲛ\* [Lac. 33]

αρτον P<sup>75</sup> ⲛ<sup>c</sup> B D L Δ Θ Ψ f<sup>1</sup> 579 892 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] αριστον A E  
 Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> 1582; omit ⲛ [Lac. 33]

-----  
 φαγεται P<sup>75</sup> ⲛ<sup>c</sup> A B D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b e TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup>] φαγε L; omit ⲛ\* [Lac. 33]

του θεου P<sup>75</sup> ⲛ<sup>c</sup> A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup>] των ουρανων 579; omit ⲛ

**Luke 14:16**

ανθρωπος τις εποιησεν δειπνον μεγα και εκαλεσεν πολλους (*Paed.*  
 2.4.5) [C]

TEXT: ανθρωπος τις εποιησεν δειπνον μεγα και εκαλεσεν πολλους

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (33) (Or) Ath Did

εποιησεν A D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b e TR Or]  
 εποιει P<sup>75</sup> ⲛ B f<sup>1</sup> UBS<sup>4</sup> [Lac. 33]

---

<sup>141</sup> Clement's text reveals the following variant in Luke 14:15. Since the variant is most likely the result of itacism, it is not included in the apparatus.

φαγεται P<sup>75</sup> ⲛ<sup>c</sup> A B E Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] φαγετε D Θ;  
 omit ⲛ\* [Lac. 33]



-----  
 μεγα P<sup>75</sup> ⲛ A B (D) E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> (579) 892 1582 a b TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup> Or ] omit e [Lac. 33]

**Luke 14:20**

γυναικα εγημα και ου δυναμαι ελθειν (*Strom.* 3.90.4) [C]

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) C (33) (Or) Ath Did

και a b e] add δια τουτο P<sup>75</sup> ⲛ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892  
 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; διο D [Lac. P<sup>45</sup> Or]

-----  
 εγημα P<sup>75</sup> ⲛ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 (a) (b) (e) TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] ηγαμηκα P<sup>45vid</sup> (a) (b) (e); ελαβον D [Lac. 33]

**Luke 14:26**

ος δ αν μη μισηση (φασι) πατερα η μητερα η γυναικα η τεκνα, εμος  
 ειναι μαθητης ου δυναται (*Strom.* 3.97.2) [Ad]\*

ος ου μισει πατερα και μητερα και παιδας, προσετι δε και την εαυτου  
 ψυχην, εμος μαθητης ειναι ου δυναται (*Quis div.* 22.2) [Ad]\*

εαν μη μισησητε τον πατερα και την μητερα, προς ετι δε και την ιδιαν  
 ψυχην + (*Strom.* 7.79.5) [All]\*

Lac. C (33) (Or) Ath (Did)

πατερα 579 e Or] add εαυτου P<sup>75</sup> B L Ψ 892 (a) (b) TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
 Did<sup>pt</sup>; add αυτου P<sup>45</sup> ⲛ A D E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 (a) (b) Did<sup>pt</sup>  
 [Lac. 33]

ετι δε και P<sup>45</sup> ⲛ A D E Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 1582 TR Did] ετι τε και  
 B L Δ 33 892 UBS<sup>4</sup>; ετι και P<sup>75</sup> a b e [Lac. Or]

εαυτου ψυχην P<sup>45</sup> A D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR Did]  
 ψυχην εαυτου P<sup>75</sup> ⲛ B 579 a b e UBS<sup>4</sup> [Lac. Or]

(μου) ειναι μαθητης P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Π Ψ f<sup>13</sup> Did<sup>pe</sup>] (μου) μαθητης ειναι  
Clem<sup>pe</sup> A D E Δ Θ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 1582 a b TR Or; ειναι μου μαθητης ⋈ B L  
579 892 UBS<sup>4</sup> Did<sup>pe</sup>; μαθητης μου ειναι e [Lac. 33]

-----  
μητερα P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] add αυτου D Did

**Luke 14:27**

+ και εαν μη το σημειον βαστασητε (*Strom.* 7.79.5) [All]

το σημειον δε βαστασαι (*Strom.* 7.79.7) [All]

-----  
Lac. C (33) Or Ath Did

**Luke 14:33**

ετι ζωντα πασιν αποταξαμενον (*Strom.* 7.79.7) [All]

το ουν αποταξασθαι πασι τοις υπαρχουσι (*Quis div.* 14.6) [All]\*

-----  
Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) C (33) Or Ath Did

τοις υπαρχουσι D Π 579 a b e] τοις εαυτου υπαρχουσιν P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A  
B E L Δ Θ Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [Lac. P<sup>45</sup> 33]

-----  
πασι P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit D [Lac. P<sup>45</sup> 33]

**Luke 15:4**

ο το απολωλος επιζητων (*Strom.* 1.169.2) [All]

-----  
Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (33) Or Ath Did

**Luke 15:11–14**

ου χρη ουν καθαπερ ασωτευομενους ημας κατα την εν τω ευαγγελιω  
του πλουσιου παιδος εικονα παραχρησθαι τοις του πατρος  
δωρημασιν (*Paed.* 2.9.2) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (33) Or Ath Did

**Luke 15:17**

εν τη των δυειν αδελφων παραβολη μισθιοι κεκληνται (*Strom.* 4.30.1)  
[All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (33) Or Ath (Did)

**Luke 16:9**

ποιησατε εαυτοις φιλους εκ του μαμωνα της αδικιας, ιν οταν εκλιπη,  
δεξωνται υμας εις τας αιωνιους σκηνας (*Quis div.* 13.3) [C]

ποιησατε εαυτοις φιλους εκ του μαμωνα της αδικιας, ινα οταν  
εκλιπη, δεξωνται υμας εις τας αιωνιους σκηνας (*Quis div.* 31.5) [C]

φιλον δε ποιησαι (*Quis div.* 32.6) [Ad]

TEXT: ποιησατε εαυτοις φιλους εκ του μαμωνα της αδικιας, ιν οταν  
εκλιπη δεξωνται υμας εις τας αιωνιους σκηνας

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (33) C Or Ath Did

ποιησατε εαυτοις φιλους <sup>κ</sup> A D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33<sup>vid</sup> 892 1582  
(a) (b) (c) TR] εαυτοις ποιησατε φιλους P<sup>75</sup> <sup>κ</sup> B L UBS<sup>4</sup>;  
ποιησατε φιλους εαυτοις 579

μαμωνα της αδικιας P<sup>75</sup> <sup>κ</sup> A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582  
b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] αδικιου μαμωνα D (a) [Lac. 33]

εκλιπη P<sup>75</sup> **8**\* B D L Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> 1582 UBS<sup>4</sup>] εκλιπητε **8**<sup>c</sup> b TR;  
 εκλειπη A Θ 579<sup>142</sup>; εκλειπητε E Δ Ω f<sup>13</sup> 892; defecerit vobis  
 (=εκλιπη υμιν) a; defecerint vobis (=εκλιπωσι υμιν) e [Lac. 33]

**Luke 16:12**

πιστοι εν τω αλλοτριω μη γενομενοι (*Strom.* 3.31.3) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (33) (Or) Ath Did

**Luke 16:16**

ουτος μεν ουν ο τυπος νομου και οι προφητων ο μεχρις Ιωαννου  
 (*Strom.* 5.55.1) [Ad]\*

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (33) Or Ath Did

μεχρις / μεχρι P<sup>75</sup> **8** B L f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 UBS<sup>4</sup>] εως A D E Δ Θ  
 Π Ψ Ω TR [NA: a b e; Lac. 33]

**Luke 16:19**

ανθρωπος γουν ην τις (ο κυριος διηγουμενος λεγει) πλουσιος  
 σφοδρα, ος ενεδιδυσκετο πορφυραν και βυσσον, ευφραινομενος  
 καθ ημεραν λαμπρως + (*Paed.* 2.105.1) [Ad]

καθαπερ ο εν τη πορφυρα και βυσσω τρυφων και τον Λαζαρον  
 υπερηφανων (*Paed.* 3.34.4) [All]

τι δε βουλεται η του Λαζαρου παραβολη τω κυριω πλουσιου και  
 πενητος εικονα δεικνυσουσα; (*Strom.* 4.30.4) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (33) Or Ath (Did)

-----

---

<sup>142</sup> Alfred Schmidtke's text of 579 reads εκλιπη instead of εκλειπη. Since Swanson's collation and the IGNTP volume on Luke both support the reading of εκλειπη, I have chosen to follow their reading and assume that Schmidtke's text is once again mistaken.

πλουσιος  $\aleph$  A B E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Psi$   $\Omega$   $f^1 f^{13}$  579 892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Did] πλουσιος ονοματι Νευης P<sup>75</sup>; πλουσιον D; honestus (=?) e  
[Lac. 33]

και βυσσον P<sup>75</sup>  $\aleph$  A B E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Psi$   $\Omega$   $f^1 f^{13}$  33 579 892 1582 a e  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> (Did)] add και D; omit b

**Luke 16:20**

+ ... πτωχος δε τις ονομα Λαζαρος εβεβλητο εις τον πυλωνα του  
πλουσιου ειλωμενος, + (*Paed.* 2.105.1) [Ad]\*

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (33) Or Ath (Did)

τις P<sup>75</sup>  $\aleph$  B D L  $\Psi$  579 a e UBS<sup>4</sup>] add ην A E  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$   $f^1 f^{13}$  892  
1582 TR; erat autem quidam (=ην δε τις) b [Lac. 33 Did]

Λαζαρος P<sup>75</sup>  $\aleph$  B D L  $\Psi$  33<sup>vid</sup> 579 a e UBS<sup>4</sup>] add ος A E  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Omega$   
 $f^1 f^{13}$  892 1582 b TR [Lac. Did]

-----  
εις ] προς P<sup>75</sup>  $\aleph$  A B D E L  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Psi$   $\Omega$   $f^1 f^{13}$  33 579 892 1582 a b e  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did

**Luke 16:21**

+ επιθυμων χορτασθηναι εκ των πιπτοντων της τραπεζης του  
πλουσιου<sup>143</sup> + (*Paed.* 2.105.1) [Ad]\*

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (33) Or Ath Did

εκ / απο των πιπτοντων P<sup>75</sup>  $\aleph^*$  B L (b) (e) UBS<sup>4</sup>] απο των ψιχιων  
των πιπτοντων  $\aleph^c$  A D E  $\Delta$   $\Theta$   $\Pi$   $\Psi$   $\Omega$   $f^{13}$  33<sup>vid</sup> (579) 892 a TR; add  
ψιχιων  $f^1$  1582

---

<sup>143</sup> The nature of Clement's argument suggests that he would have included this reading if he knew of it.

-----  
 επιθυμων P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 b e TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup>] cupiebat (=επεθυμει) a [Lac. 33]

πλουσιου P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 579 892 1582 a b e TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup>] και ουδεις εδιδου αυτω f<sup>13</sup> [Lac. 33]

**Luke 16:22**

+ ... αλλ ο μεν εκολαζετο εν Αιδου, ο πλουσιος, μετεχων του πυρος, ο  
 δε ανεθαλλεν εν κολποις του πατρος (*Paed.* 2.105.1) [All]

-----  
 Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (33) (Or) Ath Did

**Luke 17:3–4**

οπου γε και ημιν παρακελευεται της ημερας εκαστης ο κυριος αφιεναι  
 τοις αδελφοις μετανοουσιν (*Quis div.* 39.5) [All]

-----  
 Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (33) Or Ath Did

**Luke 17:3**

εαν αμαρτη (φησιν) ο αδελφος σου επιτιμησον αυτω, και εαν  
 μετανοηση, αφες αυτω + (*Paed.* 3.91.1) [C]<sup>144</sup>

-----  
 Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>75</sup>) C (33) Or Ath Did

<sup>144</sup> It is impossible to know with certainty whether Clement's text lacked the conjunction δε or if he omitted it when he quoted this verse. For this reason, the absence of δε is not included in the apparatus.

Clement's text also reveals the following variants in Luke 17:3. Since none of these variants are of genetic significance, they are not included in the apparatus.

αμαρτηση Π] αμαρτησει Θ  
 μετανοηση ⋈ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 TR] μετανοησει 579  
 [Lac. P<sup>75</sup> 33]  
 εαν<sup>1</sup> ⋈ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] αν L [NA: a  
 b e; Lac. P<sup>75</sup>]  
 εαν<sup>2</sup> ⋈ B D E L Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] add μεν Α Θ; αν μη f<sup>1</sup>;  
 add μη 1582 [NA: a b e; Lac. P<sup>75</sup> 33]

αμαρτη **Σ** A B L f<sup>1</sup> 33 892 1582 (a) (b) UBS<sup>4</sup>] add εις σε E Ω f<sup>13</sup>  
579 (e) TR; αμαρτησι Θ Π (a) (b); αμαρτησι εις σε D Δ Ψ (e)  
[Lac. P<sup>75</sup>]

**Luke 17:4**

+ εαν<sup>145</sup> επτακις της ημερας αμαρτη εις σε και το επτακις επιστρεφη<sup>146</sup>  
προς σε λεγων, μετανοω, αφες αυτω (*Paed.* 3.91.1) [C]<sup>147</sup>

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>75</sup>) C (33) Or Ath Did

αμαρτη **Σ** Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> 579<sup>148</sup> 1582 (a) (b) (e) TR] αμαρτησι A B D L Δ  
Θ Ψ 892 (a) (b) (e) UBS<sup>4</sup>; omit E f<sup>13</sup> [Lac. P<sup>75</sup> 33]

και το D (a) (e)] omit E f<sup>13</sup>; και **Σ** B L Δ Θ Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 579 892 1582 (a)  
(e) TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; και εαν A Π b; [Lac. P<sup>75</sup> 33]

επτακις<sup>2</sup> **Σ** B D L Ψ 892 a b UBS<sup>4</sup>] add της ημερας A Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup>  
579 1582 e TR; omit E f<sup>13</sup> [Lac. P<sup>75</sup> 33]

προς σε **Σ** A B D L Ψ 579 892 (a) (b) (e) UBS<sup>4</sup>] επι σε f<sup>1</sup> 1582 (a)  
(b) (e) TR; omit E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> [Lac. P<sup>75</sup> 33]

αφες D a b e] αφησεις P<sup>75vid</sup> **Σ** A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579  
892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

-----  
εις σε **Σ** A B D L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 579 892 1582 b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit  
E<sup>149</sup> f<sup>13</sup>; in die (=εν τη ημερα) a [Lac. P<sup>75</sup> 33]

<sup>145</sup> Marcovich inserts και before εαν on the basis of the New Testament

<sup>146</sup> Marcovich emends επιστρεφη to επιστρεψη on the basis of the New Testament.

<sup>147</sup> Clement's text reveals the following variant in Luke 17:4. Since the variant is most likely the result of itacism, the distinction is not included in the apparatus.

αμαρτησι A B D L Δ Ψ] αμαρτησει Θ

<sup>148</sup> Alfred Schmidtke's text of 579 reads αμαρτησι instead of αμαρτη. Since Swanson's collation and the IGNTP volume on Luke both support the reading of αμαρτη, I have again chosen to follow their reading and assume that Schmidtke's text is mistaken.

<sup>149</sup> Since the omission in E and f<sup>13</sup> appear to be due to homoeoteleuton, the accidental agreement between the two readings is not counted as genetically significant.

επιστρεφη] επιστρεψη P<sup>75vid</sup> Ⲙ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892  
1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; επιστραφη 579

μετανωω Ⲙ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a (b) e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] μετανοησω D [Lac. P<sup>75</sup>]

**Luke 17:31**

μη επιστρεφεσθω εις τα οπισω + (*Strom.* 7.93.4) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (33) Or Ath Did

**Luke 17:32**

+ καθαπερ η Λωτ γυνη (*Strom.* 7.93.4) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (33) Ath Did

**Luke 18:8**

(επιφερι:) αρα ελθων ο υιος του ανθρωπου ευρησει την πιστιν επι της  
γης; (*Strom.* 3.49.5) [Ad]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (33) Ath (Did)

-----  
την P<sup>75</sup> Ⲙ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or  
Did] omit D [NA: a b e; Lac 33]

\*\*\*\*\*

αρα ελθων ο υιος του ανθρωπου Did] αρα ο υιος του  
ανθρωπου ελθων D a b e; ο υιος του ανθρωπου ελθων αρα P<sup>75</sup>  
Ⲙ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or<sup>pt</sup>; ελθων ο  
υιος του ανθρωπου αρα Or<sup>pt</sup> [Lac. 33]

**Luke 18:22**

εν σοι λειπει (*Quis div.* 10.3) [C]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> C (33) (Or) Ath Did



**Luke 19:5**

Ζακχαϊον τοινυν, οι δε Μαθθιαν φασιν, αρχιτελωνην, ακηκοοτα του κυριου καταξιωσαντος προσ αυτον γενεσθαι (*Strom.* 4.35.2) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> (33) C Or Ath Did

**Luke 19:8**

ιδου τα ημιση των υπαρχοντων μου διδωμι ελεημοσυνην (φαναι), κυριε, και ει τινος τι εσυκοφαντησα, τετραπλουν αποδιδωμι (*Strom.* 4.35.2) [Ad]\*

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> C (33) Or Ath Did

ημιση E Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579<sup>150</sup> 892 1582 TR] ημισυ A Δ; ημισια Ⲭ B (L) (Θ) UBS<sup>4</sup>; ημισοι D [NA: a b e; Lac. 33]

των υπαρχοντων μου A (D) E Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>13</sup> 892 (a) (b) (e) TR] μου των υπαρχοντων Ⲭ B L Θ f<sup>1</sup> 579 1582 UBS<sup>4</sup> [Lac. 33]

κυριε Ⲭ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 a (b) TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit 579 e [Lac. 33]

τετραπλουν αποδιδωμι (a) e] αποδιδωμι τετραπλουν Ⲭ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 b TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [Lac. 33]

**Luke 19:9**

(καταγγελλει:) σημερον σωτηρια τω οικω τουτω (*Quis div.* 13.5) [C]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> C (33) Or Ath Did

σωτηρια Ⲭ B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] add εν A D [Lac. 33]

---

<sup>150</sup> A comparison of the collation of Alfred Schmidtke and Reuben Swanson reveals another disagreement here. Schmidtke's text reads ημιση, while Swanson has ημισια. Since both the IGNTP critical edition of Luke and von Soden support Schmidtke's reading, I assume that in this case Swanson's reading is most likely incorrect.

**Luke 19:10**

(ο σωτηρ ειπεν:) ο υιος του ανθρωπου ελθων σημερον το απολωλος  
ευρεν (*Strom.* 4.35.2) [Ad]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> C (33) (Or) Ath

το απολωλος A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did] αποαπολωλος ⋈ [Lac. 33]

**Luke 20:34**

οι υιοι του αιωνος τουτου (*Strom.* 3.87.3) [C]

εν γαρ τω αιωνι τουτω (φησιν) γαμουσι και γαμισκονται ... + (*Paed.* 1.10.3) [Ad]\*

εν γαρ τω αιωνι τουτω γαμουσι και γαμισκονται (*Paed.* 2.100.3) [Ad]\*

TEXT: ... οι υιοι του αιωνος τουτου γαμουσι και γαμισκονται

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> C (33) b (Or) Ath Did

γαμισκονται ⋈ B L 33 579 892 UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] εκγαμιζονται A E Δ  
Θ Π f<sup>13</sup>; εκγαμισκονται Ψ Ω TR; γαμιζονται f<sup>1</sup> 1582; generantur  
(=γεννωνται) a e; γαμουνται D

υιοι του αιωνος τουτου ⋈ A B D E L Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33<sup>vid</sup> 579 892  
1582 e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] fili huius saeculi (=υιοι του τουτου αιωνος)  
a; του αιωνος τουτου υιοι Θ

γαμουσι ⋈ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
generant (=γεννωσι) e; γεννωνται και γεννωσιν γαμουσι D;  
γεννωσι και γεννωνται γαμουσι Or; generantur (=γεννωνται) a

**Luke 20:35**

+ εν εκεινω δε ουκετι (*Paed.* 1.10.3) [All]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> C (33) b Or Ath (Did)

**Luke 22:31**

(ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτός) ὁ κύριος ἐξηγήσατο ὑμᾶς ὁ Σατανᾶς (λεγεῖ)  
 σινιάσαι: + (*Strom.* 4.74.4) [Ad]\*

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C 33 Or Ath (Did)

ὁ κύριος **Ⲛ** A D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b TR] omit P<sup>75</sup>  
 B L e UBS<sup>4</sup> [Lac. Did]

\*\*\*\*\*

ἐξηγήσατο ὑμᾶς ὁ Σατανᾶς Did<sup>pe</sup>] ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐξηγήσατο ὑμᾶς  
 P<sup>75</sup> **Ⲛ** A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did<sup>pe</sup>

**Luke 22:32**

+ ἐγὼ δὲ παρητησαμην (*Strom.* 4.74.4) [Ad]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C 33 Or Ath (Did)

**Luke 24:41**

ἐχετε τι βρώσιμον ἐνθάδε; (εἶπεν ὁ κύριος πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς μετὰ  
 τὴν ἀνάστασιν) + (*Paed.* 2.15.2) [C]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C Or Ath Did

-----  
 ἐνθάδε P<sup>75</sup> A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
 ὦδε **Ⲛ**\* [NA: a b e]

**Luke 24:42**

+ οἱ δὲ ... ἐπέδωκαν αὐτῷ ἰχθύος ὅππου μέρος + (*Paed.* 2.15.2) [C]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C Or Ath Did

οἱ δὲ P<sup>75</sup> **Ⲛ** A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 (b) TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup>] καὶ D e; qui (=οἱ) a

μερος P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B D L Π 579 e UBS<sup>4</sup>] add και απο μελισσιου  
κηριον / κηριου E Δ Θ Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 (a) (b) TR<sup>151</sup>

**Luke 24:43**

+ και φαγων<sup>152</sup> ενωπιον αυτων + (*Paed.* 2.15.2) [C]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C Or Ath Did

αυτων P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] παντων A

**Luke 24:44**

+ ειπεν<sup>153</sup> αυτοις (*Paed.* 2.15.2) [C]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C Or Ath Did

αυτοις A D E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 a e TR] προς αυτους P<sup>75</sup> ⋈  
B L 33 579 892 b UBS<sup>4</sup>

<sup>151</sup> It is likely that Clement's text did not contain this reading, since his quotation is part of a continuous quotation that continues directly into the following verse.

<sup>152</sup> Although Clement's use of φαγων also occurs in Θ and b, the agreement is likely accidental. A comparison of the variants in Luke 24:43 and 44 demonstrates that Clement is not drawing on the same textual tradition as Θ and b. This makes it unlikely that his reading is of any genetic significance. For this reason, the variant is listed here but not included in the apparatus or in the textual analysis.

φαγων Θ b] λαβων P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B D E L Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a (e)  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

<sup>153</sup> Although this quotation is part of a continuous quotation, it is not certain whether Clement's text omits the introductory conjunction και or δε, since his quotation is so short and his quotation of the previous verse appears to be abbreviated. For these reasons, the introductory conjunctions are not included in the apparatus.

**John 1:1**

εν αρχη ην ο λογος, και ο λογος ην προς τον θεον, και θεος ην ο  
λογος (*Protr.* 6.3) [C]

(οτι) ο λογος ην προς τον θεον (*Protr.* 7.3) [C]

εν αρχη ην ο λογος, και ο λογος ην προς τον θεον (*Exc.* 19.2) [C]

εν αρχη ο λογος ην (*Protr.* 6.4) [Ad]

ο λογος ην εν τω θεω (*Protr.* 110.2) [Ad]

(ειπεν) εν αρχη ο λογος ην εν τω θεω, και θεος ην ο λογος (*Paed.* 1.62.4) [Ad]

λογος θεος ο εν τω πατρι (*Paed.* 1.4.1) [All]

αλλα και εν αρχη ο εν ταυτοτητι λογος (*Exc.* 19.1) [All]

TEXT: εν αρχη ην ο λογος, και ο λογος ην προς τον θεον, και θεος ην  
ο λογος

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C W Ω

-----  
κατ<sup>2</sup> P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⲁ A B D E Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Or Ath Did Cyr] add ο L [NA: a b e]

**John 1:3**

παντα γαρ δι αυτου εγενετο, και χωρις αυτου εγενετο ουδε εν (*Paed.*  
1.97.3) [C]

παντα δι αυτου εγενετο, και χωρις αυτου εγενετο ουδε εν (*Strom.*  
6.95.1) [C]

παντα δι αυτου εγενετο, και χωρις αυτου εγενετο ουδε εν (*Strom.*  
6.125.2) [C]

παντα δι αυτου εγενετο (*Exc.* 8.2) [C]

ΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΟΥΔΕ ΕΝ (*Paed.* 1.60.2) [C]

ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΑΝΕΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΟΥΔΕ ΕΝ (*Paed.* 3.33.3) [Ad]

ΚΑΙ ΟΥΔΕΝ ΧΩΡΙΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ (φησι) (*Strom.* 1.45.5) [Ad]

ΠΑΝΤΑ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ, ΚΑΙ ΧΩΡΙΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΟΥΔΕ ΕΝ (*Strom.* 6.58.1) [Ad]

ΔΙ ΟΥ ΤΑ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ, ΚΑΙ ΧΩΡΙΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΟΥΔΕ ΕΝ (*Strom.* 6.141.7) [Ad]

ΔΙ ΟΥ ΤΑ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ, ΚΑΙ ΧΩΡΙΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΟΥΔΕ ΕΝ (*Strom.* 6.153.4) [Ad]

ΔΙ ΟΥ ΤΑ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ, ΚΑΙ ΧΩΡΙΣ ΟΥ ΓΕΓΟΝΕΝ ΟΥΔΕΝ<sup>154</sup> (*Strom.* 7.17.2) [Ad]

ΔΙ ΟΥ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΚΑΤΑ ΒΟΥΛΗΣΙΝ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ (*Strom.* 5.103.1) [All]

ΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΧΩΡΙΣ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΟΥΔΕ ΕΝ (*Strom.* 6.145.5) [All]

TEXT: παντα δι αυτου εγενετο, και χωρις αυτου εγενετο ουδε εν

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (C) W Ω

ουδε εν P<sup>75</sup> Ⲭ<sup>c</sup> A B C<sup>vid</sup> E L Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or  
Ath Cyr<sup>pt</sup>] ουδεν P<sup>66</sup> Ⲭ<sup>\*</sup> D f<sup>1</sup> 1582 Did [NA: a b e]

### John 1:3–4

Ο ΓΑΡ ΓΕΓΟΝΕΝ ΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ ΖΩΗ ΕΣΤΙΝ (*Paed.* 1.27.1) [C]

Ο ΓΑΡ ΓΕΓΟΝΕΝ ΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ ΖΩΗ ΗΝ (*Paed.* 2.79.3) [C]

(ΟΤΙ) ΖΩΗ ΗΝ ΤΟ ΦΩΣ (*Strom.* 4.42.3) [C]

ΤΟ ΦΩΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΩΝ (*Exc.* 13.1) [C]

Ο ΓΕΓΟΝΕΝ ΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ ΖΩΗ ΕΣΤΙΝ (*Exc.* 19.2) [C]

<sup>154</sup> Clement's predominant inclusion of εν indicates that its omission here is likely the result of his adaptation and not a genuine attestation (contra Mees).

TEXT: ο γεγονεν. εν αυτω ζωη [εστιν / ην], ... ζωη ην το φως των  
ανθρωπων

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> W Ω Ath (Did)

εστιν **Σ** D a b e] ην Clem<sup>pt</sup> P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579  
892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr [Lac. Did]

-----  
εν P<sup>75</sup> **Σ** A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr] omit P<sup>66</sup> [Lac. Did]

των ανθρωπων P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> **Σ** A C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892  
1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did Cyr] omit B

### John 1:5

και η σκοτια αυτον ου κατελαβεν (*Exc.* 8.4) [C]

και το σκοτος αυτον ου καταλαμβανει (*Paed.* 1.28.3) [Ad]

και η σκοτια αυτον ου καταλαμβανει (*Paed.* 2.79.3) [Ad]

και η σκοτια (φησιν) αυτο ου καταλαμβανει (*Paed.* 2.99.6) [Ad]

TEXT: και η σκοτια [αυτον / αυτο] ου κατελαβεν

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> W Ω Ath

αυτον a e] αυτο Clem<sup>pt</sup> P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> **Σ** A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33  
579 892 1582 b TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did Cyr

### John 1:9

ην γαρ το φως το αληθινον (*Strom.* 2.21.1) [C]

φως δε ο λογος ανθρωποις (*Protr.* 84.6) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> W Ω

-----  
 ην P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Ath Did Cyr] est (=εστιν) e

**John 1:11**

εις τα ιδια (φησιν) ηλθεν ο υιος του θεου και οι ιδιοι αυτον ουκ  
 εδεξαντο (*Strom.* 7.83.2) [Ad]

-----  
 Lac. P<sup>45</sup> W Ω Ath Did

**John 1:12**

εξουσιαν τεκνα θεου γενεσθαι (*Strom.* 4.26.5) [C]

-----  
 Lac. P<sup>45</sup> W (Ω) Did

**John 1:13**

τον ουκ εξ αιματων ουδε εκ θεληματος σαρκος εν πνευματι  
 αναγεννωμενον (*Strom.* 2.58.2) [Ad]

-----  
 Lac. P<sup>45</sup> W (Or) Did

-----  
 σαρκος B] add ουδε P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A C D L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579  
 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Ath Cyr; omit E (Or)<sup>155</sup>

**John 1:14**

και ο λογος σαρξ εγενετο (*Exc.* 19.1) [C]

δι ην ο λογος γεγονεν σαρξ (*Paed.* 2.20.1) [Ad]

οταν ο λογος σαρξ γενηται (*Strom.* 5.16.5) [Ad]

<sup>155</sup> The agreement between Clement and B and Origen with E are not listed as significant variants. In both cases, it appears that the affinity is due only to the looseness of each adaptation. For Origen's relationship with E', see Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes, *Text of the Fourth Gospel*, 53 n. 5



και γαρ ο λογος αυτος εναργως σαρξ γενομενος (*Paed.* 1.9.4) [All]

εν τουτω και ο λογος ηνθησεν τε και εκαρποφορησεν σαρξ γενομενος  
(*Strom.* 5.72.3) [All]

TEXT: και ο λογος σαρξ εγενετο

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> W

### John 1:16

παντες (φησιν) εκ του πληρωματος αυτου ελαβομεν (*Strom.* 1.87.5) [Ad]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (D) W (Ath) (Did) (Cyr)

### John 1:17

(διο και φησιν η γραφη) ο νομος δια Μωσεως εδοθη ... η δε αιδιος  
χαρις και η αληθεια δια Ιησου Χριστου εγενετο (*Paed.* 1.60.1) [C]

(δι ου) ο νομος εδοθη (*Strom.* 1.169.4) [C]

ο νομος δια Μωσεως εδοθη, η χαρις και η αληθεια δια Ιησου  
Χριστου (*Quis div.* 8.1) [C]

θεοθεν δια Μωυσεως δεδοσθαι τον νομον (*Strom.* 1.70.2) [All]

οθεν ο νομος εικοτως ειρηται δια Μωσεως δεδοσθαι (*Strom.* 1.167.1) [All]

TEXT: ... ο νομος δια Μωσεως εδοθη, η χαρις και η αληθεια  
δια Ιησου Χριστου εγενετο

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> D W (Ath) (Did)

χαρις P<sup>75</sup> Ⲡ A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Or Ath Cyr] χαρις δε P<sup>66</sup> a b e; χαρις γαρ Did

-----  
Χριστου P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲡ<sup>c</sup> A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a  
b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Ath Did Cyr] omit Ⲡ<sup>c</sup>

**John 1:18**

θεον ουδεις εωρακεν πωποτε: ο μονογενης θεος ο ων εις τον κολπον  
του πατρος εκεινος εξηγησατο (*Strom.* 5.81.3) [C]

εις τον κολπον του πατρος (*Exc.* 8.1) [C]

ο τον κολπον του πατρος εξηγουμενος υιος μονογενης (*Strom.*  
1.169.4) [Ad]

ουτος τον κολπον του πατρος εξηγησατο (*Exc.* 8.2) [Ad]

τον κολπον του πατρος ον ο μονογενης θεος μονος εξηγησατο (*Quis  
div.* 37.1) [Ad]

δι ον ο μονογενης εκ κολπων πατρος κατατεμπεται (*Paed.* 1.8.2) [All]

TEXT: θεον ουδεις εωρακεν πωποτε: ο μονογενης [θεος / υιος] ο ων  
εις τον κολπον του πατρος εκεινος εξηγησατο

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> D W (Ath)

πωποτε P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did Cyr] add nisi (=ει μη) a b e [Lac. Ath]

ο μονογενης θεος P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ<sup>c</sup> 33 Or Cyr] μονογενης θεος P<sup>66</sup> Ⲱ<sup>\*</sup> B C L  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Did; ο μονογενης υιος Clem<sup>pt</sup> A E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892  
1582 a b e TR Ath

ο ων P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ<sup>c</sup> A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 b e  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did Ath Cyr] omit Ⲱ<sup>\*</sup> (a)

εωρακεν πωποτε P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75c</sup> Ⲱ A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579  
892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did Cyr] πωποτε εωρακεν P<sup>75\*</sup> [Lac. Ath]

(θεος) υιος P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 b  
e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Ath Did Cyr] filius suus (=υιος αυτου) a

εις P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Ath Did Cyr] omit a

εκεινος P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b  
e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Ath] omit Did

**John 1:20–23**

Ἡλίας μὲν οὐκ ἐρεῖ Χρῖστος δὲ εἶναι ἀρνησεται φωνὴ δὲ ὁμολογήσει  
ἐν ἐρημῷ βοῶσα (*Protr.* 9.1) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> D W Ath Did (Cyr)

**John 1:27**

οὐκ εἰμι (φησιν) ἄξιός τὸν ἱμᾶντα τοῦ υποδηματος λῦσαι κυρίου  
(*Strom.* 5.55.1) [Ad]\*

οὐκ ἄξιός ἐστι ὁμολογῶν τὸν ἱμᾶντα τῶν υποδημάτων λυεῖν τοῦ  
κυρίου (*Paed.* 2.117.4) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> D W Ath Did (Cyr)

οὐκ εἰμι P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ C L 33 a] οὐκ εἰμι ἐγὼ P<sup>66c</sup> B Ψ f<sup>13</sup> 579 UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Or; ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμι A E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> 892 1582 b e TR<sup>156</sup> [Lac. Cyr]

ἄξιός Ⲱ A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Or] ἱκανός P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Cyr [NA: a b e]

-----  
τὸν ἱμᾶντα τοῦ υποδηματος ] αὐτοῦ τὸν ἱμᾶντα τοῦ υποδηματος  
P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr;  
τὸν ἱμᾶντα τοῦ υποδηματος αὐτοῦ P<sup>66</sup> a b (e); αὐτοῦ τὸν ἱμᾶντα 579

**John 1:47**

οἱ τῷ ὄντι Ἰσραηλῖται ... ἐν οἷς δόλος οὐδεὶς (*Strom.* 6.108.1) [Ad]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C D W (33) Or Ath (Did) (Cyr)

**John 2:1–11**

εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον ἐν τοῖς γάμοις πεποίηκεν (*Paed.* 2.29.1) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C D W (Or) (Ath) Did

---

<sup>156</sup> The reading of f<sup>13</sup> is taken from MSS 13, 69, 453, and 788.

**John 2:16**

ἐξελθετε ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρὸς μου (τοῖς κλητοῖς λέγει) (*Exc.* 9.2) [Ad]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C D W Ath Did (Cyr)

**John 3:5**

αὐτικά δι' ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος ἡ ἀναγεννήσις καθάπερ καὶ ἡ πᾶσα  
γενέσις (*Ecl.* 7.1) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C D W Or Ath Did

**John 3:6**

τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς σαρκὶς ἐστὶν οὕτω τὸ ἐκ πνεύματος  
πνεῦμα (*Strom.* 3.84.3) [Ad]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C D W (33) (Or) Ath Did

ἐστὶν P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Cyr] add quia de carne natum est (=οτι ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς τὸ  
γεγεννημένον) a b e [Lac. Or]

-----  
οὕτω ] omit P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a  
b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr [Lac. Or]

τὸ ἐκ ] καὶ τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup>  
f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr [Lac. Or]

**John 3:18**

ὁ μὴ<sup>157</sup> πιστευὼν ἤδη κεκρίται (*Strom.* 2.69.1) [C]

ὁ ἀπιστήσας (κατὰ τὴν σωτηρίον φωνὴν) ἤδη κεκρίται (*Strom.*  
4.169.4) [Ad]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C D W (Or) Ath (Did)

---

<sup>157</sup> This quotation is too brief to determine with certainty whether Clement's text includes the conjunction *δε* or not.

**John 3:19**

οτι το φως εληλυθεν εις τον κοσμον και ηγαπησαν οι ανθρωποι  
μαλλον το σκοτος η το φως (*Protr.* 101.2) [C]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C D W Or Ath (Did)

ηγαπησαν ... το σκοτος P<sup>75</sup> A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 a  
b TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did Cyr] ηγαπησαν μαλλον οι ανθρωποι το σκοτος  
P<sup>66</sup> f<sup>1</sup> 1582 (ε); οι ανθρωποι ηγαπησαν το σκοτος μαλλον ⋈

-----  
το<sup>1</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr]  
omit P<sup>66</sup> [NA: a b e; Lac. Did]

εις P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Cyr] add hoc (=τουτο) a b [Lac. Did]

κοσμον P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr] saeculum (=αιωνα) k [Lac. Did]

**John 3:30**

καμε δει ελαττουσθαι αυξειν δε μονον ηδη λοιπον τον κυριακον  
λογον (*Strom.* 6.94.6) [Ad]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C W Ath Did

**John 3:36**

ο πιστευων εις τον υιον εχει ζωην αιωνιον (*Paed.* 1.29.1) [C]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> W Or Ath Did

-----  
εχει P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr] εχη D<sup>158</sup>

---

<sup>158</sup> It is unlikely that this variant is due to itacism. The use of the subjunctive mood appears to function as part of a purpose clause introduced in Codex Bezae by the addition of the conjunction ινα at the beginning of the verse.

ζωην P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Cyr] την ζωην 892 [NA: a b e]

**John 4:7**

και την Σαμαριτιν ητει πειν σκευει κεραμεω του φρεατος ανιμωσαν  
(*Paed.* 2.38.2) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> W (Or) Ath Did

**John 4:14**

και οι διψωντες της πηγης της ζωτικης αφ ης οι μεταλαβοντες ουκετι  
διψησουσιν (*Paed.* 1.83.3) [All]

τουτεστι την διδασκαλιαν του σωτηρος ητις εστι βρωμα ημων  
πνευματικον και τομα διψαν ουκ επισταμενον (*Strom.* 7.104.4) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> W (33) Ath (Did)

**John 4:32**

εγω (φησιν ο κυριος) βρωσιν εχω φαγειν ην υμεις ουκ οιδατε (*Paed.*  
1.45.4) [C]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> W Ath (Did)

**John 4:34**

εμον βρωμα εστιν ινα ποιησω το θελημα του πεμψαντος με (*Paed.*  
1.45.4) [C]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> W Ath (Did)

ποιησω P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> B C D L Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> 33 579 1582 UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr]  
ποιω Ⲱ A E Δ Ω f<sup>13</sup> 892 TR [NA: a b e; Lac. Did]

**John 5:17**

ΕΤΙ ΤΕ ΚΑΙ Ο ΣΩΤΗΡ ΣΩΖΕΙ ΑΙΕΙ ΚΑΙ ΑΙΕΙ ΕΡΓΑΖΕΤΑΙ (*Strom.* 1.12.3) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (Or) (Ath) Did

**John 5:19**

ΩΣ ΒΛΕΠΕΙ ΤΟΝ ΠΑΤΕΡΑ (*Strom.* 1.12.3) [All]<sup>159</sup>

ΩΣ ΒΛΕΠΕΙ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΤΗΝ ΑΓΑΘΟΤΗΤΑ Ο ΥΙΟΣ ΕΝΕΡΓΕΙ (*Strom.* 5.38.7) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (Or) (Ath) (Did)

-----  
 του πατρος / τον πατερα (ποιουντα) P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> & A B E L W Δ Θ Π  
 Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Ath Cyr] ποιουντα  
 τον πατερα D<sup>160</sup> [Lac. Did]

**John 5:24**

ΑΜΗΝ ΑΜΗΝ ΛΕΓΩ ΥΜΙΝ (ΦΗΣΙΝ) Ο ΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ ΜΟΥ ΑΚΟΥΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΩΝ  
 ΤΩ ΠΕΜΨΑΝΤΙ ΜΕ ΕΧΕΙ ΖΩΗΝ ΑΙΩΝΙΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΙΣ ΚΡΙΣΙΝ ΟΥΚ ΕΡΧΕΤΑΙ  
 ΑΛΛΑ ΜΕΤΑΒΕΒΗΚΕΝ ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΘΑΝΑΤΟΥ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΖΩΗΝ (*Paed.* 1 27.1) [C]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C a Or Ath Did

ερχεται P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> & A B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582  
 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr] veniet (=ελευσεται) b e

-----  
 εις κρισιν ουκ ερχεται P<sup>66c</sup> P<sup>75</sup> & A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33  
 579 892 1582 (b) (c) TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr] ουκ ερχεται εις κρισιν W

---

<sup>159</sup> Since the following variant from John 5:19 is most likely the result of itacism, the distinction is not included in the apparatus.

βλεπει E Ω 579 892] βλεπιη P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> & A B D L Ω Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582  
 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr [Lac. Ath Did]

<sup>160</sup> Though Clement's allusion to John 5:19 is brief, his word order still indicates that his exemplar did not include the variant reading found here in Codex Bezae.

την P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr] omit D [NA: b e]

**John 6:27**

εργαζεσθε (φησιν ο κυριος) μη την απολλυμενην βρωσιν αλλα την  
μενουσαν εις ζωην αιωνιον (*Strom.* 1.7.2) [C]

(διο φησιν) εργαζεσθε μη την απολλυμενην βρωσιν αλλα την  
μενουσαν εις ζωην αιωνιον (*Strom.* 3.87.1) [C]

εργαζεσθαι γαρ την βρωσιν την εις αιωνα παραμενουσαν (ο κυριος  
ενετειλατο (*Strom.* 6.1.2) [Ad]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>66</sup> (P<sup>75</sup>) C (Or) Ath (Did)

αλλα Ⲱ E] add την βρωσιν P<sup>75</sup> A B D L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33  
579 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did Cyr

μη την απολλυμενην βρωσιν ] βρωσιν μη την απολλυμενην Ⲱ b;  
μη την βρωσιν την απολλυμενην P<sup>75</sup> A B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup>  
f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr [Lac. Did]

**John 6:32**

ου γαρ Μωσης (φησιν) εδωκεν υμιν τον αρτον εκ του ουρανου αλλ ο  
πατηρ μου διδωσιν υμιν τον αρτον εκ του ουρανου τον αληθινον  
+ (*Paed.* 1.46.2) [C]

ο ζων αρτος ο υπο του πατρος δοθεις (*Exc.* 13.3) [All]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>66</sup> C (Or) Ath Did

εδωκεν B D L W] δεδωκεν P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892  
1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr [NA: a b e]

αληθινον P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 e  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr] add panem (=αρτον) a b



υμιν<sup>1</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ A B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr] omit 579

<sup>161</sup>αλλ ... ουρανου P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ A B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 579 892  
1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr] omit f<sup>13</sup>

μου P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ A B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr] omit e [Lac. f<sup>13</sup>]

αρτον<sup>2</sup> ⳑ A B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Or Cyr] add τον P<sup>75</sup> [NA: a b e; Lac. f<sup>13</sup>]

### John 6:33

+ ο γαρ αρτος του θεου εστιν ο εκ του ουρανου καταβαινων και ζων  
διδους τω κοσμω (*Paed.* 1.46.2) [C]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>66</sup> (P<sup>75</sup>) C Ath Did

αρτος P<sup>75</sup> A B E L W Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or  
Cyr] add ο ⳑ D Θ [NA: a b e]

θεου P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ A B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr] ουρανου 579 (e)

εκ του ουρανου καταβαινων e] καταβαινων εκ του ουρανου P<sup>75</sup>  
ⳑ A B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or  
Cyr

ζων διδους P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ B D E L W Δ Θ Ψ Ω f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr] διδους ζων A Π 33 579; διδους f<sup>1</sup>

τω κοσμω P<sup>75</sup> ⳑ A B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr] huic mundo (=τουτω τω κοσμω) a b ; saeculo  
(=αιωνι) e

<sup>161</sup> The reading of f<sup>13</sup> is taken from MSS 13, 69, 346, and 547. The omission appears to be due to homoeoteleuton.

**John 6:40**

τουτο γαρ<sup>162</sup> εστι το θελημα του πατρος μου ινα πας ο θεωρων τον  
 υιον και πιστευων επ αυτον εχη<sup>163</sup> ζων αιωνιον και αναστησω  
 αυτον εν τη εσχατη ημερα (*Paed.* 1.28.5) [C]<sup>164</sup>

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> Or Did

του πατρος μου P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲛ B C D (L) W Θ f<sup>1</sup> 33 579 1582 a b e  
 UBS<sup>4</sup> Ath Cyr] του πεμψαντος με A E Π Ω TR; του πεμψαντος με  
 πατρος Δ Ψ f<sup>13</sup> 892

και αναστησω αυτον P<sup>66</sup> A D L f<sup>1</sup> 1582 b] add εγω P<sup>75</sup> Ⲛ B C E  
 W Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 a e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr; και αναστησω εγω  
 αυτον Ψ; add και εγω αναστησω αυτον Ath

εν P<sup>66</sup> Ⲛ A D L Π Ψ f<sup>13</sup> 33 a b UBS<sup>4</sup> Ath] omit P<sup>75</sup> B C E W Δ Θ Ω  
 f<sup>1</sup> 579 892 1582 e TR Cyr

-----  
 τουτο (γαρ / δε) εστι το θελημα P<sup>66c</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲛ A B C D E L W Δ Θ Π  
 Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Ath Cyr] omit P<sup>66\*</sup>

επ ] εις P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲛ A B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892  
 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Ath Cyr

**John 6:44**

τουτο γαρ εστι το ελकुσθηναι υπο του πατρος (*Strom.* 4.138.4) [All]

ειτ ουν ο πατηρ αυτος ελκει προς αυτον παντα (*Strom.* 5.83.1) [All]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (33) (Or) (Ath) Did

<sup>162</sup> On the basis of this single quotation, it is impossible to know with certainty whether Clement's text includes the introductory conjunction γαρ or not. For this reason, the conjunction γαρ is not included in the apparatus as a significant variant.

<sup>163</sup> The textual transmission of Clement's writings also attests the reading of εχει in MSS M and F.

<sup>164</sup> The following variant from John 6:40 is likely the result of itacism, since it is not strongly attested by any one textual group. For this reason, the variant is omitted.

εχη P<sup>66\*</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲛ A B C D L W Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Ath Cyr]  
 εχει Clem<sup>pe</sup> P<sup>66c</sup> E Ω f<sup>13</sup> 579 a b e

**John 6:47**

ο πιστευων εχει ζωην αιωνιον (*Strom.* 5.85.1) [C]<sup>165</sup>

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>75</sup>) (C) (33) Or Ath (Did)

πιστευων P<sup>66</sup> Ⲡ B L W Θ 892 UBS<sup>4</sup>] add εις εμε A D E Δ Π Ψ  
Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 a b e TR Did Cyr [Lac. P<sup>75</sup> C]

**John 6:51**

και ο αρτος ον εγω δωσω η σαρξ μου εστιν υπερ της του κοσμου  
ζωης (*Paed.* 1.46.2) [C]

(ειπεν) και ο αρτος ον εγω δωσω η σαρξ μου εστιν (*Paed.* 1.47.1) [C]

ο δε αρτος ον εγω δωσω (φησι) η σαρξ μου εστιν (*Exc.* 13.4) [C]

ο ζων αρτος . . . ο υιος εστι τοις εσθιειν βουλομενοις (*Exc.* 13.3) [All]

TEXT: . . . και ο αρτος ον εγω δωσω η σαρξ μου εστιν υπερ της του  
κοσμου ζωης<sup>166</sup>

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>75</sup>) A (33) Ath Did

και P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75vid</sup> Ⲡ<sup>c</sup> B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr] omit Ⲡ<sup>\*</sup> a b e

<sup>165</sup> Fee points out that both Mees and Barnard incorrectly identify the source of this reference ("Text of John in Origen," 307 n. 16). Mees lists it under John 3:15, as if it were a loose adaptation, though none of the readings in the manuscript tradition of the verse is identical to Clement's citation (*Die Zitate aus dem Neuen Testament*, 95). Barnard, on the other hand, identifies it as a loose adaptation of John 3:36 (*Biblical Text of Clement*, 55). Swanson also identifies it as a reference to John 3:36 in both his dissertation ("The Gospel Text of Clement of Alexandria," 145) and his more recent volume on the Greek manuscripts of John (Reuben J. Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus: John* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995], 36). I concur with Fee that it is better identified as an exact quotation of the Alexandrian text of John 6:47.

<sup>166</sup> It is likely that Clement's text includes the introductory και, since it appears in two separate quotations from different works.

αρτος Ⲭ D W a b] add δε P<sup>66</sup> B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892  
1582 e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr [Lac. P<sup>75</sup>]

εστιν P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> (Ⲭ) B C D L W Ψ 33 579 a b e UBS<sup>4</sup> Or<sup>pt</sup> Cyr] add ην  
εγω δωσω E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 TR Or<sup>pt</sup>

-----  
δωσω P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲭ B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr] add υμιν 579; add αυτω 892

η σαρξ P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲭ B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 (b)  
(e) TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr] σαρξ 579 (b) (e); το σωμα a

σαρξ ... ζωης ] υπερ της του κοσμου ζωης η σαρξ μου εστιν Ⲭ

### John 6:53

(ο κυριος εν τω κατα Ιωαννην ευαγγελιω...) φαγεσθε μου τας  
σαρκας (ειπων) και πιεσθε μου το αιμα (*Paed.* 1.38.2) [Ad]

φαγεσθε μου (φησι) την σαρκα και πιεσθε μου το αιμα (*Paed.* 1.42.3) [Ad]

-----  
Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>75</sup>) A (Or) Ath Did

-----  
την σαρκα P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲭ B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892  
1582 b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr] corpus (=το σωμα) a

### John 6:55

το αιμα μου γαρ (φησιν ο κυριος) αληθης εστιν ποσις (*Paed.* 1.36.5) [C]

-----  
Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (Ⲭ) A (D) 33 Ath Did

αληθης P<sup>66c</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲭ<sup>c</sup> B C L W Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr]  
αληθως P<sup>66\*</sup> Ⲭ<sup>\*</sup> D E Δ Θ Ω TR [NA: a b e]

-----  
μου P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲭ B C D E L W Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr] omit Δ

γαρ ] omit P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> B C E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b e  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr [NA: Ⲭ\* D]

το αιμα (μου γαρ αληθης) εστιν ποσις P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲭ<sup>c</sup> B C E L W Δ Θ  
Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr] omit (Ⲭ) D<sup>167</sup>

ποσις P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲭ<sup>c</sup> B C E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a b e  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr] ποτον Ⲭ\* [Lac. D]

### John 7:16

η διδαχη η εμη ουκ εστιν εμη (ο κυριος λεγει) αλλα του πεμψαντος με  
πατρος (*Strom.* 1.87.6) [Ad]\*

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> A C Or Ath Did

πατρος 33] omit P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲭ B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892  
1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr

### John 7:18

ο δε αφ εαυτου (φησι) λαλων την δοξαν την ιδιαν ζητει (*Strom.* 1.87.6)  
[C]

ο μεν αφ εαυτου λαλων την δοξαν την ιδιαν ζητει (φησιν ο κυριος): ο  
δε ζητων την δοξαν του πεμψαντος αυτον ουτος αληθης εστι και  
αδικια ουκ εστιν εν αυτω (*Strom.* 1.100.3) [C]\*\*

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> A C Or Ath Did

ο δε P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr] qui (=ος) a b e; και ο Ⲭ

ουκ εστιν εν αυτω L 892] εν αυτω ουκ εστιν P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲭ B D E W Δ  
Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr; εν εαυτω ουκ εστιν 579

---

<sup>167</sup> Since the omission in Codex Bezae and Vaticanus appear to be due to homoeoteleuton, the accidental agreement between the two readings is not counted as genetically significant.

-----  
 δοξαν την P<sup>66</sup> Ⲱ B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b  
 e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr] <sup>168</sup>omit P<sup>75</sup>

αυτον P<sup>66c</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b  
 e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr] με P<sup>66\*</sup>

**John 8:12**

φως ουν ο κυριος και γνωσις η αληθης (*Strom.* 6.2.4) [All]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>75</sup>) A C b (Or) (Ath) (Did)

**John 8:24**

εαν γαρ μη πιστευσητε (φησιν ο κυριος) αποθανεισθε εν ταις  
 αμαρτιαις υμων (*Strom.* 5.85.1) [Ad]\*

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> A C (33) Ath Did Cyr

πιστευ[σ]ητε P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> B E L W Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 579 892 1582 a b TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] add μοι Ⲱ D Θ f<sup>13</sup> e [Lac. 33]

-----  
 πιστευσητε P<sup>66</sup> Ⲱ B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup> Or<sup>pt</sup>] πιστευητε P<sup>75</sup> Or<sup>pt</sup>; [NA: a b e; Lac. 33]

ταις αμαρτιαις P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892  
 1582 a e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] τη αμαρτια b [Lac. 33]

**John 8:32**

και η αληθεια ελευθερωσει υμας (*Strom.* 2.22.6) [C]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> A C (33) Ath Did Cyr

<sup>168</sup> This omission appears to be due to homoeoteleuton.

**John 8:34**

πας μεν ουν ο ποιων την αμαρτιαν δουλος εστιν + (*Strom.* 2.22.5) [C]

πας γαρ (φησιν) ο αμαρτανων δουλος εστιν (ο αποστολος λεγει<sup>169</sup>)  
(*Strom.* 3.30.3) [Ad]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> A (C) (Or) Ath (Did) Cyr

εστιν D b] add της αμαρτιας P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲡ B C E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup>  
f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did<sup>170</sup>

**John 8:35**

+ ο δε δουλος ου μενει εν τη οικια εις τον αιωνα + (*Strom.* 2.22.5) [C]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> A Or Did Cyr

αιωνα Ⲡ W 33] add ο υιος μενει P<sup>75</sup> B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892  
1582 e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; add ο δε υιος P<sup>66</sup> D a (b) Ath; Ιησους μενη  
579<sup>171</sup>

-----  
εν τη οικια P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲡ B C E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582  
b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Ath] εις την οικιαν D; add Domini (=του κυριου) a

**John 8:36**

+ εαν δε ο υιος υμας ελευθερωση<sup>172</sup> ελευθεροι εσεσθε (*Strom.* 2.22.6) [C]

<sup>169</sup> Jesus is clearly speaking here, but Clement confuses this verse with Rom 6:16.

<sup>170</sup> Since this citation is part of a longer continuous citation, it is likely that the omission of της αμαρτιας represents Clement's actual text.

<sup>171</sup> The fact that the omission of ο [δε] υιος μενει is also attested to by Ⲡ Ω 33 makes it likely that the phrase may have also been absent from Clement's text. On the possibility of it being a deliberate omission, see n. 173 below.

<sup>172</sup> Since the following variant in John 8:36 is not strongly attested by any one textual group, it is most likely the result of itacism.

ελευθερωση P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲡ<sup>c</sup> B C E L Ω Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> 33 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Ath] ελευθερωσει D Δ Θ Ω f<sup>13</sup> 579; ελευθερωθη Ⲡ' [NA: a b e]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> A Or Did Cyr

-----  
<sup>173</sup>δε ] ουν P<sup>66</sup> Ⲡ B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 579 892 1582 b  
 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Ath; omit P<sup>75</sup> f<sup>13</sup> a e

ο υιος P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲡ B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup> Ath] omit W

υμας P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲡ B C E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup> Ath] ημας 579<sup>174</sup>

ελευθεροι ] οντως ελευθεροι P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲡ B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup>  
 f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Ath

<sup>175</sup>εσεσθε P<sup>75</sup> Ⲡ B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a  
 b e TR Ath UBS<sup>4</sup>] εστε P<sup>66</sup>

#### John 8:44

υμεις εκ του πατρος υμων του διαβολου εστε και τας επιθυμιας του  
 πατρος υμων θελετε<sup>176</sup> ποιειν. εκεινος ανθρωποκτονος ην απ  
 αρχης και εν τη αληθεια ουχ εστηκεν, οτι ουκ εστιν αληθεια εν  
 αυτω. οταν λαλη το ψευδος, εκ των ιδιων λαλει, οτι ψευστης εστι  
 και ο πατηρ αυτου. (*Strom.* 1.85.2) [C]

<sup>173</sup> This δε appears to have been part of Clement's text, since it occurs in the midst of a longer continuous quotation. It is possible, however, that it might indicate that Clement omitted the final clause of verse 35 and inserted the conjunction δε as he continued quoting verse 36. In any case, it seemed best to include it in the apparatus, since it is part of a longer quotation.

<sup>174</sup> A comparison of the collations of 579 by Alfred Schmidtke and Reuben Swanson reveals a disagreement on this reading. Schmidtke's text reads υμας, while Swanson has ημας. While ημας was not listed in any of the critical texts consulted, it is included in the apparatus, since Swanson's work has been found to be highly reliable in its presentation of other variants. In any case, it has no effect on the analysis of Clement's text, since the reading has no other support.

<sup>175</sup> Clement's text reveals the following variant in John 8:36. Since the variant is most likely the result of itacism, εσεσθαι is listed in the apparatus under εσεσθε.

εσεσθε B C E Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Ath] εσεσθαι Ⲡ  
 D L Ω Θ

<sup>176</sup> Since the following variant from John 8:44 is most likely the result of itacism, the distinction is not included in the apparatus. θελετε rel] θελεται P<sup>66</sup>



Lac. P<sup>45</sup> A (Ath) (Did) Cyr

του<sup>1</sup> P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⚭ B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Or Did Ath] omit 892 TR [NA: a b e; Lac. Π]

ουχ<sup>1</sup> P<sup>75</sup> C E Ω 1582 TR Or] ουκ P<sup>66</sup> ⚭ B D L W Δ Θ Π Ψ <sup>177</sup>f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup>  
33 892 UBS<sup>4</sup> Did [NA: a b e; Lac. 579 Ath]

ουκ εστιν αληθεια P<sup>75</sup> ⚭ B C E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582  
a e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] αληθεια ουκ εστιν P<sup>66</sup> D (b) [Lac. 579 Ath Did]

εστι P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⚭ B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did] add καθως Ψ a b e [Lac. Ath]

-----  
υμων<sup>1</sup>] omit P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⚭ B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892  
1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did [Lac. Π Ath]

του<sup>2</sup> P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⚭ B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did Ath] omit 892 [NA: a b e]

απ P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⚭ B C D E W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a b e  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] εξ L [Lac. Ath Did]

ουχ / ουκ εστηκεν ... αληθεια (P<sup>66</sup>) P<sup>75</sup> ⚭ B C (D) E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ  
Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did] omit 579 [Lac. Ath]

οταν P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⚭ B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 89 1582 a b  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did] qui (=ος) e [Lac. Ath]

εκ των ιδιων λαλει P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⚭ B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33  
892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did] omit 579 [Lac. Ath]

<sup>177</sup> A comparison here of Lake's edition of f<sup>1</sup> with the collation by Swanson and the critical editions by Tischendorf, Tregelles, and von Soden indicates Lake's reading of ουχ is most likely inaccurate. For this reason, I have chosen not to follow Lake's reading.

**John 8:56**

ηγαλλιασατο (γαρ φησιν) ινα ιδη<sup>178</sup> την ημεραν την εμην (*Exc.* 18.1) [C]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> Ath Cyr

**John 10:1**

αμην αμην λεγω υμιν, ο μη εισερχομενος δια της θυρας εις την αυλην  
των προβατων αλλα αναβαινων αλλαχοθεν εκεινος κλεπτης εστι  
και ληστης: + (*Strom.* 5.86.4) [C]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C Or Ath Did Cyr

λεγω υμιν P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582  
a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] υμιν λεγω B

αναβαινων αλλαχοθεν P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33  
579 892 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] αλλαχοθεν αναβαινων D

**John 10:2**

+ ο δε εισερχομενος δια της θυρας ποιμην εστι των προβατων +  
(*Strom.* 5.86.4) [C]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C Or Ath Did Cyr

ποιμην εστι P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 a  
(e) TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] αυτος εστιν ο ποιμην D (b); εκεινος εστιν ο ποιμην W

εισερχομενος P<sup>66</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892  
1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] ερχομενος P<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>178</sup> Clement's text reveals the following variant in John 8:56. Since the variant is most likely the result of itacism, the distinction is not included in the apparatus.

ιδη P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did] ειδη  
Ⲱ A B Ω; ηδη Θ [NA: a b e]

**John 10:3**

+ τουτω ο θυρωρος ανοιγει (*Strom.* 5.86.4) [C]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C (Or) Ath Did Cyr

**John 10:7**

(ο κυριος λεγει) εγω ειμι η θυρα των προβατων (*Strom.* 5.86.4) [C]

---

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) C 892 Or Ath Did Cyr

-----  
 η θυρα P<sup>66</sup> & A B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 a b e TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup>] ο ποιμην P<sup>75</sup> [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

**John 10:8**

(ναι φασι γεγραφθαι) παντες οι προ της παρουσιας του κυριου  
 κλεπται εισι και λησται (*Strom.* 1.81.1) [Ad]\*

παντες (ουν) οι προ κυριου κλεπται και λησται (*Strom.* 1.84.7) [Ad]\*

αλλ οι μεν κλεπται παντες και λησται (ως φησιν η γραφη) (*Strom.*  
 1.135.2) [Ad]\*

ταχα δ αν ειεν κλεπται και λησται οι παρ Ελλησι φιλοσοφοι και οι  
 προ της του κυριου παρουσιας παρα των Εβραικων προφητων  
 μερη της αληθειας ου κατ επιγνωσιν λαβοντες (*Strom.* 1.87.2) [All]

ουτος κλεπτης υπο της γραφης ειρηται (*Strom.* 1.100.4) [All]<sup>179</sup>

επει κλεπτας της βαρβαρου φιλοσοφιας Ελληνας ειναι προσειπεν η  
 γραφη (*Strom.* 2.1.1) [All]<sup>180</sup>

---

<sup>179</sup> Although as a rule one-word references are excluded from this study, this reference is cited since its context clearly indicates it is from John 10:8, and Clement uses it as a reference to Scripture.

<sup>180</sup> See the preceding note.

οπως κλεπτας ειρησθαι προς του κυριου τους Ελληνας εξακουστων  
(*Strom.* 5.140.1) [All]<sup>181</sup>

TEXT: παντες ... προ ... κλεπται εισι και λησται

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) C 892 Ath Did Cyr

παντες P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 a e  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] omit D b

προ P<sup>66</sup> Ⲱ<sup>c</sup> A B D L W Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit  
P<sup>45vid</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ<sup>\*</sup> E Δ Ω a b e

### John 10:11

ο γαρ αγαθος ποιμην την ψυχην εαυτου τιθησιν υπερ των προβατων  
(*Paed.* 1.97.3) [Ad]

ο γαρ αγαθος ποιμην την ψυχην τιθησιν υπερ των προβατων  
(*Strom.* 1.169.1) [Ad]

ο γουν ποιμην και των καθ εκαστον κηδεται προβατων (*Strom.*  
6.158.1) [All]

TEXT: ... ο αγαθος ποιμην την ψυχην ... τιθησιν υπερ των  
προβατων

Lac. C 892 Or Ath

τιθησιν P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ<sup>c</sup> A B E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 a e  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did Cyr] διδωσιν P<sup>45</sup> Ⲱ<sup>\*</sup> D b

προβατων P<sup>45vid</sup> P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579  
1582 a TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did Cyr] onibus suis (=προβατων αυτου) b e

-----  
ο αγαθος ποιμην ] ο καλος ποιμην P<sup>45vid</sup> Did; ο ποιμην ο καλος  
P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Cyr; pastor enim (b) / autem (a) bonus (= ο δε καλος ποιμην) a b

<sup>181</sup> See n. 179 above.

**John 10:16**

και γενησονται (φησιν) οι παντες μια ποιμνη και εις ποιμην (*Paed.*  
1.53.3) [Ad]\*

εστιν δε και αλλα<sup>182</sup> (φησιν ο κυριος) προβατα α ουκ εστιν εκ της  
αυλης ταυτης (*Strom.* 6.108.2) [Ad]

TEXT: και αλλα προβατα α ουκ εστιν εκ της αυλης ταυτης ... και  
γενησονται μια ποιμνη και εις ποιμην

Lac. (P<sup>75</sup>) C (33) 892 (Or) Ath

και γενησονται P<sup>45</sup> <sup>ε</sup> B D L W Θ Ψ f<sup>1</sup> 33 1582 UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr<sup>pt</sup>  
και γενησεται P<sup>66</sup> <sup>\*</sup> A E Δ Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> 579 a b e TR; ινα γενωνται  
Did [Lac. P<sup>75</sup>]

και εις ποιμην Δ a b e] εις ποιμην P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> <sup>ε</sup> A B D E L W Θ Π  
Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr; και ποιμην εις Did [Lac. Or]

προβατα ] ad εχω P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> <sup>ε</sup> A B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33  
579 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did Cyr [Lac. Or]

α P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> <sup>ε</sup> A B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Did Cyr] απερ P<sup>45</sup> [Lac. Or]

εστιν P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> <sup>ε</sup> A B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 a b  
e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr] εισιν Did [Lac. Or]

εκ P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>66</sup> <sup>ε</sup> A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Did Cyr] omit W [Lac. P<sup>75</sup> Or]

**John 10:27**

τα δε εμα προβατα της εμης ακουει φωνης (*Strom.* 6.108.3) [Ad]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> C 892 (Or) Ath (Did) Cyr

<sup>182</sup> The loose nature of Clement's citation makes it impossible to know with certainty whether it includes the conjunction δε or not.

ακουει P<sup>75</sup> A D E Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 1582 TR] ακουουσιν P<sup>66</sup> ⋈ B L W  
Θ f<sup>13</sup> 33 a b e UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did; ακουσωσιν 579

\*\*\*\*\*

εμα προβατα Or] προβατα τα εμα P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B D E L W Δ Θ Π  
Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did  
εμης φωνης Or<sup>pt</sup> Did] φωνης μου P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B D E L W Δ Θ Π  
Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or<sup>pt</sup>

### John 11:43

και τω τεθνεωτι Λαζαρε, ειπεν, εξιζι: + (*Paed.* 1.6.3) [All]

---

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) (P<sup>75</sup>) 892 Ath (Did) (Cyr)

### John 11:44

+ ο δε εξηλθεν της γης, ο νεκρος (*Paed.* 1.6.3) [All]

---

Lac. (P<sup>45</sup>) (P<sup>75</sup>) 892 Ath Did Cyr

### John 13:5

και τους ποδας ενιπτεν αυτων σαβανω περιζωσαμενος (*Paed.* 2.38.1)  
[All]

και αυτος ο σωτηρ απονιπτων τους ποδας των μαθητων (*Paed.* 2.63.2)  
[All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> C (33) Ath Did Cyr

### John 13:33

(αυτος εστιν ο ειπων) τεκνια, ετι μικρον μεθ υμων ειμι (*Strom.* 6.104.3)  
[C]

(φησι γαρ) παιδια ετι μικρον μεθ υμων ειμι (*Paed.* 1.13.3) [Ad]\*

τεκνια (φησιν) ολιγον ετι μεθ υμων ειμι (*Strom.* 3.99.2) [Ad]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ath Did Cyr

μικρον P<sup>66</sup> A B C D E W Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 579 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or]  
add χρονον ξ L Θ Ψ f<sup>13</sup> 892

-----  
τεκνια P<sup>66</sup> ξ A B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b e  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or] add μου 579

**John 14:2**

εισι γαρ παρα κυριω και μισθοι και μοναι πλειονες (*Strom.* 4.36.3) [All]

την μονην εκεινην την οφειλομενην (*Strom.* 7.88.3) [All]

-----  
Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Or Ath Did

**John 14:6**

(ο κυριος αυτος ειπεν) εγω ειμι η αληθεια (*Strom.* 1.32.4) [Ad]

εγω (φησιν) ειμι η αληθεια (*Strom.* 5.16.1) [Ad]

ουν ει ο κυριος αληθεια (*Strom.* 2.52.7) [All]

TEXT: εγω ειμι ... η αληθεια

-----  
Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> (Or) (Ath) (Did) Cyr

**John 14:8–9**

εγω σοι δειξω θεου πατρος αγαθου προσωπον (*Quis div.* 23.2) [All]

-----  
Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>75</sup>) C (33) (Or) (Ath) (Did)

**John 14:15**

αγαπα δε Χριστον Ιησουν ο το θελημα αυτου ποιων και φυλασσων  
αυτου τας εντολας (*Quis div.* 29.5) [All]

-----  
Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>75</sup>) C (33) Or Ath Did

**John 15:1**

εγω ειμι η αμπελος η αληθινη, και ο πατηρ μου ο γεωργος εστιν +  
(*Paed.* 1.66.4) [C]

αμπελος δε ο κυριος αλληγορεται (*Strom.* 1.43.2) [All]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> C W 892 (Ath) Did Cyr

ο<sup>2</sup> Ⲡ A B E L Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Ath] omit  
D Δ [NA: a b e]

**John 15:2**

+ (ειτα επιγαγεν παλιν) παν κλημα εν εμοι μη φερων καρπον αιρει  
αυτο, και παν το καρποφορον καθαιρει,<sup>183</sup> ινα καρπον πλειω  
φερη (*Paed.* 1.66.4) [C]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> C W 892 Or Ath (Did) Cyr

καθαιρει a] add αυτο (Ⲡ) A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582  
(b) (e) TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did

καρπον πλειω / πλειονα Ⲡ B L Ψ 33 579 a b e UBS<sup>4</sup>] πλειονα  
καρπον A D E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 TR Did

αυτο Ⲡ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>13</sup> 33 a e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] αυτος 579;  
omit f<sup>1</sup> 1582; add pater (=πατηρ) [Lac. Did]

καρποφορουں ] καρποφορον D a; καρπον φερων Ⲡ (A) B E L Δ  
Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> (33) 579 1582 (b) e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [NA: Lac. Did]

**John 15:5–6**

ουκ εστι κλημα της αι ζωσης υπερουρανιας αμπελου, εκκοπτεται το  
πυρ αθρουν αναμενει (*Quis div.* 37.6) [All]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>66</sup>) P<sup>75</sup> C W (33) 892 (Or) (Ath) (Did) Cyr

<sup>183</sup> Marcovich adds αυτο on the basis of the New Testament.



**John 15:11**

ταυτα λελαληκα υμιν, ινα η χαρα η εμη πληρωθη + (*Strom.* 2.71.2)  
[Ad]<sup>184</sup>

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>66</sup>) P<sup>75</sup> C W 892 Or Ath Did Cyr

-----  
εμη ] add εν υμιν η και η χαρα υμων A B D Θ Π Ψ 579 a b c  
UBS<sup>4</sup>; add εν υμιν μεινη και η χαρα υμων X E L Δ Ω f<sup>13</sup> TR; add η  
εν υμιν και η χαρα υμων 33; εν ημιν η και η χαρα υμων f<sup>1</sup> 1582  
[Lac. P<sup>66</sup>]

**John 15:12**

+ αυτη δε<sup>185</sup> εστιν η εντολη η εμη, ινα αγαπατε αλληλους καθως  
ηγαπησα υμας (*Strom.* 2.71.2) [C]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>66</sup>) P<sup>75</sup> C W (33) 892 Or Ath Did Cyr

-----  
καθως X A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] ως  
P<sup>66</sup> [NA: a b e]

**John 15:13**

ει δε τας ψυχας οφειλομεν τοις αδελφοις (*Quis div.* 37.5) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> C W (33) 892 Or Ath Did Cyr

---

<sup>184</sup> The abbreviated form of this verse makes it impossible to know whether Clement's text omits or includes the introductory conjunction και.

<sup>185</sup> Though Clement's quotation of John 15:12 is part of a continuous quotation, his adaptive use of the previous verse makes it impossible to determine whether his text included the conjunction δε, as it does in f<sup>13</sup>.

**John 15:15**

ουκετι υμας δουλους, αλλα φιλους λεγω (*Strom.* 7.79.1) [Ad]<sup>186</sup>

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> C W (33) 892 (Or) Ath (Did)

**John 16:27**

αυτος γαρ ο πατηρ φιλει υμας, οτι υμεις εμε πεφιληκατε (*Paed.* 1.8.2) [C]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>66</sup>) P<sup>75</sup> 892 Or Ath Did

εμε B C D E W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr] με Ⲡ  
A L [NA: a b e; Lac. P<sup>66</sup>]

**John 17:1–4, 8, 20**

η και ο κυριος ηυχετο, ευχαριστων μεν εφ οις ετελειωσεν την  
διακονιαν, ευχομενος δε ως πλειστους οσους εν επιγνωσει  
γενεσθαι, ιν εν τοις σωζομενοις δια της σωτηριας κατ επιγνωσιν  
ο θεος δοξαζηται (*Strom.* 7.41.7) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> (33) 892 (Or) (Ath) (Did)

**John 17:2**

και μονον ζωης αιωνιου ταμιαν, ην ο υιος διδωσιν ημιν παρ εκεινου  
λαβων (*Quis div.* 6.4) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>66</sup>) P<sup>75</sup> (33) 892 Or Ath Did

---

<sup>186</sup> Clement's adaptation of John 15:15 is, unfortunately, too ambiguous to determine his attestation of the variant readings associated with this portion of the manuscript tradition. The following variants are listed below for information purposes only.

ουκετι υμας λεγω D E Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 TR Or] ουκετι λεγω υμας P<sup>66</sup>  
Ⲡ A B L Ψ 33 579 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr [Lac. Did]  
λεγω P<sup>66</sup> Or] ειρηκα Ⲡ A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr [Lac. Did]

**John 17:3**

το δε αγνοειν τον πατερα θανατος εστιν, ως το γνωναι ζωη αιωνιος  
(*Strom.* 5.63.8) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>66</sup>) P<sup>75</sup> (33) 892 (Or) (Ath)

**John 17:19**

υιος θεου υπερ ημων αγιαζομενος (*Strom.* 5.66.5) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>66</sup>) P<sup>75</sup> 892 Or Did

**John 17:21**

(λογων την ευαγγελιον του κυριου ... λεγει) ινα παντες εν ωσι,  
καθως συ, πατερ<sup>187</sup>, εν εμοι καγω εν σοι, ινα και αυτοι εν ημιν ωσιν,  
ινα και<sup>188</sup> ο κοσμος πιστευη οτι συ με απεστειλας + (*Paed.* 1.71.1) [C]

εν αυτω γαρ ο υιος και εν τω υιω ο πατηρ (*Paed.* 1.53.1) [All]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>66</sup>) P<sup>75</sup> 892 (Ath) (Did)

εν ωσιν Ⲭ A E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 TR Or Ath Did  
Cyr] ωσιν P<sup>66</sup> B C D W a b e UBS<sup>4</sup>

πιστευη P<sup>66</sup> Ⲭ\* B C W UBS<sup>4</sup>] πιστευση Ⲭ<sup>c</sup> A D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup>  
f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 TR Or Cyr [NA a b e; Lac. Ath Did]

---

<sup>187</sup> Clement's text in John 17:21 reveals the following variant concerning the spelling of πατερ:

πατερ Ⲭ A C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr]

πατηρ B D Ω [NA: a b e; Lac. P<sup>66</sup> Or]

<sup>188</sup> It is doubtful that Clement's use of και is genetically significant. While f<sup>1</sup> also attests the same reading, it is unlikely that Clement was relying on a common tradition, since he does not support any of the other distinctive features of f<sup>1</sup>. For this reason, it is not included in the statistical analysis.

-----  
 εν<sup>1</sup> Ⲱ A B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
 Cyr] omit C [Lac. P<sup>66</sup> Or]

\*\*\*\*\*

καθως ... εν σοι Ⲱ A B C D E L W Δ (Θ) Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579  
 1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr] ινα ωσπερ εγω και συ εν εσμεν Ath  
 Did [Lac. P<sup>66</sup> Or]

ινα και αυτοι P<sup>66</sup> Ⲱ A B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582  
 a (b) (e) TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr] ινα και ουτοι Did; κακεινοι Ath

### John 17:22

+ καγω την δοξαν ην εδωκας μοι δεδωκα αυτοις, ινα ωσιν εν καθως  
 ημεις εν: + (Pacd. 1.71.1) [C]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> Ω 892 Or Did

καγω P<sup>66</sup> Ⲱ B C D L W Ψ f<sup>1</sup> 33 1582 (a) (b) (e) UBS<sup>4</sup> Ath Cyr] και  
 εγω A E Δ Θ Π f<sup>13</sup> TR (a) (b) (e); εγω 579

εδωκας A D Θ Π Ψ 579] δεδωκας P<sup>66vid</sup> Ⲱ B C E L W Δ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33  
 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Ath Cyr [NA: a b e]

δεδωκα P<sup>66</sup> B C D E L W Δ Ψ f<sup>1</sup> 33 579 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Ath Cyr]  
 εδωκα Ⲱ A Θ Π f<sup>13</sup> [NA: a b e]

καθως P<sup>66</sup> Ⲱ A B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
 Ath Cyr] add et (=και) a b e

εν<sup>2</sup> P<sup>66</sup> B C D L W f<sup>1</sup> 33 1582 e UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr] add εσμεν Ⲱ<sup>c</sup> A E Δ Θ  
 Π Ψ f<sup>13</sup> a b TR Ath; omit Ⲱ<sup>c</sup> 579

-----  
 δοξαν P<sup>66</sup> Ⲱ A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 a b e TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup> Ath Cyr] add μου W

ωσιν P<sup>66</sup> Ⲱ A B C E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Ath  
 Cyr] add το D [NA: a b e]

**John 17:23**

+ ΕΓΩ ΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΙΣ ΚΑΙ ΣΥ ΕΝ ΕΜΟΙ, ΙΝΑ ΩΣΙ ΤΕΤΕΛΕΙΩΜΕΝΟΙ ΕΙΣ ΕΝ (*Paed.*  
1.71.1) [C]

και ηγαπησας αυτους καθως, εμε ηγαπησας (*Paed.* 1.8.2) [C]

TEXT: ΕΓΩ ΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΙΣ ΚΑΙ ΣΥ ΕΝ ΕΜΟΙ, ΙΝΑ ΩΣΙ ΤΕΤΕΛΕΙΩΜΕΝΟΙ ΕΙΣ ΕΝ ...  
και ηγαπησας αυτους καθως εμε ηγαπησας

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> (Ω) 892 Or Ath Did (Cyr)

εγω P<sup>66</sup> Ⲱ A B C E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582 b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr]  
καγω D 579 a [Lac. Ω]

ηγαπησας<sup>1</sup> P<sup>66</sup> Ⲱ A B C E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 e  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr] ηγαπησα D a b

καθως P<sup>66</sup> Ⲱ A B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr] add et (=και) a b; καμε W

εμε P<sup>66</sup> Ⲱ A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr]  
συ με D a; καμε W; tu (=συ) b

εγω ... εμοι P<sup>66</sup> Ⲱ A B C E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ (f<sup>1</sup>) f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 a b  
(e) TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr] συ εν εμοι καγω εν αυτοις D [Lac. Ω]

εις P<sup>66</sup> Ⲱ A B E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 (a) (b) (e) TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr] add εις C; add το D (a) (b) (e) [Lac. Ω]

ηγαπησας<sup>2</sup> P<sup>66</sup> Ⲱ A B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582 a b e  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr] ηγαπησαν 579<sup>189</sup>

<sup>189</sup> While the variant ηγαπησαν is only found in Swanson's collation, it is included in the apparatus since Swanson's work has been found to be highly reliable in its presentation of other variants. In any case, the reading has no other support and, therefore, has no affect on the analysis of Clement's text.

**John 17:24**

(κύριος ευαγγελιω λεγων) πατερ,<sup>190</sup> ους εδωκας<sup>191</sup> μοι, θελω ινα οπου  
ειμι εγω κακεινοι ωσι μετ εμου, ινα θεωρωσι την δοξαν την εμην,  
ην εδωκας μοι οτι ηγαπησας με προ καταβολης κοσμου + (*Paed.*  
1.71.2) [C]

---

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>66</sup>) P<sup>75</sup> 892 Or Ath Did Cyr

ους A C E L Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582 a b e TR] ο ⋈ B D W 579  
UBS<sup>4</sup>; ου Θ [Lac. P<sup>66</sup>]

κακεινοι ⋈ B C D E L Δ Θ Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] και  
εκεινοι A W Π [NA: a b e; Lac. P<sup>66</sup>]

εδωκας<sup>2</sup> B E Θ Π TR] δεδωκας ⋈ A C D L W Δ Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33  
579 1582 UBS<sup>4</sup> [NA: a b e; Lac. P<sup>66</sup>]

-----  
ειμι εγω ⋈ A B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 a b TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit εγω P<sup>66</sup>; ego fuero (=εγω εσομαι) e

την εμην P<sup>66vid</sup> ⋈ A B C E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 a b e  
TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] omit D

**John 17:25**

+ πατερ<sup>192</sup> δικαιε, και ο κοσμος σε ουκ εγνω, εγω δε σε εγνω,  
κακεινοι εγνωσαν οτι συ με απεστειλας: + (*Paed.* 1.71.2) [C]

---

<sup>190</sup> Clement's text in John 17:24 and 25 reveals the following variant concerning the spelling of πατερ. It is of no significant textual value, so it is not included in the apparatus.

πατερ ⋈ C D E L Ω Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]

πατηρ A B [NA: a b e; Lac. P<sup>66</sup> Cyr]

<sup>191</sup> It is unlikely that Clement's attestation of εδωκας<sup>1</sup> is genetically significant. While the reading does also appear in MSS A, it has been excluded from the textual analysis since Clement does not attest any of the other distinctive features of that manuscript. Thus the agreement between the two appears to be only accidental.

<sup>192</sup> See n. 190 above.

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> 892 Or Ath Did Cyr

σε εγνων **Σ** B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582 (a) (b) (e) TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
εγνων σε W 579; σε εγνωκα D (a) (b) (e); εγνων A

-----  
και ο κοσμος **Σ** A B C E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] ο κοσμος τουτος D; et hic mundus (=και ουτος κοσμος) a;  
mundus (=κοσμος) b

κακεινοι ] και ουτοι **Σ** A B C D E L Ω Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579  
1582 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

### John 17:26

+ και εγνωρισα αυτοις το ονομα σου και γνωρισω (*Paed.* 1.71.2) [C]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>66</sup> P<sup>75</sup> 892 Or Ath Did Cyr

-----  
εγνωρισα **Σ** A B C D E L W Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 a b e TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>] εγνωρισαν Θ

### John 19:17

εβαστασε τα Ξυλα της ιερουργιας ο Ισαακ, ως ο κυριος το Ξυλον  
(*Paed.* 1.23.1) [All]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>66</sup>) P<sup>75</sup> C D Δ 892 (Or) Ath Did Cyr

### John 20:29

μακαριοι (τοινυν) οι μη ιδοντες και πιστευσαντες (*Strom.* 2.9.6) [C]

Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>66</sup>) P<sup>75</sup> (33) 579 892 (Or) Ath Did

ιδοντες **Σ**<sup>c</sup> A B C D E L (W) Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 33 a b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or  
Cyr] add με **Σ**<sup>r</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 [Lac. Π<sup>66</sup>]

-----  
 ιδοντες **Σ** A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or  
 Cyr] ειδοτες W [NA: a b e; Lac. P<sup>66</sup>]

και πιστευσαντες P<sup>66</sup> **Σ** B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582 a  
 b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Cyr] πεπιστευσαντες A

### John 21:4–5

σταθεις, (φησιν), ο κυριος επι τω αιγιαλω προς τους μαθητας  
 (αλιευοντες δε ετυχον) ενεφωνησεν τε, παιδια, μη τι οψον εχετε;  
 (*Paed.* 1.12.2) [Ad]<sup>\*</sup>

-----  
 Lac. P<sup>45</sup> (P<sup>66</sup>) P<sup>75</sup> 579 892 Or Ath Did Cyr

επι **Σ** A D L Θ Ψ 33 (a) (b) (e)] εις B C E Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 1582 (a) (b)  
 (e) TR UBS<sup>4</sup>; omit W [Lac. P<sup>66</sup>]

μη τι A B C D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582 b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>] μη **Σ**  
 W; aliquid (=τι) a [Lac. P<sup>66</sup>]

-----  
 παιδια **Σ** A B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 1582 b e TR UBS<sup>4</sup>]  
 omit A a [Lac. P<sup>66</sup>]



## QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

### INTRODUCTION

While the presentation and collation of Clement's text of the Gospels in the previous chapter provides convenient access to specific readings attested by Clement, it does not provide a clear indication of the overall affinities of his Gospel text. Conclusions about Clement's overall textual affinities require a method of data analysis that examines the whole of Clement's text in each particular Gospel.

Until the middle of the twentieth century, collating a manuscript or a Father against the TR and noting "significant" deviations was the primary method used to determine textual affinity.<sup>1</sup> Studies since then have demonstrated the inadequacy of this approach.<sup>2</sup> In addition to the problems of using an artificial standard like the TR as the base text, a method of data analysis was needed that considered all genetically significant<sup>3</sup> textual variants—not just differences with the TR. Such a method was devised by Ernest C. Colwell in 1959 and refined with the assistance of Ernest Tune in

---

<sup>1</sup> Bart D. Ehrman's article, "Methodological Developments" provides the most comprehensive overview and assessment of the methods used by text critics since John Mill in 1707 for analyzing and classifying New Testament textual witnesses.

<sup>2</sup> Bruce Metzger delivered the *coup de grâce* for this method in his 1945 article, "The Caesarean Text of the Gospels."

<sup>3</sup> Genetically significant textual variants refer only to those readings that indicate a "genealogical" textual relationship among manuscripts. For this reason readings that are attested by only a single witness are excluded from the analysis. In addition, readings that are the result of scribal errors (non-sense readings) or scribal stylistic preferences (e.g., nu-movable, itacism, minor spelling differences, and οὕτω/οὕτως) are also excluded. Larry Richards demonstrates the insignificance of this latter type of variants for establishing genetic textual relationships in his textual study of the Johannine Epistles (see W. Larry Richards, *The Classification of the Greek Manuscripts of the Johannine Epistles* [SBLDS 35; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977], 33–41). Genetically significant variants are indicated in the previous chapter by their presence above the dashed line in the textual apparatus.

1963.<sup>4</sup> Colwell and Tune's method has become the standard method of quantitative analysis for determining the affinities of a Father's text and is applied to Clement's text in this chapter.<sup>5</sup> This method enables a clear

---

<sup>4</sup> See Ernest C. Colwell, "Method in Locating a Newly-Discovered Manuscript within the Manuscript Tradition of the Greek New Testament," in *Studia Evangelica: Papers Presented to the International Congress on "The Four Gospels in 1957" Held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1957* (ed. Kurt Aland et al.; TU 73; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959): 757–77; repr. in idem, *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, 26–44; Ernest C. Colwell, with Ernest W. Tune, "The Quantitative Relationships Between MS Text-Types," in *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey* (ed. J. Neville Birdsall and Robert W. Thomson; Freiburg: Herder, 1963): 25–32; repr. in Colwell, *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, 56–62. The superiority of this method has been demonstrated in numerous subsequent studies: Gordon D. Fee, "Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John"; idem, "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria"; idem, "P<sup>75</sup>, P<sup>66</sup>, and Origen: The Myth of Textual Recension in Alexandria," in *New Dimensions in New Testament Study* (ed. Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenney; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), 19–45; repr. in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (ed. Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee; SD 45; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 247–73; idem, "The Text of John and Mark in the Writings of Chrysostom," *NTS* 26 (1979–80): 525–47; idem, "Origen's Text of the New Testament and the Text of Egypt," *NTS* 28 (1982): 348–64; Larry Hurtado, *Text-Critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981); and Carroll D. Osburn, "The Text of the Pauline Epistles in Hippolytus of Rome," *SecCent* 2 (1982): 97–124.

<sup>5</sup> The pattern of analysis in this chapter follows that originally developed by Ehrman in his work on Didymus. While building on Colwell and Tune's work, Ehrman essentially follows the application of the method as presented in the subsequent work of Fee, "Codex Sinaiticus," and Hurtado, *Text-Critical Methodology*. The superiority and acceptance of the pattern employed by Ehrman as the methodological standard for patristic analysis is demonstrated in its use in the following studies: James Brooks, *The New Testament Text of Gregory of Nyssa* (SBLNTGF 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991); Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes, *Text of the Fourth Gospel* (Holmes has applied this method to Origen's text of John, but the results still await publication); Arthur Cunningham, "Cyril of Alexandria"; Darrell D. Hannah, *The Text of 1 Corinthians in the Writings of Origen* (SBLNTGF 4; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997); Mullen, *Cyril of Jerusalem*; Brogan, "Text of the Gospels"; James Cate, "The Text of the Catholic Epistles and the Revelation in the Writings of Origen" (Ph.D. diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1997); Raquel, "The Text of the Synoptic Gospels"; Jean-François Racine, "The Text of Matthew in the Writings of Basil of Caesarea" (Ph.D. diss., Toronto School of Theology, 2000); and Carroll D. Osburn, *The Text of the Apostolos in Epiphanius of Salamis* (SBLNTGF 6; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004). Though Racine's dissertation has since been published, references to his work are taken from his

comparison of Clement's entire text with the representative textual witnesses listed in the apparatus.

## QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

The quantitative method devised by Colwell and Tune compares the percentage of agreement between textual witnesses in variation units determined to be genetically significant.<sup>6</sup> In practice, this method begins with the collation of a text whose textual affinities are unknown with a number of other witnesses whose textual affinities belong to one of the four major groups of readings, or as they are more commonly called, text-types: Alexandrian, Byzantine, Caesarean, and Western.<sup>7</sup> The agreement and disagreement between the established witnesses and the unknown text in the genetically significant readings are then tabulated and converted into levels of proportional agreement. Next, the proportional level of agreement between the representative manuscripts and the manuscript under investigation are compared to determine if a relationship with one of the established groups can be identified.

An examination of the leading representatives of the different textual groups led Colwell and Tune to conclude that manuscripts could be identified as a distinct textual group if their individual members agreed in approximately 70% of all genetically significant variants and differed with nongroup members by a 10% gap.<sup>8</sup> From this they reasoned that a manuscript's textual affinity could be classified as belonging to one of the established textual families if it shared in that same 70/10 distinction.

While subsequent studies confirm the basic principle of Colwell and Tune's 70/10 rule of thumb, they also show that such a precise distinction is too arbitrary. For example, Larry Richards's quantitative analysis of the Johannine Epistles demonstrates that, instead of imposing an arbitrary rate of agreement, members of each group should determine their own rate of agreement.<sup>9</sup> Ehrman's study of Didymus led to a similar conclusion. Due to

---

unpublished dissertation, since his published volume was not available at the time this study was conducted (Jean-François Racine, *The Text of Matthew in the Writings of Basil of Caesarea* [SBLNTG 5; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004]).

<sup>6</sup> See n. 3 above.

<sup>7</sup> While text critics occasionally differ on the labels they give to each of these major groups of readings, the manuscripts that represent them are commonly accepted. See chapter 3 n. 7.

<sup>8</sup> Colwell and Tune, "Quantitative Relationships," 29.

<sup>9</sup> Richards, *Classification of the Greek Manuscripts*, 43–68. For example, Richards found that there is a 90% agreement between most members of the Byzantine subgroups of the Johannine Epistles, while Alexandrian manuscripts

the fragmentary and random nature of patristic analysis, Ehrman suggests that, when applied to patristic quotations, Colwell and Tune's 70/10 distinction be lowered to a  $\pm 65\%$  agreement among group members, with a margin of only 6–8% with other groups.<sup>10</sup>

While subsequent patristic studies demonstrate the validity of Ehrman's modification of Colwell and Tune's 70/10 rule, Jean-François Racine's more recent examination of Basil of Caesarea's text of Matthew illustrates the need for further refinement when the quantitative method is applied to texts that are lacunose. Racine notes that the comparison of textual relationships expressed as specific percentages provides a false sense of confidence in the accuracy of the results, since there is no consideration of the margin of error due to the size of the sample. The complete accuracy of the results of the quantitative method requires a comparison of the entire text of a manuscript or Father with the entire text of other established manuscripts. This, of course, is impossible, due to the highly lacunose nature of a large number of manuscripts and patristic citations. The evaluation of such texts requires, therefore, the use of samples. The use of samples, however, introduces the possibility of error, since the sample may not be representative of the whole. Statistical analysis acknowledges this possibility by qualifying the accuracy of results in terms of error correction. Generally speaking, the larger the sample size, the smaller the margin of error due to sample size.

Racine's study is the first patristic textual analysis to include the possible range of error correction with the use of quantitative analysis. One should not conclude, however, that the failure to consider the possible margin of error in patristic studies previous to Racine renders those results invalid. One merely needs to recognize that such specific results are not necessarily as clear-cut as the statistics might indicate—especially when the size of the sample is particularly small. The inclusion of error correction along with the proportional results helps to counter any sense of false accuracy that the results might imply. Fortunately, the majority of recent patristic studies do not base their conclusions solely on the proportional levels of agreement identified through quantitative analysis.<sup>11</sup> Racine made use of the basic

---

tended to agree in 70% of all variation. It should be noted, however, that the latter did confirm Colwell and Tune's basic distinction.

<sup>10</sup> Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind*, 202, 222.

<sup>11</sup> This is not the case with two recent studies on Origen completed at the New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary: James Cate's "The Text of the Catholic Epistles and the Revelation in the Writings of Origen," and Sylvie Raquel's "The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Writings of Origen." More about this will be said in the following chapter's discussion of the comprehensive profile method.

formula for determining standard deviation.<sup>12</sup> This same method is applied in this chapter to the quantitative analysis of Clement's text of the Gospels.

The formula for calculating the possible margin of error due to the use of samples is as follows:<sup>13</sup>

$$\sigma_p = \sqrt{\frac{p(100 - p)}{n - 1}} \cdot t_{0.05, n}$$

In the formula above  $s_p$  represents the standard deviation of the percentage distribution,  $p$  is the percentage of agreement reached by quantitative analysis,  $n$  is the size of the sample, and  $t$  represents the standard normal value at a 95% confidence interval.

There are four principle steps involved in calculating the standard deviation. For the sake of example, these steps are illustrated by a comparison of Clement's text of Matthew and UBS<sup>4</sup>. First, one determines the size of the sample ( $n$ ), which, in this case, is the total number of shared readings between the UBS<sup>4</sup> and Clement: 118. Second, the number of agreements between the representative witnesses and Clement are tabulated and converted into a percentage ( $p$ ). In this case, Clement and the UBS<sup>4</sup> agree in 74 of the 118 units of variation for a total rate of agreement of 62.7%. The size of the sample ( $n$ ) and the overall agreement ( $p$ ) are then applied to the first part of the formula, which is listed below.

$$s_p = \sqrt{\frac{62.7(100 - 62.7)}{118 - 1}} = \sqrt{\frac{62.7(37.3)}{117}} = \sqrt{19.98897} = 4.47$$

Now that the standard deviation ( $s_p$ ) has been calculated, the margin of error needs to be determined by multiplying the standard deviation times the second part of the formula ( $t_{0.05, n}$ ). The "t" stands for the "T-score" and refers to the standardized scores found in a distribution of t chart. These scores are used to calculate the amount of standard deviation from the sample

<sup>12</sup> The standard deviation formula can be found in most statistical handbooks: e.g., Chester H. McCall Jr., *Sampling and Statistics Handbook for Research* (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1982), 43–49, 118–30.

<sup>13</sup> The second part of this formula is modified slightly from its form in Racine's study. The changes were made to better express the values under consideration and due to the fluctuating small sample size of Clement's text. These differences are explained in the discussion of the second half of the formula.

mean. The T-score is found by first choosing a confidence interval for the results. While any confidence level can be chosen, this study uses the 95% level, since it is one of the confidence levels most commonly used. If a smaller confidence level was chosen, the margin of error would decrease, but the possibility of inaccuracy would increase. In this case, the 95% confidence level means that there is a 95% certainty that if both manuscripts were compared in full (not just sample passages), the actual level of agreement between them would fall within the margin of error limits. The 0.05 following the letter t in the formula represents this degree of confidence.

The subscript n in the final part of the formula deserves consideration at this point. The n refers to the size of the sample. In his discussion of the error calculation formula, Racine makes a distinction between two different charts used to determine the margin of error, the Z-table and the distribution of T-table.<sup>14</sup> According to Racine, the Z-table should be the standard chart consulted for the second half of the margin of error formula, unless the size of the sample is inferior to thirty. In the latter case, he notes the T-table is more accurate. Racine's distinction between the two charts is not really necessary. In reality, there is so little difference between the two tables when the sample size is greater than thirty that it makes little sense to switch back and forth between the two.<sup>15</sup> This, of course, was not a problem for Racine, since the majority of the readings he compares with Basil are well over 500.<sup>16</sup> Due to the fluctuating number of readings preserved by church fathers, a formula that is consistent, regardless of the sample size, is needed for use in future patristic studies. For this reason, it makes more sense to use the T-table in the formula, since it has been shown to provide a more accurate assessment of smaller sample sizes and has virtually no difference with the Z-table when the sample size is greater than thirty.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Racine, "Text of Matthew," 259.

<sup>15</sup> John Bell, "Statistics for Practical People," online: <http://proaxis.com/~johnbell/sfpp/sfpp6.htm>. For a discussion on the effect of an increased sample size and the corresponding decrease in variation, see David S. Moore and George P. McCabe, *Introduction to the Practice of Statistics* (4th ed.; New York: Freeman, 2003), 264.

<sup>16</sup> Of the twenty-three witnesses Racine examines, only four share fewer than 500 readings with Basil: the Old Latin MSS e (174) and k (284), the corrections made to **κ** (77), and the 54 readings shared with Gregory of Nyssa. In any case, even these readings do not drop below thirty.

<sup>17</sup> It is also well documented that the Z-score is often more difficult to work with, since half of its scores will be negative and half will be positive. The T-score eliminates this disadvantage by modifying the Z-score so it never has a negative number (see, e.g., McCall, *Sampling and Statistics*, 54–56). The distribution of t table can be found in most statistical handbooks, although sometimes a chart that lists the

When the second half of the formula is applied to the example, the following results: The number from the T-table for a 95% confidence level with a sample size of 118 is 1.960.<sup>18</sup> The possible margin of error is then determined by multiplying the standard deviation of 4.47 ( $s_p$ ) by 1.96 ( $t$ ). The result of 8.8 indicates there is a 95% certainty that a 62.7% rate of agreement exists between Clement and UBS<sup>4</sup> with a margin of error of  $\pm 8.8\%$ .

#### CLEMENT'S TEXTUAL AFFINITIES IN MATTHEW

An examination of the critical apparatus in the previous chapter reveals that Clement, like many early Christians, appears to have a preference for the Gospel of Matthew more than any other canonical Gospel. The aggregate number of his quotations, adaptations, and allusions to Matthew equals more than 270—nearly double the number of times he refers to either Luke or John. When these references are collated against the representative witnesses in Matthew, 118 genetically significant variants are identified. Table 1 reveals the results of the quantitative analysis where each of the individual witnesses is ranked according to its proportional rate of agreement with Clement in these units of variation.

One of the most immediate observations from the results in table 1 is the high level of error correction attached to each of the witnesses. The highest margin of error is 30.9% (Athanasius); the lowest is 8.8%. While the majority of the witnesses have a margin of error around 8–9%, these levels are still nearly triple those found in Racine's study of Basil.<sup>19</sup> As noted previously, the high margin of error levels is a result of the relatively small number of passages available for analysis. Though these correction levels are higher than ideal, they should not obviate analysis. On the contrary, they should remind us that the sporadic and fragmentary nature of patristic citations generally results in a relatively small number of passages for analysis. In fact, of the recent patristic studies, only Origen, Basil, and Cyril

---

various scores for all sample sizes below thirty is more difficult to find. The chart accessed for this study is from Ronald A. Fisher, *Statistical Tables* (6th ed.; New York: Hafner, 1963), 46.

<sup>18</sup> While the T-score by which the error correction is determined will vary when the sample size is thirty or less, it seems best to use the standard T-score of 1.960 (as Racine appears to do, regardless of the sample size) when the number is larger. This seems best for two reasons: (1) the difference between the T-scores when the sample size is larger than thirty is so minute that no more specific calculation is necessary; and (2) most T-tables provide very few specific T-scores when the sample size is greater than thirty.

<sup>19</sup> Racine, "Text of Matthew," 262.

TABLE 1

Witnesses Ranked According to Proportional Agreement with  
Clement in Genetically Significant Variation in Matthew  
(118 Units of Variation)

Rank	MSS	Total Ag.	Total Var.	% Ag.	Marg. Error
1.	Ath	7	9	77.8%	30.9%
2.	Or	43	65	66.2%	11.6%
3.	ⲁ	73	116	62.9%	8.8%
4.	UBS <sup>4</sup>	74	118	62.7%	8.8%
5.	Π	68	109	62.4%	9.1%
6.	TR	73	118	61.9%	8.8%
7.	Ω	72	118	61.0%	8.8%
8.	B	71	117	60.7%	8.9%
9.	C	46	76	60.5%	11.1%
10.	E	70	117	59.8%	8.9%
11.	k	31	52	59.6%	13.5%
12.	Δ	67	114	58.8%	9.1%
13.	D	61	105	58.1%	9.5%
14.	Did	22	38	57.9%	15.9%
15.	892	67	118	56.8%	9.0%
	33	63	111	56.8%	9.3%
16.	Θ	65	116	56.0%	9.1%
	f <sup>13</sup>	65	116	56.0%	9.1%
17.	ⲁ <sup>c</sup>	66	118	55.9%	9.0%
	f <sup>1</sup>	66	118	55.9%	9.0%
18.	1582	64	116	55.2%	9.1%



Table 1 (cont.)

Rank	MSS	Total Ag.	Total Var.	% Ag.	Marg. Error
19.	L	56	105	53.3%	9.6%
20.	a	47	96	49.0%	10.1%
21.	c	20	42	47.6%	15.3%
22.	b	47	100	47.0%	9.8%
23.	A	7	15	46.7%	27.6%

produce a large enough number of citations that allow for smaller error correction levels.<sup>20</sup> So, while a larger sample of Clement's text would be a desideratum, the evidence that is available can still provide valuable insight into the relationship of Clement's text with the leading representatives of the major textual groups.<sup>21</sup>

The limited number of citations in Clement does, however, render of little use the presentation of a table containing the full quantitative analysis of all the witnesses to one another in the units of variation identified. As Ehrman concludes in his study on Didymus, the limited and sporadic nature of patristic citations does not provide enough data to assess the overall relationship between the individual witnesses themselves.<sup>22</sup> The latter can only be done successfully when comparing substantial portions of the continuous text of one manuscript with the continuous text of another manuscript. While members of the textual families, like the Alexandrian witnesses, would still share some level of agreement, the arbitrary nature of the passages would lead to inconsistent results. An example of this is seen in Brogan's study of Athanasius, where in 76 units of variation in Matthew the UBS<sup>4</sup> agrees more with the Byzantine witness A (91.7%) than any other

<sup>20</sup> Raquel's study of Origen's text of Matthew reveals 758 genetically significant variants; Ehrman, Holmes, and Fee's analysis of Origen in John 815; and Cunningham 848 in John.

<sup>21</sup> While Clement has a smaller number of variants than Origen, Basil, and Cyril, the number is comparable to the variants in Didymus and Athanasius (Matthew: Clement 118; Didymus 163; Athanasius 76; Mark: Clement 47; Didymus 10; Athanasius 1; Luke: Clement 143; Didymus 125; Athanasius 30; John: Clement 72; Didymus 128; Athanasius 131).

<sup>22</sup> Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind*, 201–202.

witness.<sup>23</sup> Since such a presentation would add little to this study, a full quantitative analysis of all the witnesses to one another in the identified units of variation is not included for any of the four Gospels.

When the proportional relationships of the witnesses in table 1 are analyzed, the first thing that stands out is the close relationship Clement shares with two of the leading Alexandrian fathers. The top two witnesses in closest agreement with Clement are Athanasius (77.8%) and Origen (66.2%). While the third Alexandrian father, Didymus, follows at a further distance (57.9%), his relationship with Clement is still closer than that of over half of the other manuscripts. This suggested relationship with Clement is of special consideration, since scholars have wondered whether the church fathers in Alexandria shared a common textual tradition.

While this high level of agreement with Clement in Matthew may suggest a close textual relationship exists between these Alexandrian fathers, the relatively small number of shared readings with Athanasius (9) and Didymus (38), plus their consequently high margin of error levels, preclude any kind of categorical conclusion based on this evidence alone. But even with this caveat in mind, it is still interesting to note that Clement's relationship with Origen is based on a much larger number of passages. Furthermore, the gap between witnesses increases to much more significant levels when any of the other witnesses are compared. After Origen, Clement's next closest relationship is with the Primary Alexandrian witness **ⲁ**, which is separated by a gap of 3.3%. The largest gap increases to 19.2% with the Western witness **b**.<sup>24</sup>

Outside of his agreement with Athanasius and Origen, the manuscripts in table 1 fall into four basic groups. A handful of Primary Alexandrian and Byzantine witnesses dominate the top of the list and are followed by a mixture of Byzantine and Western witnesses, then more uniform groups of Secondary Alexandrian, Caesarean, and finally Western readings at the bottom.

Clement's closest agreement is with a cluster of manuscripts ranked third to ninth. As just noted, these seven witnesses are divided between Alexandrian (**ⲁ**, UBS<sup>4</sup>, **B**, **C**) and Byzantine (**Π**, **TR**, **Ω**) witnesses. Of this mixed group, Clement's closest level of agreement is with two of the leading Primary Alexandrian witnesses, **ⲁ** (62.9%) and UBS<sup>4</sup> (62.7%). Even though his first

<sup>23</sup> While Brogan provides a chart of the complete quantitative analysis of all the witnesses with one another for each of the four Gospels, the chart serves no real purpose to his study. In each case, the chart is merely identified with no further discussion or reference to its findings. See Brogan, "Text of the Gospels," 187–88, 199–201, 208–9.

<sup>24</sup> As is noted later, MS **A** is not included in this calculation due to the unreliable nature of its testimony.

group of witnesses is made up of mostly Alexandrian witnesses, it does not necessarily mean that Clement has another “Alexandrian” connection.<sup>25</sup> The entire group of Alexandrian and Byzantine witnesses is separated at most by a mere 2.4% (from  $\aleph$  at 62.9% to C at 60.5%), and, with the exception of MS C, they all also share virtually the same margin of error level, about  $\pm 8.8\%$ . Thus it can only be said that Clement’s closest agreement is with a mixture of Alexandrian and Byzantine witnesses.

The cluster of witnesses ranked 10<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup> reveals a mixed group of Byzantine (E,  $\Delta$ ), and Western witnesses (k, D). At most, these witnesses are separated by 1.7% (from E at 59.8% to D at 58.1%). With the exception of the Old Latin MS k, these witnesses share virtually the same margin of error, about  $\pm 9.0\%$ . The highest margin of error level belongs to MS k at 13.5%. While MS k only preserves 44% of the total number of readings under consideration, its level of agreement (59.6%) is separated by only 1.5% from Codex Bezae. Since Codex Bezae preserves a far greater number of readings (105 vs. 52), it is unlikely the percentage of agreement represented by MS k is inaccurate.

In contrast to the similarity of agreement between Codex Bezae and k, the remaining so-called Western witnesses e, a, and b form a clear block together at the bottom of the list, with a much lower rate of agreement (49.0%, 47.6%, and 47.0%). While this split among the Western witnesses might lead to the conclusion that the margins of error levels reflect an actual

---

<sup>25</sup> While previous patristic studies demonstrate the relationship between Athanasius and Didymus to the Alexandrian text-type, these Fathers are not included as representational witnesses of the Alexandrian text in this study. It seemed best to exclude them due to the small number of their shared readings with Clement, the possibility of the existence of unique readings shared in common among the Alexandrian fathers in opposition to all text-types, and the circular logic involved in using Alexandrian fathers to determine the nature of those manuscripts identified as the Alexandrian text-type. While Sylvie Raquel’s reconstruction of Origen’s text of the Synoptic Gospels is relied on in this study, her conclusions regarding his textual affinities are not. Raquel’s conclusion that Origen’s strongest textual affinity in Matthew is with the witness f<sup>1</sup> is highly questionable for two reasons: (1) her quantitative analysis relies on an inadequate number of representational witnesses (e.g., the Western text is represented only by D, and C and L are the only witnesses for Secondary Alexandrian readings); and, more seriously, (2) her conclusions depend solely on quantitative analysis. The latter is particularly surprising, since it is well-documented that due to the possibility of accidental agreement among manuscripts a document cannot be reliably classified unless one also considers its attestation of characteristic group readings. See Ehrman, “Methodological Developments,” 40–41. The importance of supplementing the results of quantitative analysis with group profiles is discussed more fully in the following chapter.

closer level of agreement among them, this is probably not the case. The large variation between the proportional levels of agreement among the Western witnesses is more likely due to the uncontrolled nature of the so-called Western text in early Christianity. Such variation among Western witnesses is a consistent feature of patristic citations.<sup>26</sup> This characteristic of the Western witnesses does little to explain the combination of these witnesses, however, since the Western witnesses, in spite of the variation among themselves, are often still grouped together, separate from the other witnesses.<sup>27</sup>

The next group of witnesses ranked fifteenth to nineteenth is made up of four Secondary Alexandrian witnesses (892, 33, 8<sup>c</sup>, and L), and four Caesarean (Θ, f<sup>13</sup>, f<sup>1</sup>, and 1582). While the witnesses in this group are separated at most by a break of 4.8% from the previous group (892 at 1.3% to L at 4.8%), a gap easily overcome within the limits of the margin of error, the common textual affinity between the Secondary Alexandrian and Caesarean text-types, combined with the position they share toward the end of the list, indicates that these witnesses exert a smaller influence on Clement's text than that of the previous group.

As mentioned previously, the next three witnesses, ranked twentieth to twenty-second are the Western witnesses e, a, and b. Although these Western witnesses appear as a block at the bottom of the list, the presence of the other Western witnesses in the upper portion of the list still testifies to the puzzling combination of these witnesses.

The final witness at the bottom of the list is the Byzantine manuscript A. Due to the small and fragmentary nature of its testimony, Ehrman and Brogan exclude the testimony of this manuscript from their respective studies of Didymus<sup>28</sup> and Athanasius.<sup>29</sup> This study also reaches the same conclusion about the reliability of manuscript A. The manuscript is of little use for determining Clement's textual affinities in Matthew, since it preserves less than 13% of the variants. The problems associated with such a

---

<sup>26</sup> Ehrman notes this phenomenon among the Western witnesses in his study of Didymus (see *Didymus the Blind*, 192), and similar results can be found in more recent patristic studies (e.g., Brogan, "Text of the Gospels," 190, 202, 210–11; Racine, "Text of Matthew," 262). For a discussion of the problem associated with the nature of Western readings, and the problems they pose for labeling the so-called Western witnesses as a text-type, see Ehrman, "The Text of the Gospels at the End of the Second Century," in *Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunel Colloquium, June 1994* (ed. D. C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux; NTTS 22; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 101–2.

<sup>27</sup> See, for example, Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind*, 192.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 190–91.

<sup>29</sup> Brogan, "Text of the Gospels," 189.

small sample are collaborated by its correspondingly high margin of error level of  $\pm 27.6\%$ . In addition, manuscript A is not even remotely close to agreeing with the percentage of agreement shared by the remaining Byzantine witnesses (E, Π, TR, Δ, Ω). The smallest break between MS A and its nearest Byzantine witness is 12.1% (Δ at 58.8% and A at 46.7%). In spite of the shared conclusion with Ehrman and Brogan on the reliability of A, there is one interesting difference with this study. Whereas A ranks as the highest percentage of agreement in Ehrman's and Brogan's respective lists, it falls to the bottom of Clement's list.

The mixed combination of witnesses with no significant gap between most of them in table 1 obscures a clear assessment of Clement's textual affinities. This problem is somewhat ameliorated when the witnesses are arranged according to their textual groups. Table 2 provides the combined percentages of agreement of each individual witness with the other witnesses from their respective textual groups.<sup>30</sup>

While the combined levels of proportional agreement among textual groups in table 2 helps to identify Clement's textual affinities more clearly, they also continue to reveal the puzzling nature of his text. Surprisingly, Clement has no clear-cut agreement with one particular textual group. Instead, his highest level of agreement is almost split between the Primary Alexandrian group (62.1%) and the Byzantine group (60.8%)—a margin of only 1.3%. Clement's agreement with an early strand of the Byzantine tradition is not really that surprising, however, since some Byzantine readings are present among the early papyri.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Due to the problems associated with its reliable testimony, MS A is excluded from this chart. While the UBS<sup>4</sup> and the TR are not ancient witnesses themselves, it seemed best to include them throughout this study since their eclectic texts clearly represent the Alexandrian and Byzantine text-types, respectively. Furthermore, on the basis of the assessment of Brogan's study of Athanasius, Ⲛ<sup>c</sup> has also been included as a Secondary Alexandrian witness. In all three of these cases, calculations are provided both with and without these witnesses.

<sup>31</sup> In his study of P<sup>46</sup>, Zuntz found a number of readings in agreement with later Byzantine readings. While some of these readings were discarded as late, when they recur in Western witnesses he argues they reproduce an ancient reading from before "the emergence of separate Eastern and Western traditions" (Gunther Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum* [London: British Academy, 1953], 55–57, 150–51). This is a significant point, since Westcott and Hort discard Byzantine readings *en bloc* as late and secondary. It should be pointed out, however, that the presence of some Byzantine readings in early papyri does not point to the existence of an early Byzantine text-type, as Harry Sturz mistakenly concludes (*The Byzantine Text-Type and New Testament Textual Criticism* [Nashville: Nelson, 1984]). The Byzantine text-type only appears several hundred years later, around the time of Chrysostom, when Byzantine readings are no longer occasional

TABLE 2

Proportional Agreement with Clement Arranged  
by Textual Group in Matthew

<u>ALEXANDRIAN</u>	<u>Agreements</u>	<u>Variants</u>	<u>% Agree</u>	<u>Mg. Err.</u>
Primary Alexandrian				
UBS <sup>4</sup>	74	44	62.7%	8.8%
$\aleph^*$	73	43	62.9%	8.8%
B	71	46	60.7%	8.9%
Totals	218	133	62.1%	5.1%
Totals (w/o UBS <sup>4</sup> )	144	89	61.8%	6.3%
Secondary Alexandrian				
C	46	30	60.5%	11.1%
L	56	49	53.3%	9.6%
33	63	48	56.8%	9.3%
892	67	51	56.8%	9.0%
Totals (w/o $\aleph^c$ )	232	178	56.6%	4.8%
$\aleph^c$	66	52	55.9%	9.0%
Totals (w/ $\aleph^c$ )	298	230	56.4%	4.2%
Average Alexandrian (w/ UBS <sup>4</sup> and $\aleph^c$ )	516	363	58.7%	3.3%
<u>CAESAREAN</u>				
$\Theta$	65	51	56.0%	9.1%
f <sup>1</sup>	66	52	55.9%	9.0%
f <sup>13</sup>	65	51	56.0%	9.1%
1582	64	52	55.2%	9.1%
Totals	260	206	55.8%	4.5%

---

but begin to appear as the dominant readings in manuscripts. Zuntz's conclusion is far more likely: some Byzantine readings must be ancient, and the later Byzantine text originated not as a creation but as a process of choosing between early readings.

Table 2 (cont.)

<u>BYZANTINE</u>	<u>Agreements</u>	<u>Variants</u>	<u>% Agree</u>	<u>Mg. Err.</u>
TR	73	45	61.9%	8.8%
E	70	47	59.8%	8.9%
Δ	67	47	58.8%	9.1%
Π	68	41	62.4%	9.1%
Ω	72	46	61.0%	8.8%
Totals	350	226	60.8%	4.0%
Totals (w/o TR)	277	181	60.5%	4.5%

  

<u>WESTERN</u>				
D	61	44	58.1%	9.5%
a	47	49	49.0%	10.1%
b	47	53	47.0%	9.8%
c	20	22	47.6%	15.3%
k	31	21	59.6%	13.5%
Totals	206	189	52.2%	4.9%

The next closest level of agreement also reveals no statistical difference between Clement's agreement with the Caesarean group (55.8%) and the Secondary Alexandrian group (56.4%). Since scholarship clearly connected the Caesarean tradition only to the Gospel of Mark, little should be made of this lack of distinction. Clement shows the least agreement with the Western witnesses (52.2%).

Before drawing any conclusions on Clement's textual affinities in Matthew, the results from table 2 call attention to an important question that needs to be considered. Does the low level of Clement's proportional agreements necessitate a further revision of Colwell and Tune's group classification level, even beyond Ehrman's suggested adjustment to 65%? In the case of Clement's citations, at least in Matthew, the answer appears to be a cautious yes. Even though Clement's level of agreement falls slightly short of 65%, the difference easily falls into the level allowed by error correction. In addition, outside of the close level of agreement between the Primary Alexandrian and Byzantine witnesses, the remaining textual groups almost completely fall within the suggested 6–8% margin of difference. The largest margin is with the Western witnesses at 9.6%, followed by the Caesarean at 6%. The only group that does not reach the 6–8% level is the Secondary Alexandrian witnesses, and in their case, they are only off by less than one half of a percent (5.7%)—hardly significant.

While the quantitative analysis indicates that Clement's text is clearly not Western, Caesarean, or even Secondary Alexandrian, it is not able to determine conclusively if it is predominantly Primary Alexandrian or Byzantine. Why is this the case? There are several possibilities: (1) there is simply not enough available evidence to clearly classify Clement's text of Matthew; (2) Clement's textual affinities are obscured by block mixture; or (3) Clement's extant text of Matthew represents a stage in the earliest history of the transmission of the text when a number of early Byzantine readings were present within some streams of the Alexandrian text. If the latter is true, it could be significant for our understanding of the history of the transmission of the New Testament text.

Since a comparable amount of evidence proved to be sufficient for clearly establishing the textual affinities of Didymus and Athanasius, the likelihood of the first possible conclusion is questionable. The possibility of block mixture can also be eliminated, since an examination of Clement's textual references throughout all four Gospels fails to identify a clear grouping of references. By default, the only option that seems plausible is that Clement's text reflects a stream within the Alexandrian tradition in which a number of early Byzantine readings were still present. The validity of these conclusions will be reevaluated after group readings are assessed in the next chapter.

#### CLEMENT'S TEXTUAL AFFINITIES IN MARK

Determining patristic relationships with the Gospel of Mark is particularly difficult. Since Matthew and Luke share most of the material in Mark, there is little distinctly Markan material available for textual analysis. Thus, unless a church father specifically refers to a passage as originating from Mark, Markan references cannot usually be identified with certainty. Ehrman's study, for example, identifies only ten references to Mark in Didymus,<sup>32</sup> and Brogan's only one in the writings of Athanasius!<sup>33</sup> The case would be similar with Clement, if not for his block reference to Mark 10:17–31 in his exposition of the rich man who came to Jesus.<sup>34</sup> Yet even when passages are identified with Mark, the number of genetically significant variants is usually so small that the results cannot be relied upon with complete confidence without further evidence. In the case of Clement, however, the reliability of

<sup>32</sup> Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind*, 88–90.

<sup>33</sup> Brogan, "Text of the Gospels," 116.

<sup>34</sup> Outside of Mark 10:17–31, there are only two places where Clement clearly refers to the text of Mark: one is a quotation from 8:38; the other is a distant allusion to 9:29.



the results may be improved if they reflect the proportional agreements identified with his usage elsewhere.

While Clement's reference to Mark 10:17–31 provides a substantially large portion of text for analysis, it also raises questions about its reliability. Such a large block reference from the New Testament, not intermingled within Clement's exposition, opens the possibility of textual corruption during the process of transmission.<sup>35</sup> It is a well-known fact that at times scribes in the Middle Ages altered the text they were copying to bring it into conformity to the text they were more acquainted with. The fact that a quotation of this size could have been modified does not mean it was altered. M. Jack Suggs has pointed out that, while some scribes did not copy their texts with the greatest degree of accuracy, others *were* more accurate.<sup>36</sup> Thus the question of the reliability of this passage can be answered only by an examination of the internal evidence within the passage itself.

An examination of the passage from Mark 10 indicates that it is unlikely that it was subject to major alternation by scribes during transmission. This is apparent for several reasons. First, if later scribes had altered the passage, one would expect the text to bear a very strong resemblance to the predominant text of the later church, the Byzantine text. This is not the case. On the contrary, the passage contains a number of different types of readings similar to what was seen in Clement's text of Matthew. As the quantitative analysis will demonstrate, although the passage does have a stronger proclivity to the Western witnesses than to the other witnesses, it still falls short of the 65% level of agreement typically used in classifying a textual group. Second, while the passage functions as a quotation from Mark, some of the verses are more like an allusion, or an adaptation, than a precise quotation (e.g., 10:25, 27). If the passage had been altered, these verses would have been the ones most likely subject to scribal emendation. Instead, the loose nature of these quotations most likely indicates Clement loosely quoted the passage from memory.<sup>37</sup> In addition, verses 29 and 30 are quoted in exactly the same form in latter sections of Clement's exposition (*Quis div.* 22.1 and 25.1). While in theory a scribe could have changed these references as well, it seems unlikely since these passages also do not bear a resemblance to a particular text-type. In light of these textual characteristics, the passage appears to be a reliable indication of what Clement actually wrote.

---

<sup>35</sup> Fee, "The Use of Greek Patristic Citations," 355.

<sup>36</sup> M. Jack Suggs, "The Use of Patristic Evidence in the Search for a Primitive New Testament Text," *NTS* 4 (1957–58): 139–47.

<sup>37</sup> On the loose nature of this citation, see Aland, "Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri," 119–20; see also chapter 2 n. 21 and chapter 4 n. 63.

Table 3 reveals the results of the quantitative analysis of Clement's text of Mark. As was the case with Matthew, each of the individual witnesses is ranked according to its percentage of agreement with Clement. The quotation from Mark 8:38 and the verses from Mark 10 reveal a total of 47 genetically significant units of variation. While the number of variants is considerably larger than those found in the studies of Mark in Didymus or Athanasius, it is still far below the ideal size—although the number is even larger than the size used by Brogan for his analysis of Athanasius's text of Luke.<sup>38</sup> Due to the smaller number of references identified in Mark, the margin of error levels are nearly double those found in the analysis of Matthew.

The chart reveals several interesting observations. First of all, though the Alexandrian father Origen is not the highest level of agreement, he still ranks fourth in the list at 60%. Unfortunately, there is no evidence available for assessing Clement's relationship with Didymus or Athanasius in Mark. As indicated by a margin of error of  $\pm 59.9\%$ , the small size of shared readings between Clement and Origen (3/5) renders the certainty of the results highly suspect.

Unlike the clusters of textual traditions in Matthew, no consistent pattern of agreement exists between the witnesses. The witnesses ranked first to eighth present a mixture of Caesarean ( $f^{13}$ ), Western (b, D, k), Byzantine (TR, E,  $\Omega$ ), and Secondary Alexandrian (892) witnesses. These witnesses are separated at most by a margin of 6.1%. As was the case in Matthew, none of the witnesses reach the 65% level of agreement suggested for group classification.

The next group of witnesses ranked ninth to twelfth also reveals another mixture of textual witnesses—one Byzantine (A), two Primary Alexandrian ( $\aleph$ , UBS<sup>4</sup>), one Western (a), two Secondary Alexandrian (579, C), and two Caesarean ( $f^1$ , 1582) witnesses. A gap of 2.1% separates these witnesses (A at 53.2% and 1582 at 51.1%).

The final group of witnesses ranked thirteenth to eighteenth includes one Byzantine witness ( $\Pi$ ), five Secondary Alexandrian witnesses (33, L,  $\aleph^C$ ,  $\Psi$ ,  $\Delta$ ), one Primary Alexandrian witness ( $\aleph$ ), and one Caesarean witness ( $\Theta$ ). In spite of the lower level of agreement found in this group, the high margin of error attached to each witness should again point to the fluid nature of the rankings. In addition, the enormous margin of error levels of 80.1% and 215.2% for the Secondary Alexandrian witnesses 33 and L suggest that they be excluded from the analysis, since they share less than one-thirteenth of the total number of readings under consideration.

---

<sup>38</sup> Brogan's study identifies only 30 units of genetic significance in Luke ("Text of the Gospels," 202).

TABLE 3

Witnesses Ranked According to Proportional Agreement with  
Clement in Genetically Significant Variation in Mark  
(47 Units of Variation)

Rank	MSS	Total Ag.	Total Var.	% Ag.	Marg. Error
1.	f <sup>13</sup>	28	44	63.6%	14.4%
2.	b	26	41	63.4%	14.9%
3.	TR	29	47	61.7%	14.0%
	E	29	47	61.7%	14.0%
4.	Or	3	5	60.0%	59.9%
5.	892	28	47	59.6%	14.2%
6.	Ω	19	32	59.4%	17.3%
7.	D	27	46	58.7%	14.4%
8.	k	23	40	57.5%	15.5%
9.	A	25	47	53.2%	14.6%
	B	25	47	53.2%	14.4%
	UBS <sup>4</sup>	25	47	53.2%	14.4%
10.	a	20	38	52.6%	16.1%
11.	579	24	46	52.2%	14.6%
12.	C	24	47	51.1%	14.4%
	f <sup>1</sup>	24	47	51.1%	14.4%
	1582	24	47	51.1%	14.4%
13.	Π	23	46	50.0%	14.6%
	33	2	4	50.0%	80.1%

Table 3 (cont.)

Rank	MSS	Total Ag.	Total Var.	% Ag.	Marg. Error
	L	1	2	50.0%	215.2%
	ⲛ	21	42	50.0%	15.3%
14.	ⲛ <sup>C</sup>	22	45	48.9%	14.8%
	Ψ	22	45	48.9%	14.8%
15.	Δ	21	45	46.7%	14.7%
16.	Θ	20	46	43.5%	14.5%
17.	e	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
	Ath	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
	Did	0	0	0.0%	0.0%

Clement's textual relationships in Mark become more clear when the witnesses are arranged by textual group in table 4. Clement is most closely aligned to the Western group (58.2%), although his level of agreement falls about 7 percent below the ideal level of agreement for group classification. The Byzantine witnesses are only 1.2% behind, at 57.1%. The next closest group is, statistically speaking, equally split between both the Primary (52.2%) and Caesarean (52.2%). The Secondary Alexandrian group is right behind at 51.3%.

While Clement's highest level of agreement is with the Western witnesses, the 1.1% differential between his agreements with the Western witnesses and the Byzantine text does not come even close to the 6–8% level of disparity between groups suggested by Ehrman. In fact, the margin of error associated with each group should caution any hard and fast conclusion from being based on this evidence alone. The 6–8% break between groups is reached, however, with the Primary Alexandrian and the Caesarean witnesses (6.0%) and the Secondary Alexandrian witnesses (6.9%).

As was the case with Clement's text of Matthew, no single textual group emerges as the sole textual influence behind Clement's text of Mark. On the basis of the evidence available, the most that can be said is that in Mark Clement exhibits a slightly greater proclivity toward Western witnesses than

TABLE 4

Proportional Agreement with Clement Arranged  
by Textual Group in Mark

<u>ALEXANDRIAN</u>	<u>Agreements</u>	<u>Variants</u>	<u>% Agree</u>	<u>Mg. Err.</u>
Primary Alexandrian				
UBS <sup>4</sup>	25	22	53.2%	14.4%
Ⲭ <sup>*</sup>	21	21	50.0%	15.3%
B	25	22	53.2%	14.4%
Totals	71	65	52.2%	8.5%
Totals (w/o UBS <sup>4</sup> )	46	43	51.7%	10.4%
Secondary Alexandrian				
C	24	23	51.1%	14.4%
Δ	21	24	46.7%	14.7%
Ψ	22	23	48.9%	14.8%
579	24	22	52.2%	14.6%
892	28	19	59.6%	14.2%
Totals (w/o Ⲭ <sup>c</sup> )	119	111	51.7%	6.5%
Ⲭ <sup>c</sup>	22	23	48.9%	14.8%
Totals (w/ Ⲭ <sup>c</sup> )	141	134	51.3%	5.9%
Average Alexandrian (w/ UBS <sup>4</sup> and Ⲭ <sup>c</sup> )	212	199	51.6%	4.8%
<u>CAESAREAN</u>				
Θ	20	26	43.5%	14.5%
Γ <sup>1</sup>	24	23	51.1%	14.4%
Γ <sup>13</sup>	28	16	63.6%	14.4%
1582	24	23	51.1%	14.4%
Totals	96	88	52.2%	7.2%
<u>BYZANTINE</u>				
TR	29	18	61.7%	14.0%
A	25	22	53.2%	14.4%
E	29	18	61.7%	14.0%
Π	23	23	50.0%	14.6%
Ω	19	13	59.4%	17.3%
Totals	125	94	57.1%	6.6%
Totals (w/o TR)	96	76	55.8%	7.4%

Table 4 (cont.)

<u>WESTERN</u>	<u>Agreements</u>	<u>Variants</u>	<u>% Agree</u>	<u>Mg. Err.</u>
D	27	19	58.7%	14.4%
a	20	18	52.6%	16.1%
b	26	15	63.4%	14.9%
k	23	17	57.5%	15.5%
Totals	96	69	58.2%	7.5%

Byzantine, and a more distant relationship to the other textual groups. Nothing more can be concluded until these findings are supplemented by a group profile analysis in the next chapter.

#### CLEMENT'S TEXTUAL AFFINITIES IN LUKE

While Clement's references to Luke are slightly more than half the number of his references to Matthew, the references to Luke yield a higher number of genetically significant units of variation. In Matthew, 118 significant variants were identified from a total of 274 references, whereas 143 references to Luke produce 143 genetically significant variants. The results of the quantitative analysis appear in table 5, where the witnesses are ranked according to the level of their proportional agreement with Clement in the 143 units of variation.

A quick examination of table 5 reveals three significant results. First of all, two of the top four witnesses are again Alexandrian fathers. Origen ranks the highest at 71.4%, and Didymus follows at 58.6%. Athanasius, however, is much more removed at 50.0%, but since he shares only 4 readings with Clement, it is difficult to draw any conclusion about his lower level of agreement. While the number of shared readings between Clement and Didymus is greater than those of Athanasius, they are still far too small to draw any quick conclusions from them. At the same time, however, the collective proportionally high agreement between Clement and Didymus in Matthew and with Origen in Mark makes their level of agreement worthy of observation. Second, outside of Origen, no witness ranks over 70%, though Codex Bezae (D) is not too far away, at 66.4%. The high ranking of D stands in contrast to the anti-Western proclivity found in Clement's textual affinities in Matthew and is closer to his relationship with Western readings in Mark. While the overall rankings reveal a largely mixed combination of witnesses, it does reveal a slight shift in the placement of the

TABLE 5

Witnesses Ranked According to Proportional Agreement with  
Clement in Genetically Significant Variation in Luke  
(143 Units of Variation)

Rank	MSS	Total Ag.	Total Var.	% Ag.	Marg. Error
1.	Or	25	35	71.4%	15.2%
2.	D	89	134	66.4%	8.0%
3.	33	65	107	60.7%	9.3%
4.	Did	17	29	58.6%	18.2%
5.	$\aleph^*$	81	141	57.4%	8.2%
6.	$f^l$	81	142	57.0%	8.2%
7.	a	67	118	56.8%	9.1%
8.	$\Psi$	81	143	56.6%	8.2%
9.	1582	80	143	55.9%	8.2%
10.	$\aleph^c$	79	143	55.2%	8.2%
11.	L	78	143	54.5%	8.2%
12.	b	66	122	54.1%	8.9%
13.	892	76	141	53.9%	8.3%
14.	UBS <sup>4</sup>	77	143	53.8%	8.2%
	$\Omega$	77	143	53.8%	8.2%
15.	$P^{75}$	62	116	53.4%	9.1%
16.	$\Pi$	74	140	52.9%	8.3%
17.	e	63	120	52.5%	9.0%
18.	$f^{13}$	73	141	51.8%	8.3%
19.	TR	74	143	51.7%	8.2%
	A	74	143	51.7%	8.2%
20.	$\Theta$	73	143	51.0%	8.2%

Table 5 (cont.)

Rank	MSS	Total Ag.	Total Var.	% Ag.	Marg. Error
21.	B	71	142	50.0%	8.3%
	Ath	2	4	50.0%	74.2%
22.	E	71	143	49.7%	8.2%
23.	Δ	70	142	49.3%	8.3%
24.	579	65	134	48.5%	8.5%
25.	P <sup>45</sup>	27	56	48.2%	13.2%
26.	C	14	32	43.8%	17.5%

Byzantine readings. Where in Matthew and Mark the Byzantine readings tended to be concentrated to the upper half of the list, here they are grouped toward the bottom.

A closer examination of the results, outside of the Alexandrian fathers and Codex Bezae, reveals the largely mixed nature of the rankings. Of the witnesses ranked third to tenth, four are Alexandrian (33, Ψ, Ⲙ, Ⲙ<sup>c</sup>), two are Caesarean (f<sup>1</sup>, 1582), and one Western (a). These witnesses are separated by a gap of 5.5%. While the majority of these witnesses are Alexandrian, there is no clear grouping pattern between Primary or Secondary Alexandrian witnesses.

The next sixteen witnesses, ranked eleventh to twenty-fourth, are separated by a range of only 6% (L at 54.5% to 579 at 48.5%)—a gap easily offset by the average margin of error of these witnesses. The first twelve witnesses in this group are divided between four Alexandrian witnesses (L, 892, UBS<sup>4</sup>, P<sup>75</sup>), two Western witnesses (b, c), four Byzantine witnesses (Ω, Π, TR, A), and two Caesarean witnesses (f<sup>13</sup>, Θ). The lower half of this group contains the Byzantine witnesses E and Δ, as well as the Alexandrian witnesses B and 579. Outside the general grouping of the Byzantine witnesses toward the lower half of the list, the other witnesses tend to be spread randomly across the list. The disparity between the Western witnesses can again be seen in their scattered rankings. For example, Codex Bezae is ranked second, the Old Latin witness a is ranked seventh and is separated from Bezae by 9.6%, while the other Old Latin witness c is separated from Codex Bezae by 13.9%.

The final witness at the bottom of the list is the Secondary Alexandrian witness C. The smaller number of shared readings and the correspondingly



TABLE 6

Proportional Agreement with Clement Arranged  
by Textual Group in Luke

ALEXANDRIAN	<u>Agreements</u>	<u>Variants</u>	<u>% Agree</u>	<u>Mg. Err.</u>
Primary Alexandrian				
UBS <sup>4</sup>	77	66	53.8%	8.2%
P <sup>75</sup>	62	54	53.4%	9.1%
κ <sup>*</sup>	81	60	57.4%	8.2%
B	71	71	50.0%	8.3%
Totals	291	251	53.7%	4.2%
Totals (w/o UBS <sup>4</sup> )	214	185	53.6%	4.9%
Secondary Alexandrian				
C	14	18	43.8%	17.5%
L	78	65	54.5%	8.2%
Ψ	81	62	56.6%	8.2%
33	65	42	60.7%	9.3%
579	65	69	48.5%	8.5%
892	76	65	53.9%	8.3%
Totals (w/o κ <sup>c</sup> )	379	321	54.1%	3.7%
κ <sup>c</sup>	79	64	55.2%	8.2%
Totals (w/ κ <sup>c</sup> )	458	385	54.3%	3.4%
Average Alexandrian (w/ UBS <sup>4</sup> and κ <sup>c</sup> )	749	636	54.1%	2.6%
<u>CAESAREAN</u>				
P <sup>45</sup>	27	29	48.2%	13.2%
Θ	73	70	51.0%	8.2%
f <sup>1</sup>	81	61	57.0%	8.2%
f <sup>13</sup>	73	68	51.8%	8.3%
1582	80	63	55.9%	8.2%
Totals	334	291	53.4%	3.9%

Table 6 (cont.)

<u>BYZANTINE</u>	<u>Agreements</u>	<u>Variants</u>	<u>% Agree</u>	<u>Mg. Err.</u>
TR	74	69	51.7%	8.2%
A	74	69	51.7%	8.2%
E	71	72	49.7%	8.2%
Δ	70	72	49.3%	8.3%
Π	75	68	52.4%	8.2%
Ω	77	66	53.8%	8.2%
Totals	441	416	51.5%	3.3%
Totals (w/o TR)	367	347	51.4%	3.7%

WESTERN

D	89	45	66.4%	8.0%
a	67	51	56.8%	9.0%
b	66	56	54.1%	8.9%
c	63	57	52.5%	9.0%
Totals	285	209	57.7%	4.4%

higher margin of error level (17.5%) makes the testimony of this witness, like the Caesarean witness P<sup>45</sup> before it, more limited.

Table 6 reveals the picture that emerges when manuscript support of Clement is divided into textual groups. As was the case in Mark, Clement agrees most closely with the Western witnesses (57.7%), though his level of agreement with the Alexandrian witnesses (54.1%) is not too far behind. The fact that Clement's relationship between these two groups is only separated by 3.6%, and their rate of agreement falls considerably lower than the 65% level for group classification, warns against any classification of Clement's text in Luke based on quantitative analysis alone. The next closest group is the Caesarean witnesses, at 53.4%. The close proximity in agreement between the Caesarean and Alexandrian witnesses is not that surprising, since the classification of the Caesarean witnesses as a text-type is only clearly identified in Mark. Clement's lowest rate of agreement here is with the Byzantine group (51.4%).

Once again the results of the quantitative analysis do not allow any hard and fast classification of Clement's text in Luke. The most conclusive point that can be drawn from these results is that in Luke Clement shows a marked shift in his level of agreement between the Alexandrian and the Western

text-types. In Matthew, Clement's references reveal a strong proclivity to the Alexandrian and Byzantine text and very little connection to the Western text. The situation, however, is nearly opposite in the other two Synoptic Gospels. In Mark and Luke, Clement aligns most closely with the Western text and, at least in the case of Mark, is least connected to the Alexandrian text. One should not forget, however, that in each of these Gospels Clement's highest levels of group agreement fail to reach the 65% threshold of agreement for group classification.

#### CLEMENT'S TEXTUAL AFFINITIES IN JOHN

While the results from the quantitative analysis of Clement's references in the Synoptic Gospels were somewhat less than ideal, the evidence is much clearer when it comes to Clement's references to the Gospel of John. The collation of Clement's text of the Gospel of John reveals 72 genetically significant variation units. Table 7 reveals the results of the quantitative analysis when the witnesses are ranked according to their proportional agreement with Clement in these 72 units of variation.

Unlike the previous tables of ranked witnesses for Mark and Luke, table 7 reveals clear blocks of manuscript attestation in close agreement. Alexandrian witnesses dominate the upper half of the list. Seven of the first ten witnesses are Alexandrian (L, 33, C, B, P<sup>75</sup>, UBS<sup>4</sup>, Ψ), while the other three witnesses are the Alexandrian fathers Origen, Cyril, and Athanasius. What is even more striking is that all ten of these witnesses (including the Alexandrian fathers) exceed the 65% criterion for group classification. Of the witnesses ranked eleventh to sixteenth, four of the witnesses are Alexandrian (W, P<sup>66</sup>, 8<sup>c</sup>, 579), two are Caesarean (f<sup>1</sup>, 1582), and one is Byzantine (A). While the small size of shared readings results in a high margin of error level for all 31 witnesses in the list, the clear grouping of these witnesses indicates that these results are not merely accidental. The only witnesses whose margin of error is significantly high enough to cast some suspicion on their accuracy are P<sup>45</sup> (54.7%), Athanasius (25.1%), and Didymus (23.1%).

Caesarean and Secondary Alexandrian witnesses make up the majority of the next six witnesses. These witnesses are ranked eleventh to sixteenth and agree with Clement from 65.3% to 61.9%. While their high level of agreement indicates a relationship with the previous group, their secondary influence can be seen by the increasing gap with the previous group. The narrowest margin is with 1582 at 2.3% and the largest being with 579 at 5.7%. The group also includes one Primary Alexandrian witness (P<sup>66</sup>).

TABLE 7

Witnesses Ranked According to Proportional Agreement with  
Clement in Genetically Significant Variation in John  
(72 Units of Variation)

Rank	MSS	Total Ag.	Total Var.	% Ag.	Marg. Error
1.	L	54	72	75.0%	10.1%
2.	33	52	70	74.3%	10.3%
3.	Or	29	40	72.5%	14.0%
4.	C	33	46	71.7%	13.2%
5.	B	51	72	70.8%	10.6%
6.	Cyr	35	50	70.0%	12.8%
7.	P <sup>75</sup>	32	46	69.6%	13.4%
8.	UBS <sup>4</sup>	50	72	69.4%	10.7%
9.	Ath	11	16	68.8%	25.1%
10.	Ψ	48	71	67.6%	11.0%
11.	1582	47	72	65.3%	11.1%
12.	f <sup>1</sup>	46	71	64.8%	11.2%
13.	W	34	53	64.2%	13.0%
14.	κ <sup>c</sup>	44	70	62.9%	11.4%
15.	P <sup>66</sup>	33	53	62.3%	13.2%
16.	579	39	63	61.9%	12.1%
17.	A	35	57	61.4%	12.8%
18.	Θ	43	71	60.6%	11.4%
	Π	42	71	60.6%	11.4%
19.	Ω	36	60	60.0%	12.5%
20.	E	43	72	59.7%	11.4%

TABLE 7 (cont.)

Rank	MSS	Total Ag.	Total Var.	% Ag.	Marg. Error
	TR	43	72	59.7%	11.4%
21.	Δ	41	72	56.9%	11.5%
22.	D	35	64	54.7%	12.3%
23.	892	24	44	54.5%	14.9%
24.	Ⲙ	38	70	54.3%	11.8%
25.	f <sup>13</sup>	39	72	54.2%	11.6%
26.	p <sup>45</sup>	3	6	50.0%	54.7%
27.	Did	9	19	47.4%	23.1%
28.	e	26	59	44.1%	12.8%
29.	a	25	58	43.1%	12.9%
30.	b	23	59	39.0%	12.6%

The final cluster of witnesses is dominated by the remaining Byzantine (A, Π, Ω, E, TR, Δ) and Western (D, e, a, b) witnesses. It also includes the three Caesarean witnesses (Θ, f<sup>13</sup>, p<sup>45</sup>), one Secondary Alexandrian witness (892), and one Primary Alexandrian witness (Ⲙ). The presence of the Primary Alexandrian witness Ⲙ so close to the bottom of the list is not surprising, since it has been shown that its text is Western in John 1:1–8:38.<sup>39</sup> The bottom of the list belongs to the three Western witnesses (a, e, b) and the Alexandrian father Didymus. A significant range of at least 20.2% separates these witnesses from the top seven Alexandrian witnesses (Ψ at 67.6% to Did at 47.4%). Though Didymus's margin of error level of ±23.1% is higher than the average witness in the list, his separation from the other Alexandrian witnesses should not be attributed to the smaller number of readings shared with Clement in John. Ehrman demonstrates that at John 6:47 Didymus's textual alignment shifts from Alexandrian to "a highly eclectic text in which variants from each of the several traditions ... are represented in random fashion."<sup>40</sup> Since 11 of the 19 readings shared with Clement are from after John 6:46, Didymus's isolation from the other

<sup>39</sup> Fee, "Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John," 23–44.

<sup>40</sup> Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind*, 215–16.

TABLE 8

Proportional Agreement with Clement Arranged  
by Textual Group in John

<u>ALEXANDRIAN</u>	<u>Agreements</u>	<u>Variants</u>	<u>% Agree</u>	<u>Mg. Err.</u>
Primary Alexandrian				
UBS <sup>4</sup>	50	72	69.4%	10.7%
p <sup>66</sup>	33	53	62.3%	13.2%
p <sup>75</sup>	32	46	69.6%	13.4%
κ* (8:39–21:25)	19	35	54.3%	16.7%
B	51	72	70.8%	10.6%
Totals	185	278	66.5%	5.6%
Totals (w/o UBS <sup>4</sup> )	135	206	65.5%	6.5%
Secondary Alexandrian				
C	33	46	71.7%	13.2%
L	54	72	75.0%	10.1%
W	34	53	64.2%	13.0%
Ψ	48	71	67.6%	11.0%
33	52	70	74.3%	10.3%
579	39	63	61.9%	12.1%
892	24	44	54.5%	14.9%
Totals (w/o κ <sup>c</sup> )	284	419	67.8%	4.5%
κ <sup>c</sup>	44	70	62.9%	11.4%
Totals (w/ κ <sup>c</sup> )	328	489	67.1%	4.2%
Average Alexandrian (w/ UBS <sup>4</sup> and κ <sup>c</sup> )	513	767	66.9%	3.3%
<u>CAESAREAN</u>				
Θ	43	71	60.6%	11.4%
f <sup>1</sup>	46	71	64.8%	11.2%
f <sup>13</sup>	39	72	54.2%	11.6%
1582	47	72	65.3%	11.1%
Totals	175	286	61.2%	5.7%

Table 8 (cont.)

<u>BYZANTINE</u>	<u>Agreements</u>	<u>Variants</u>	<u>% Agree</u>	<u>Mg. Err.</u>
TR	43	72	59.7%	11.4%
A	35	57	61.4%	12.8%
E	43	72	59.7%	11.4%
Δ	41	72	56.9%	11.5%
Π	43	71	60.6%	11.4%
Ω	36	60	60.0%	12.5%
Totals	241	404	59.7%	4.8%
Totals (w/o TR)	198	332	59.6%	5.3%
<u>WESTERN</u>				
Ⲛ (1:1–8:38)	19	35	54.3%	16.7%
D	35	64	54.7%	12.3%
a	25	58	43.1%	12.9%
b	23	59	39.0%	12.6%
c	26	59	44.1%	12.8%
Totals	128	275	46.5%	5.9%

Alexandrian witnesses is what one would expect. In any case, the dramatic shift in agreement with the Western witnesses at the bottom of this list reveals a strongly anti-Western proclivity in Clement's text of the Fourth Gospel.

When the witnesses are arranged by textual group in table 8, Clement's basic alignment with the representative witnesses hinted at in table 7 becomes even more apparent.

In John, Clement's text is most closely aligned with the Alexandrian witnesses, at 66.9%. There is no significant distinction when the Alexandrian witnesses are divided between Primary (66.5%) and Secondary Alexandrian (67.1%). The next closest level of agreement is with the Caesarean witnesses (61.2%), which are separated from the Alexandrian readings by a break of 5.7%. A narrow margin of 1.6% separates Clement's level of agreement between the Caesarean and Byzantine witnesses. The most significant level of difference, though, is with the Western witnesses. Clement's level of agreement with the Western witnesses drops to 46.5%, resulting in a 20.4% break between his level of agreement with the Alexandrian witnesses and the Western witnesses.

Clement's strong levels of agreement with the Alexandrian tradition clearly identify his text as Alexandrian. The results of quantitative analysis are, however, insufficient to distinguish a clear proclivity toward either a Primary or Secondary Alexandrian distinction. The results also reveal that the Western text has little influence on Clement in John.

#### CONCLUSION

The quantitative analysis of Clement's text of the Gospels allows some preliminary conclusions to be made about the nature of his text. Whereas other patristic studies have considered the relationship of a Father's entire Gospel text by adding up the total proportional agreement within each of the Gospels with the textual families, the highly varied nature of Clement's text precludes such a simple tabulation. Clement's text as a whole shares no overall agreement with one specific text-type. Instead, his affinities appear to shift between a primarily Alexandrian or Western influence. In Matthew and John, Clement shares a closer relationship with Alexandrian readings, while in Mark and Luke his affinity is more in line with the Western text-type. The fact that Clement's highest levels of agreement in the Synoptic Gospels fall below 65% may suggest that during his day the transmission of Matthew, Mark, and Luke in Alexandria was more fluid or transitional in nature—that is, instead of there being one dominant and established text of each of the Synoptics, there was still a competing number of diverse readings in circulation. Clement's text of John is different, however. His text of John is clearly Alexandrian and shows little influence from any other textual family.

While the quantitative analysis in this chapter has allowed some preliminary conclusions to be drawn about the nature of Clement's text of the Gospels, it needs to be examined more closely in relationship to Clement's attestation of group readings. Without a group profile analysis, there is no way to know, for example, if some of the conclusions drawn about the nature of Clement's textual relationships are merely the result of accidental agreement between some of the manuscripts. This further analysis will take place in the following chapter.



## GROUP PROFILE ANALYSIS

### THE PROFILE METHOD

The previous chapter sought to determine the textual affinities of Clement's text of the Gospels by a comparison of the proportional levels of agreement with the individual witnesses of the four major text-types. While this method reveals some insight into Clement's textual proclivities, it is insufficient in two areas: (1) it fails to identify a definitive picture of Clement's textual affinities in the Synoptic Gospels; and (2) although Clement's text shows a strong proclivity toward the Alexandrian text-type in John, it is unable to determine whether a distinction exists between Primary or Secondary Alexandrian witnesses. The ambiguity of these results may be due to the limits of quantitative analysis, since agreement among individual witnesses may be the result of accidental agreements in error, or to the fact that individual witnesses of different text-types often share readings.<sup>1</sup> Since the quantitative analysis method cannot detect the presence of such phenomena, the results from the last chapter require further analysis.

Since the limitations of quantitative analysis arise from a fixation on individual readings, text critics have sought to supplement it with an examination of *group readings* that distinguish the four different text-types, a method known as group profile analysis. The underlining assumption of this method is that, to classify a manuscript or, in this case, a church father, with a specific textual family, it/he must also exhibit readings that characterize that particular text-type. While a variety of group profile methodologies emerged over the course of the last century,<sup>2</sup> Bart Ehrman's

---

<sup>1</sup> Bart D. Ehrman, "The Use of Group Profiles for the Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence," *JBL* 106 (1987): 466; idem, "Methodological Developments," 40–41; Fee, "Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John," 23–44; idem, "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria."

<sup>2</sup> With the exception of Ehrman's method, four principal methods that focus on group readings arose during the last century. (1) Edward Ardrone Hutton suggested a method in 1911 that sought to classify a manuscript on the basis of its level of agreement with 312 New Testament passages identified as "triple readings" (i.e.,

readings where the Alexandrian, Western, and Byzantine text-types contained distinctive readings). See his *Atlas of Textual Criticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911). (2) While Hutton's method found little widespread support, Colwell adapted the method as the first of three steps to determine a manuscript's basic affinity. Rather than limit the base readings to readings represented by the three main text-types, Colwell felt it should be expanded to include the sub-text-types as well: thus the change in terminology from "triple" to "multiple readings." A multiple reading is defined as "one in which the minimum support for each of at least three variant forms of the text is either one of the major strands of the tradition, or the support of a previously established group..., or the support of some one of the ancient versions..., or the support of some single manuscript of an admittedly distinctive character (such as D)" (Colwell, "Locating a Manuscript," 27–28). (3) Kurt and Barbara Aland developed a method that uses select readings (*Teststellen*) to distinguish between Byzantine manuscripts and those that belong to other textual traditions. In contrast to Hutton, however, the *Teststellen* identified by the Alands is limited to one thousand passages where the Byzantine tradition preserves distinct readings (Kurt Aland, ed., *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* [ANTF; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1987–]; Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 106–7, 128, 317–37). (4) The most popular method has been the Claremont Profile Method, which Paul McReynolds and Frederik Wisse devised in 1982 to quickly classify a large number of manuscripts. In short, this method contends that manuscripts can be classified around common patterns of attestation (group readings that make up larger group profiles) identified from isolated test passages in a given text. Once the group profiles are established, a new manuscript need only be classified on the basis of its agreement in these isolated passages, rather than by a full collation. While originally designed to classify Byzantine manuscripts into subgroups, it has been used more generally (see Paul McReynolds, "The Claremont Profile Method and the Grouping of Byzantine New Testament Manuscripts" [Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1968]; and Frederik Wisse, "The Claremont Profile Method for Classification of the Byzantine New Testament Manuscripts: A Study in Method" [Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1968]). Wisse later revised and published his dissertation in *The Profile Method for Classifying and Evaluating Manuscript Evidence*.

Another more recent method of classifying manuscripts is Gerd Mink's "local genealogical method." Mink's method was developed specifically for constructing the primary text of the *Editio Critica Maior* of the New Testament. It attempts to overcome the well-known flaw of Westcott and Hort's use of the genealogical method: the highly contaminated nature of readings in any given manuscript (see Ernest C. Colwell, "Genealogical Method: Its Achievements and Its Limitations," *JBL* 66 [1947]: 109–33; repr. in idem, *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, 63–83). Due to the highly contaminated textual tradition of the New Testament, Mink's method accounts for manuscript contamination by the creation of a local stemma that "reflects all the genealogical data." Once individual stemma have been constructed for all the variants in a book, the results can then be used to construct a global stemma (or stemmata) of manuscripts based on their texts.

Comprehensive Profile Method has proven to be the most successful in patristic textual studies.<sup>3</sup> The benefit of Ehrman's method is a threefold group profile analysis that examines the strength and extent of a reading's support in relation to each text-type (the *inter-group profile*), the strength of a reading's attestation within a given text-type, regardless of its support in other textual groups (the *intra-group profile*), and a combined profile that incorporates the strengths of each of the first two profiles. The thoroughness of Ehrman's method enables it either to clarify the ambiguity of the results of quantitative analysis, to provide a stronger confirmation of those results, or to provide a more precise assessment of the congruence of a Father's text with the known text-types.<sup>4</sup> This chapter will apply Ehrman's group profile method to Clement's text of the Gospels to determine if it can provide a more precise assessment of Clement's textual affinities. Each Gospel will be analyzed individually, since the results of the quantitative analysis indicate Clement's overall text of the Gospels is not uniform.

---

While this method has promise, it currently has been applied only to the Catholic Epistles. See Gerd Mink, "Eine umfassende Genealogie der neutestamentlichen Überlieferung," *NTS* 39 (1993): 481–99; idem, "Editing and Genealogical Studies: The New Testament," *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 15 (2000): 51–56; idem, "Problems of a Highly Contaminated Tradition: The New Testament," in *Studies in Stemmatology II* (ed. P. van Reenen, A. den Hollander, and Margot van Mulken; Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2004), 13–85.

<sup>3</sup> For a summary and evaluation of the various group profile methods, see Ehrman, "Methodological Developments," 31–45; idem, "Use of Group Profiles," 467–71; Thomas C. Geer Jr., "Analyzing and Categorizing New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Colwell Revisited," in Ehrman and Holmes, *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*, 253–67; W. Larry Richards, "Test Passages or Profiles: A Comparison of Two Text-Critical Methods," *JBL* 115 (1996): 251–69; David C. Parker, "A Comparison between the *Text und Textwert* and the Claremont Profile Method Analyses of Manuscripts in the Gospel of Luke," *NTS* 49 (2003): 108–38.

<sup>4</sup> E.g., the results of Ehrman's initial quantitative analysis indicate that Didymus's Gospel text is primarily Alexandrian but with a slightly greater affinity (1.3%) toward the "Early" rather than "Later" Alexandrian witnesses. A group profile analysis, however, reveals that Didymus is actually a leading witness of the "Late" Alexandrian text. See Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind*, 220–22, 249–53; idem, "Use of Group Profiles," 473–485; With the exception that Athanasius's Gospel text shows little Western influence (44.9%), quantitative analysis fails to produce a statistically significant difference between Athanasius's support of the Secondary Alexandrian text (67.7%) and his support of the other textual groups (Primary Alexandrian 66.8%, Caesarean 65.4%, and Byzantine 64.8%). Group profile analysis, however, removes the ambiguity and enables Athanasius to be clearly classified as a Secondary Alexandrian witness. See Brogan, "Text of the Gospels," 220–24, 249–58.

Before applying Ehrman's profile method to Clement's text of each Gospel, it will be helpful to provide first a more precise explanation and definition of the terms and categories upon which the method operates and how they are modified in relation to Clement.<sup>5</sup>

#### INTER-GROUP RELATIONSHIPS

Inter-group relationships between the five text-types being examined are divided into three different types of readings.

**Distinctive Readings.** Distinctive readings refer to readings that are "distinct" to a particular textual group, that is, readings that are supported by *most* group members (more than one-half) and that are not present in the witnesses from other textual groups. In Clement's case, distinctive readings are defined as follows:

Distinctively Primary Alexandrian:

Readings found in more than half of the Primary Alexandrian witnesses and no others.

Distinctively Secondary Alexandrian:

Readings found in more than half of the Secondary Alexandrian witnesses and no others.

Distinctively Byzantine:

Readings supported by all but one of the Byzantine witnesses and no others.

Distinctively Caesarean:<sup>6</sup>

Readings found in all the Caesarean witnesses and no others.<sup>7</sup>

Distinctively Western:

Readings found in at least one Greek Western witness, two Old Latin manuscripts, and no others. When the Old Latin witnesses are not extant, readings found in two Greek witnesses.

**Exclusive Readings.** The second type of readings considered in the inter-group profile is exclusive readings. Exclusive readings are those that are

---

<sup>5</sup> The following explanation and definitions, with minor modification, are from Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind*, 226–27; idem, "Use of Group Profiles," 478–86; Brogan, "Text of the Gospels," 228–31; and Racine, "Text of Matthew," 270–72.

<sup>6</sup> For a discussion on the rationale of including the Caesarean text-type, see chapter 3 nn. 7 and 16.

<sup>7</sup> With the exception of Luke, where the limited number of extant readings in P<sup>45</sup> requires that a distinctive reading be defined as one found in more than one-half of all Caesarean witnesses and no others.

shared by at least two group members with no support from nongroup witnesses. Readings already determined to be distinctive are excluded.

**Primary Readings.** Primary readings are the final type of reading examined in the inter-group profile. Primary readings refer to readings shared by at least two group members and that also have greater group support than non-group support. Greater group support is defined as follows:

Uniform Primary Readings:

Readings shared by all group members, but that are supported neither uniformly by another group, nor predominantly by more than one other group, nor by more than two other groups when one of them supports the reading predominantly.<sup>8</sup>

Predominant Primary Readings:

Readings supported by at least two-thirds of a group's witnesses but supported neither uniformly nor predominantly by another group.

Primary Readings:

When the two above categories do not apply, readings supported by a greater number of group than nongroup witnesses.

#### INTRA-GROUP RELATIONSHIPS

The second profile involves intra-group relationships. This profile deals with the following two types of readings.

**Uniform Readings.** Uniform readings are readings that are supported by all the witnesses in a group that contains the text.

**Predominant Readings.** Readings supported by at least two-thirds of all witnesses of a group that contain the text are referred to as predominant readings.

#### THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

The application of the comprehensive profile method to Clement's text of Matthew results in the three groups of data presented in table 9.

---

<sup>8</sup> For a more precise definition of uniform and predominant readings, see their description in the intra-group profile that follows.

TABLE 9  
Group Profile Analysis  
Readings in Matthew

Profile One, Inter-Group Relationships

	<u>Distinctive</u>	<u>Exclusive</u>	<u>Primary</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Prim. Alex.	0/0	0/0	6/13 (46.2%)	6/13 (46.2%)
Sec. Alex.	0/1	0/1 (0.0%)	2/7 (28.6%)	2/9 (22.2%)
Byzantine	0/1	0/1 (0.0%)	7/12 (58.3%)	7/14 (50.0%)
Caesarean	0/0	0/4 (0.0%)	1/4 (25.0%)	1/8 (12.5%)
Western	2/10 (20.0%)	4/18 (22.2%)	7/12 (58.3%)	13/40 (32.5%)

Profile Two, Intra-Group Relationships

	<u>Uniform</u>	<u>Predominant</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Prim. Alex.	57/84 (67.9%)	16/32 (50.0%)	73/116 (62.9%)
Sec. Alex.	46/71 (64.8%)	13/30 (43.3%)	59/101 (58.4%)
Byzantine	54/87 (62.1%)	19/26 (73.1%)	73/113 (64.6%)
Caesarean	43/69 (62.3%)	17/27 (63.0%)	60/96 (62.5%)
Western	24/43 (55.8%)	12/30 (40.0%)	36/73 (49.3%)

Profile Three, Uniform and Predominant Readings that are also Distinctive, Exclusive, or Primary

	<u>Uniform</u>	<u>Predominant</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Prim. Alex.	3/7 (42.9%)	3/6 (50.0%)	6/13 (46.2%)
Sec. Alex.	1/1 (100%)	1/4 (25.0%)	2/5 (40.0%)
Byzantine	5/10 (50.0%)	2/3 (66.7%)	7/13 (53.8%)
Caesarean	0/2 (0.0%)	0/0	0/2 (0.0%)
Western	8/16 (50.0%)	2/11 (18.2%)	10/27 (37.0%)

What immediately stands out from this first profile is the small number of readings and the low level of agreement Clement shares with the textual groups: not *one* is above 50%. While these observations are accurate, they should not be that surprising. In fact, as Ehrman notes, one should actually expect a small number of readings in this profile, especially among the distinct and exclusive readings, since seldom do all manuscripts of a given text-type agree on a particular reading.<sup>9</sup> Thus the concern here should not be the number of readings, but the presence or absence of readings in Clement that characterize each particular text-type. Also, rather than looking for a certain level of agreement, as in the suggested minimum 65% level in the quantitative analysis method, one should look for a group witness to share a stronger level of agreement with one textual group than another, regardless of the percentage level. In particular, one would expect a group witness to preserve frequently distinctive readings from one group and rarely the distinctive readings from another group. In addition, a group witness should also preserve a much higher attestation of the exclusive and primary readings of one group than those of another.

Clement's support of distinctive and exclusive readings in the first profile reveals little useful information for determining his textual affinity in Matthew. While one expects a small number of distinctive and exclusive readings, it is surprising to discover that, outside of a few Western readings, Clement does not preserve a *single* distinctive or exclusive reading for any of the textual groups. To be more specific, Clement's text reveals no distinctive readings available for comparison for either the Primary Alexandrian or Caesarean textual families; the same is true for the exclusive Primary Alexandrian readings. Among the distinctive readings that do appear, Clement supports neither the single Secondary Alexandrian reading<sup>10</sup> nor the Byzantine reading.<sup>11</sup> Further, though Clement does support distinctive Western readings, he supports only two readings out of ten.<sup>12</sup> The situation changes little among the exclusive readings. Here Clement fails to support the single exclusive Secondary Alexandrian reading,<sup>13</sup> the exclusive Byzantine reading,<sup>14</sup> or the four Caesarean readings.<sup>15</sup> Once again, Clement's

---

<sup>9</sup> Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind*, 230.

<sup>10</sup> Clement does not preserve the distinctive Secondary Alexandrian reading in Matt 5:4.

<sup>11</sup> Clement does not preserve the distinctive Byzantine reading in Matt 5:36.

<sup>12</sup> Clement preserves distinctive Western readings in Matt 25:39 and 26:23. Clement does not preserve distinctive Western readings in Matt 5:42; 10:5; 10:42 (X2); 11:28; 18:10; 18:22; and 21:22.

<sup>13</sup> Clement does not preserve the exclusive Secondary Alexandrian reading in Matt 25:27.

<sup>14</sup> Clement does not preserve exclusive Byzantine readings in Matt 5:28.

support resides with only a few exclusive Western readings.<sup>16</sup> Although Clement preserves no distinctive or exclusive readings from any other group, this should not lead one to classify his text as Western. Such a conclusion seems unlikely because the six Western readings Clement supports are far outnumbered by the twenty-two readings he does not support!

When the primary readings are taken into consideration, Clement's strongest support is split equally between the Western and the Byzantine readings. He preserves seven out of twelve primary Western readings (58.3%),<sup>17</sup> seven out of twelve Byzantine readings (57.3%),<sup>18</sup> six out of thirteen Primary Alexandrian readings (46.20%),<sup>19</sup> two out of seven Secondary Alexandrian readings (25.0%),<sup>20</sup> and only one out of four primary Caesarean readings (28.6%).<sup>21</sup>

A clearer picture of Clement's textual affinities appears only when the results of the distinctive, exclusive, and primary readings are tabulated together. When this is done three conclusions become apparent.

First, the totals are similar to the results of the quantitative analysis in Matthew that identifies Clement's textual proclivities most closely with the Primary Alexandrian and Byzantine textual groups. The primary difference here is that this time the Byzantine readings (50.0%) are slightly higher than the Primary Alexandrian readings (46.2%). Outside these two groups, his support drops from 18–37% with the other witnesses. Does the high level of Clement's attestation with the Byzantine text point to the early existence of

<sup>15</sup> Clement does not preserve exclusive Caesarean readings in Matt 5:36; 10:27 (X2); 19:19.

<sup>16</sup> Clement preserves exclusive Western readings in Matt 5:25; 5:36; 5:42; 25:35. Clement does not preserve exclusive Western readings in Matt 5:7; 5:8; 5:14; 5:42; 6:19 (X2); 6:20; 10:5; 10:32; 10:42; 12:37; 18:4; 19:21; 23:27.

<sup>17</sup> Clement preserves primary Western readings in Matt 6:32; 7:13; 13:43; 23:9; 23:26; 23:37; and 25:41. Clement does not preserve primary Western readings in Matt 5:9; 12:36; 15:11; 21:16; and 25:26.

<sup>18</sup> Clement preserves primary Byzantine readings in Matt 5:25; 5:48; 10:23; 12:36; 16:26; 22:40; and 23:9. Clement does not preserve primary Byzantine readings in Matt 5:25; 5:48; 19:17; 19:23; and 23:37.

<sup>19</sup> Clement preserves primary Primary Alexandrian readings in Matt 5:22; 5:42; 13:34; 19:3; 23:37; and 25:39. Clement does not preserve primary Primary Alexandrian readings in Matt 5:36; 5:44; 10:23; 19:21; 23:9; 25:27; and 27:46.

<sup>20</sup> Clement preserves primary Secondary Alexandrian readings in Matt 23:8 and 24:35. Clement does not preserve primary Secondary Alexandrian readings in Matt 6:34; 12:36; 12:37; 18:10; 19:14.

<sup>21</sup> Clement preserves primary Caesarean readings in Matt 23:27. Clement does not preserve primary Caesarean readings in Matt 13:13; 13:33; and 23:37.



the Byzantine text-type? No. On the contrary, the fact that all but one of the Byzantine readings are primary readings indicates that these readings are *not unique* to the Byzantine text-type; they are simply readings shared by the other textual families. Thus, at most, this high level of agreement points to the antiquity of a number of Byzantine readings, a fact already demonstrated by the presence of some Byzantine readings in early papyri.<sup>22</sup>

Second, the totals indicate that, although Clement shows an awareness of a number of Western readings (13), the far greater number of Western readings that he does not preserve (27) indicates that the Western tradition has little influence on his text. This confirms the conclusion that emerges from the quantitative analysis.

Finally, the results of this group profile also clarify some of the more ambiguous results of the quantitative analysis. First, where the quantitative analysis results rank the Secondary Alexandrian readings only 5.7 to 4.4% behind the Alexandrian and Byzantine readings (62.1% and 60.8% to 56.4%), the profile method significantly diminishes the strength of Clement's relationship to the Secondary Alexandrian witnesses by increasing the margin of difference to 27.8%! Furthermore, and even more conclusively, Clement shows little affinity with the Caesarean textual family (12.5%). This is in strong contrast to the 55.8% level of agreement from the quantitative analysis. Clement fails to preserve a single one of the four Caesarean exclusive reading and supports only one out of four primary readings. In Matthew, at least, Clement's text cannot be characterized as Caesarean. Of course, this is exactly what one expects, since the Caesarean family of readings is not thought to have arisen until after Clement's time.

The second profile in table 9 (the Intra-Group Profile) overcomes the paucity of the data in the first profile by looking at the proportional levels of Clement's support of uniform and predominant readings in each of the textual groups, regardless of their presence among the other textual groups. This profile is designed to indicate the extent and strength of a witness's attestation within each group. To be classified as a member of a particular group, a witness should preserve, therefore, a high proportion of the readings (primarily the uniform readings) shared with the group. Thus, unlike the previous profile, the level of proportional agreement is important here and should, ideally, approach the 65–70% level suggested in the quantitative analysis. When applied to Clement, the results are not particularly helpful. Not only are Clement's levels of agreement below 65%, but they are also nearly equally divided between the Byzantine, Primary Alexandrian, and Caesarean readings in Matthew. The clearest result from

---

<sup>22</sup> See comments on Zuntz in chapter 5 n. 31.

this intra-group profile is that Clement once again shows little influence from readings present in the Western textual tradition (49.3%).

The particular shortcoming of this second profile is the inflated level of support it gives to non-Western uniform and predominant readings, due to the presence of a large number of exclusive and distinctive Western readings (readings where two or more Western witnesses provide support but no others) in early Christian manuscripts.<sup>23</sup> The third profile in table 9 overcomes this weakness by combining the strength of the inter- and intra-group profiles; it examines the level of Clement's agreement with the uniform and predominant readings of each textual group that are also distinctive, exclusive, or primary.<sup>24</sup>

The result of the third profile resembles, once again, the findings from the previous profiles and the quantitative analysis: Clement's strongest textual affinity in Matthew is closest to the Primary Alexandrian and Byzantine readings. Among the uniform readings, Clement's highest support is with the Secondary Alexandrian<sup>25</sup> uniform reading at 100%, followed by the Byzantine<sup>26</sup> and Western<sup>27</sup> at 50%. Clement supports 42.9%

---

<sup>23</sup> This phenomenon can be seen by the number of Western distinctive and exclusive readings made evident by any comparison of Western readings against other textual groups. In the case of Clement, the first profile illustrates this point well. In Matthew alone, there are a total of 28 distinctive and exclusive Western readings. In contrast, the accumulated total of all the other textual groups produces only eight readings—more than a three to one difference! In addition, the same point can be illustrated by a comparison of the distinctive and exclusive readings among the results of the first profile among the other Gospels. To a much lesser degree, of course, the exclusive and distinctive readings among the other textual groups have a similar effect on the profile.

<sup>24</sup> As the totals indicate, this combination profile does reduce the exaggerated totals of the non-Western uniform and predominant readings from the intra-group profile. The number of Primary Alexandrian uniform and predominant readings drops from 116 to 13, Secondary Alexandrian readings from 101 to 5, Byzantine readings from 113 to 13, Caesarean readings from 96 to 2, and Western readings from 73 to 27. The decrease is not as significant among the Western readings because they have a larger number of uniform and predominant readings that are also distinctive, exclusive, or primary.

<sup>25</sup> Clement preserves uniform Secondary Alexandrian readings in Matt 24:35.

<sup>26</sup> Clement preserves uniform Byzantine readings in Matt 5:25; 10:23; 12:36; 16:26; 22:40. Clement does not preserve uniform Byzantine readings in Matt 5:25; 5:36; 19:17; 19:23; 23:37.

<sup>27</sup> Clement preserves uniform Western readings in Matt 6:32; 7:13; 13:43; 23:9; 23:26; 25:39; 25:41; 26:23. Clement does not preserve uniform Western readings in Matt 5:42; 10:5; 10:42 (X2); 11:28; 12:36; 21:16; 21:22.

of the Primary Alexandrian readings<sup>28</sup> and none of the Caesarean readings.<sup>29</sup> While Clement's 100% level of agreement with the Primary Alexandrian readings strengthens his connections to the Alexandrian tradition, not too much should be made of it because it is based on a single reading.

Among the predominant readings, Clement's support is again the highest with the Byzantine readings. Here Clement's support reaches the level of 66.7%,<sup>30</sup> as compared to 50% with the Primary Alexandrian readings,<sup>31</sup> 25.0% with the Secondary Alexandrian readings,<sup>32</sup> and only 18.2% with the Western readings.<sup>33</sup> No Caesarean predominant readings are extant for consideration.

As expected, the totals of both the uniform and predominant readings establish Clement's textual affinities most closely to the Byzantine (53.8%) and Primary Alexandrian readings (46.2%). While a margin of 7.6% separates the two groups, the margin of difference is not that significant when one takes into consideration the small number of readings being compared. Clement's next closest affinity is with the Secondary Alexandrian tradition (40.0%), followed by the Western text (37.0%), and with no relationships with the Caesarean (0%).

Although Clement's text of Matthew aligns most closely with the Byzantine and Primary Alexandrian readings in each of the group profiles, his relatively low level of proportional agreement in the third profile, combined with the small number of distinctive and exclusive readings from the first profile, mitigates against an attempt to classifying his text as solely Byzantine or Primary Alexandrian. Instead, the information available through the group profile method may suggest that Clement's text in Matthew represents a early stage in the development of the textual tradition in Alexandria, a stage during which a "reservoir"—following the imagery

---

<sup>28</sup> Clement preserves uniform Primary Alexandrian readings in Matt 5:22; 5:42; 13:34. Clement does not preserve uniform Primary Alexandrian readings in Matt 5:44; 10:23; 23:9; 25:27.

<sup>29</sup> Clement does not preserve uniform Caesarean readings in Matt 13:13; 23:37.

<sup>30</sup> Clement preserves predominant Byzantine readings in Matt 5:48 and 23:9. Clement does not preserve predominant Byzantine readings in Matt 5:48.

<sup>31</sup> Clement preserves predominant Primary Alexandrian readings in Matt 19:3; 23:37; 25:39. Clement does not preserve predominant Primary Alexandrian readings in Matt 5:36; 19:21; 27:46.

<sup>32</sup> Clement preserves predominant Secondary Alexandrian readings in Matt 23:8. Clement does not preserve predominant Secondary Alexandrian readings in Matt 5:4; 18:10; 19:14.

<sup>33</sup> Clement preserves predominant Primary Western readings in Matt 23:37 and 25:35. Clement does not preserve predominant Primary Western readings in Matt 5:9; 5:42; 6:20; 10:32; 18:10; 18:22; 23:9; 23:27; 25:26.

characterized by Zuntz—of different readings existed, including a number of early Byzantine readings that eventually disappeared from some later streams of the Alexandrian text. If this is the case, it may also help to explain the shifting nature of Clement's textual affinities among the Synoptic Gospels. Before any such final conclusions can be drawn, a specific examination of each of the Byzantine readings Clement supports from the third profile, and an assessment of their relation/presence in the Alexandrian and Western traditions, is necessary. This examination will be undertaken in the next chapter.

#### THE GOSPEL OF MARK

The results of the comprehensive profile method applied to Clement's text of Mark confirm the overall assessment drawn from the quantitative analysis: Clement's text bears a clear affinity with the Western text. While the Primary Alexandrian textual tradition has some degree of influence on Clement's text, it clearly plays a secondary role. Clement appears to have virtually no connection to the Secondary Alexandrian readings and a very minimal influence from the Caesarean and Byzantine groups. Before these observations are discussed in more detail, however, it should be noted once again that the nature of Clement's text essentially limits these results to his text of Mark 10:17–31.<sup>34</sup> While it is possible that his text in Mark 10 is representative of his entire Gospel, the nature of the extant evidence does not allow such a conclusion to be drawn with any certainty. Since the strengths and weaknesses of each of the three individual profiles are already mentioned in connection to Matthew, they are not discussed in as much detail in the rest of this chapter.

Although the overall data from the first profile identifies Clement's textual affinities most closely with the Western readings, his strongest connection to the Western text is apparent among his support of the distinctive and exclusive readings. Since primary readings are shared to varying degrees by all the text-types, it is the distinctive and exclusive

---

<sup>34</sup> The only extant passage in Clement outside of Mark 10 is 8:38. This verse yields only one genetically significant variant. The reading Clement preserves, however, provides no information for the first or third profiles, and, with the exception of the Old Latin MSS a k and Origen, is supported by all of the other extant witnesses. As such, it only affects the results of the second profile.

TABLE 10

Group Profile Analysis  
Readings in Mark

Profile One, Inter-Group Relationships

	<u>Distinctive</u>	<u>Exclusive</u>	<u>Primary</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Prim. Alex.	0/0	0/0	3/9 (33.3%)	3/9 (33.3%)
Sec. Alex.	0/0	0/1 (0.0%)	0/2 (0.0%)	0/3 (0.0%)
Byzantine	0/1 (0.0%)	0/1 (0.0%)	1/6 (16.7%)	1/8 (12.5%)
Caesarean	0/0	0/3 (0.0%)	1/5 (16.7%)	1/8 (12.5%)
Western	2/4 (50.0%)	3/8 (37.5%)	5/8 (62.5%)	10/20 (50.0%)

Profile Two, Intra-Group Relationships

	<u>Uniform</u>	<u>Predominant</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Prim. Alex.	19/32 (59.4%)	5/13 (38.5%)	24/45 (53.3%)
Sec. Alex.	14/26 (53.8%)	7/12 (58.3%)	21/38 (55.3%)
Byzantine	20/32 (62.5%)	4/8 (50.0%)	24/40 (60.0%)
Caesarean	13/20 (65.0%)	4/11 (36.4%)	17/31 (54.8%)
Western	8/12 (66.7%)	11/15 (73.3%)	19/27 (70.4%)

Profile Three, Uniform and Predominant Readings that are also Distinctive, Exclusive, or Primary

	<u>Uniform</u>	<u>Predominant</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Prim. Alex.	1/5 (20.0%)	2/4 (50.0%)	3/9 (33.3%)
Sec. Alex.	0/1 (0.0%)	0/0	0/1 (0.0%)
Byzantine	1/3 (33.3%)	0/2 (00.0%)	1/5 (20.0%)
Caesarean	0/1 (0.0%)	1/3 (33.3%)	1/4 (25.0%)
Western	2/5 (40.0%)	3/5 (60.0%)	5/10 (50.0%)

readings that most clearly define the textual character of each of the manuscript traditions. And among these readings, Clement does not support a single one of the six distinctive and exclusive readings scattered across the Alexandrian, Byzantine, and Caesarean traditions.<sup>35</sup> What is notable, however, is Clement's strikingly higher attestation of the Western readings. Here Clement supports two of the four distinctive Western readings<sup>36</sup> and three of the eight exclusive Western readings.<sup>37</sup> Clement's strong support of the Western text continues among the primary readings that are not isolated to one particular textual tradition. Among these readings, Clement supports the primary Western readings at 62.5%,<sup>38</sup> the Primary Alexandrian readings at 33.3%,<sup>39</sup> and both the Byzantine and Caesarean readings at a meager 16.7%.<sup>40</sup> Clement does not support any of the primary Secondary Alexandrian readings.<sup>41</sup>

When the three categories of readings are totaled in the first profile, it is no surprise that Clement's strongest connection is decidedly in favor of the Western readings (50.0%). Of the remaining four groups, the Primary Alexandrian readings follow at a distance at 33.3%, and the Byzantine and Caesarean readings are removed even further at 12.5% each. Clement does not share a single agreement with any of the extant Secondary Alexandrian readings.

The combined totals of the data from the uniform and predominant in the second profile clearly connect Clement to the Western tradition more

---

<sup>35</sup> Clement does not preserve the distinctive Byzantine reading in Mark 10:21, nor does he preserve the exclusive Secondary Alexandrian reading found in Mark 10:17; the three exclusive Caesarean readings in Mark 10:19; 10:20 (X2); and the exclusive Byzantine readings in Mark 10:21.

<sup>36</sup> Clement preserves the distinctive Western readings in Mark 10:27 (X2). Clement does not preserve distinctive Western readings in Mark 10:22 and 10:30.

<sup>37</sup> Clement preserves the three exclusive Western readings in Mark 10:17; 10:18; 10:22. Clement does not preserve the six exclusive Western readings in Mark 8:38; 10:17; 10:19 (X2); 10:22.

<sup>38</sup> Clement preserves primary Western readings in Mark 10:17; 10:20; 10:21; 10:27; 10:29. Clement does not preserve primary Western readings in Mark 10:19; 10:22; 10:24.

<sup>39</sup> Clement preserves primary Primary Alexandrian readings in Mark 10:25; 10:29; 10:31. Clement does not preserve primary Primary Alexandrian readings in Mark 10:20; 10:24; 10:27; 10:28 (X2); 10:29.

<sup>40</sup> Clement preserves primary Byzantine readings in Mark 10:19. Clement does not preserve primary Byzantine readings in Mark 10:20; 10:21; 10:24; 10:27; 10:29. Clement preserves primary Caesarean readings in Mark 10:19. Clement does not preserve primary Caesarean readings in Mark 10:21; 10:29 (X2); 10:31.

<sup>41</sup> Clement does not preserve primary Secondary Alexandrian readings in Mark 10:24; 10:29.

than any other textual group.<sup>42</sup> As mentioned previously, to classify a witness as a bona fide member of a group, a witness should not only share a high proportion of a group's readings but also support a higher attestation of a group's uniform readings than its predominant readings. The value of predominant readings are not as significant, since they often comprise readings shared with other groups, in addition to being readings where a group's textual tradition is divided. When this second profile has been applied successfully to other Fathers, a Father's affinities are always stronger among its uniform than its predominant readings.<sup>43</sup> The situation is slightly different with Clement. Among the uniform readings, Clement's support of the Western readings ranks first, at 66.7%. The Caesarean readings come in second place, at 65.0%, followed by the Byzantine at 62.5%, the Primary Alexandrian (59.4%) and Secondary Alexandrian (53.8%) readings being further removed. Whereas the proportional levels of the predominant Primary Alexandrian, Byzantine, and Caesarean readings drop significantly in comparison to their uniform readings, Clement's support of predominant Western readings increases 6.6% to 75.3%.<sup>44</sup> The increased number of Western predominant readings—readings whose distinctive Western character is not as strongly Western as the uniform readings—slightly dilutes the strength of this second profile's identification of Clement's text as Western. This is not to say that Clement's text does not have a distinctive Western nature to it—it clearly does. But the results suggest that Clement's text of Mark may not be as dominantly Western as a 70.4% total level of agreement may at first suggest.

The third profile again shows that Clement's textual proclivities are overwhelmingly aligned with the Western tradition. Among uniform readings that are also distinctive, exclusive, or primary, Clement supports 40% of the Western readings,<sup>45</sup> 33.3% of the Byzantine,<sup>46</sup> and 20.0% of the Primary Alexandrian readings.<sup>47</sup> He displays no support for any of the other

---

<sup>42</sup> After Clement's support of the Western readings at 70.4%, the next *closest* group is separated by a margin of 10.4%, the Byzantine readings at 60.0%.

<sup>43</sup> E.g., Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind*, 234–35; Brogan, "Text of the Gospels," 241, 256; Racine, "Text of Matthew," 275.

<sup>44</sup> Clement's support of the Secondary Alexandrian predominant readings also increases to 58.3%.

<sup>45</sup> Clement preserves uniform Western readings in Mark 10:27 (X2). Clement does not preserve uniform Western readings in Mark 10:22 (X2) and 10:24.

<sup>46</sup> Clement preserves uniform Byzantine readings in Mark 10:19. Clement does not preserve uniform Byzantine readings in Mark 10:21 and 10:27.

<sup>47</sup> Clement preserves uniform Primary Alexandrian readings in 10:29. Clement does not preserve uniform Primary Alexandrian readings in Mark 10:20; 10:24; 10:27; 10:28.

uniform readings attested by the other text-types.<sup>48</sup> The situation changes only slightly among the predominant readings. Here Clement supports 60% of the Western,<sup>49</sup> 50% of the Primary Alexandrian,<sup>50</sup> and 33.3% of the Caesarean,<sup>51</sup> and he fails to attest either of the Byzantine readings.<sup>52</sup> There are no primary Secondary Alexandrian readings available for comparison.

When the uniform and predominant readings are combined, the results reveal the influence of the Western readings on Clement's text of Mark. His support of the Western readings is 50.0%. The Primary Alexandrian readings follow next, but they are separated by a gap of 16.7%, at 33.3%. The Caesarean and Byzantine traditions appear to have little influence, since their support is limited to 25% and 20%, respectively. There is no indication that Secondary Alexandrian readings have any influence.

Although the results of the group profile analysis suggest that Clement's affinities align closest with the Western text in Mark 10:17–31, there are still a number of reasons that caution against prematurely classifying his text too quickly as Western. For one, while Clement's overall level of agreement at 50.0% gives his text a definitive Western flavor, it is not all-encompassing. His text also reveals a limited but noticeable Primary Alexandrian influence. The most significant factor, however, is the rather loose way Clement quotes the passage in Mark. Clement's text reveals a number of readings that indicate he made a number of small but frequent modifications to the text. This led Mees to claim that Clement's so-called Western readings are not uniquely Western but are merely the result of Clement's loose handling of the text.<sup>53</sup> More recently, Barbara Aland has also referred to many of these divergences as either examples of harmonization or mere "banalities" that, in her opinion, "go back to the rapid dictation of the author to his stenographer."<sup>54</sup> Thus before any firm conclusion can be drawn about the strength of the Western influence on Clement's text of Mark, a further

---

<sup>48</sup> Clement does not preserve uniform Secondary Alexandrian readings in Mark 10:19. He also fails to preserve uniform Caesarean readings in Mark 10:29.

<sup>49</sup> Clement preserves predominant Western readings in Mark 10:17; 10:20; and 10:21. Clement does not preserve predominant Western readings in Mark 10:19 and 10:30.

<sup>50</sup> Clement preserves predominant Primary Alexandrian readings in Mark 10:25; 10:31. Clement does not preserve predominant Primary Alexandrian readings in Mark 10:28; and 10:29.

<sup>51</sup> Clement preserves predominant Caesarean readings in Mark 10:19. Clement does not preserve predominant Caesarean readings in Mark 10:29 and 10:31.

<sup>52</sup> Clement does not preserve predominant Byzantine readings in Mark 10:20 and 10:21.

<sup>53</sup> See pp. 42–43.

<sup>54</sup> Aland, "Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri," 119–20.



analysis is needed to determine whether Clement's attestation of the specific Western readings in the third profile are genuinely Western in origin or merely the accidental result of his loose quotation of the passage. Until this can be performed in the following chapter, Clement's text of Mark can only be classified tentatively as Western.

#### THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

The application of the comprehensive profile method to the Gospel of Luke yields results that share some surprising similarities with those in Mark (see table 11). As with Mark, Clement's text identifies most closely with the Western text, though again the levels of proportional agreement fall somewhat short of 65%. Among the other text-types, Clement's next closest level of agreement resides with the Primary Alexandrian readings.

As was the case with Clement's text of Mark, the first profile provides a striking illustration of the strong connection Clement shares with the Western text in Luke. Outside of the Western tradition, Clement's text of Luke reveals few distinctive readings among the other textual traditions; there is only one exclusive Secondary Alexandrian reading (Luke 12:37) and one Byzantine (Luke 12:11), neither of which Clement attests. While the number of readings for comparison increases somewhat among the exclusive readings, Clement also fails to support a single one of the Alexandrian, Byzantine, or Caesarean readings!<sup>55</sup> It is only among the Western distinctive (64.3%)<sup>56</sup> and exclusive (35.3%)<sup>57</sup> readings that Clement's support is clearly manifest.

The influence of the Western text on Clement is also present among the primary readings, although the 3% margin of difference with the Primary Alexandrian readings is not significant. Clement's support is highest among

---

<sup>55</sup> Clement does not preserve the exclusive Primary Alexandrian reading in Luke 14:13, nor the three exclusive Secondary Alexandrian reading in Luke 6:45; 12:30. 10:17. He also does not preserve the exclusive Byzantine readings in Luke 12:15; 12:28; 19:8, nor the exclusive Caesarean readings in Luke 6:35; 16:21; 20:34.

<sup>56</sup> Clement preserves the distinctive Western readings in Luke 3:13; 3:22; 12:11; 12:20 (X2); 12:24; 12:30 (X2); 17:4. Clement does not preserve the distinctive Western readings in Luke 6:43 (X2); 10:41; 12:19 (X2).

<sup>57</sup> Clement preserves the exclusive Western readings in Luke 7:25; 12:11; 12:31; 14:20; 19:8. Clement does not preserve the exclusive Western readings found in Luke 3:23; 12:12; 12:23; 12:24; 12:27; 12:30; 12:36; 16:9; 20:34; 24:42.

TABLE 11

Group Profile Analysis  
Readings in Luke

Profile One, Inter-Group Relationships

	<u>Distinctive</u>	<u>Exclusive</u>	<u>Primary</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Prim. Alex.	0/0	0/1 (0.0%)	10/29 (34.5%)	10/30 (33.3%)
Sec. Alex.	0/1 (0.0%)	0/3 (0.0%)	1/4 (25.0%)	1/8 (12.5%)
Byzantine	0/1 (0.0%)	0/3 (0.0%)	3/24 (12.5%)	3/28 (10.7%)
Caesarean	0/0	0/3 (0.0%)	1/6 (16.7%)	1/9 (11.1%)
Western	9/14 (64.3.1%)	5/15 (33.3%)	6/16 (37.5%)	20/45 (44.4%)

Profile Two, Intra-Group Relationships

	<u>Uniform</u>	<u>Predominant</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Prim. Alex.	50/96 (61.5%)	15/37 (40.5%)	74/133 (55.6%)
Sec. Alex.	36/53 (67.9%)	26/53 (49.1%)	62/106 (58.5%)
Byzantine	52/93 (55.9%)	19/37 (51.4%)	71/130 (54.6%)
Caesarean	43/73 (58.9%)	23/36 (63.9%)	66/109 (60.6%)
Western	23/32 (71.9%)	30/40 (75.0%)	53/72 (73.6%)

Profile Three, Uniform and Predominant Readings that are also Distinctive, Exclusive, or Primary

	<u>Uniform</u>	<u>Predominant</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Prim. Alex.	8/23 (34.8%)	2/5 (40.0%)	10/28 (35.7%)
Sec. Alex.	0/0	0/2 (0.0%)	0/2 (0.0%)
Byzantine	3/13 (23.1%)	1/9 (11.1%)	4/22 (18.2%)
Caesarean	0/2 (0.0%)	1/1 (100.0%)	1/3 (33.3%)
Western	10/17 (58.8%)	6/10 (60.0%)	16/27 (59.3%)

the Western (37.5%),<sup>58</sup> followed by the Primary Alexandria readings (34.5%),<sup>59</sup> the Secondary Alexandrian (25.0%),<sup>60</sup> with minimal Caesarean (16.7%)<sup>61</sup> and Byzantine (12.5%)<sup>62</sup> support.

When the data of all three categories are combined, Clement's affinity once more favors the Western tradition. Clement agrees 44.4% with the Western witnesses, 33.3% with the Primary Alexandrian, and only 12.5% with the Secondary Alexandrian, 11.1% with the Caesarean, and 10.7% with the Byzantine. In addition to underlining Clement's affinity with the Western text in Luke, the results testify to the lack of affinity Clement shares with the Byzantine and Caesarean traditions.

The results from both the uniform and predominant readings in the intra-group profile also identify Clement's strongest affinities in Luke with the Western text. According to the combined totals, Clement supports 73.6% of the Western readings, followed by the Caesarean at 60.6%, while his support of the other textual groups is closely divided among the Secondary Alexandrian readings at 58.5%, the Primary Alexandrian at 55.6%, and the Byzantine at 54.6%. What is significant about this second profile is that Clement's highest level of agreement with the Western text is not found among the uniform readings but with the predominant readings. Clement's level of support increases from 71.9% among the uniform readings to 75% with the predominant. As the case was with the identification of Clement's text as Western in Mark, this is unusual. To be classified as a clear member of the Western text-type, one would expect Clement to support a greater number of uniform readings. Instead, his slightly greater support of predominant Western readings—readings shared with other groups—suggests he may not be a particularly strong witness. In

---

<sup>58</sup> Clement preserves the primary Western readings in Luke 6:37; 9:62 (X3); 10:21; 10:42. Clement does not preserve the primary Western readings in Luke 6:22; 6:29 (X2); 6:38; 12:8; 12:24; 12:35; 12:49; 13:32; 14:26.

<sup>59</sup> Clement preserves the primary Primary Alexandrian readings in Luke 6:31; 6:36; 6:38; 6:45; 13:32; 16:9; 16:21; 17:3; 20:34; 24:42. Clement does not preserve the primary Primary Alexandrian readings in Luke 3:23; 6:30; 6:38; 6:44; 6:45 (X2); 6:46; 9:62; 12:22; 12:28 (X2); 12:30; 14:16; 14:26; 16:9; 19:8 (X2); 22:31; 24:44.

<sup>60</sup> Clement preserves the primary Secondary Alexandrian readings in Luke 6:36. Clement does not preserve the primary Secondary Alexandrian readings in Luke 6:44; 12:20; 12:24.

<sup>61</sup> Clement preserves the primary Caesarean reading in Luke 12:36. Clement does not preserve the primary Caesarean readings in Luke 3:2; 6:45; 12:24; 12:28; 17:4.

<sup>62</sup> Clement preserves the primary Byzantine readings in Luke 6:38; 7:28; 12:28. Clement does not preserve the primary Byzantine reading in Luke 3:22; 3:23; 6:36; 6:38 (X2); 6:45; 9:62; 10:21 (X3); 12:11; 12:23; 12:30; 14:15; 16:9; 16:16; 17:3; 17:4 (X2); 20:34 (X2).

any case, the nature of these results should caution against too quickly identifying Clement's text as Western on the basis of this profile alone. Before any final conclusion can be drawn, a careful examination into the nature of Clement's Western readings is also needed.

The results of the third profile largely confirm the findings of the first two: while Clement's strongest textual proclivities in Luke are Western, the level of his proportional agreement still falls short of the 65% level necessary to classify his text solidly as Western. Among uniform readings that are also distinctive, exclusive, or primary, Clement supports the Western readings at 58.8%,<sup>63</sup> the Primary Alexandrian readings at 34.8%,<sup>64</sup> and the Byzantine at 23.1%.<sup>65</sup> Clement does not support any of the Caesarean uniform readings.<sup>66</sup> No Secondary Alexandrian readings are available for comparison. Clement's textual affinities switch sharply among the predominant readings. Clement supports 100% of the Caesarean tradition,<sup>67</sup> 60.0% of the Western,<sup>68</sup> 40% of the Primary Alexandrian,<sup>69</sup> 11.1% of the Byzantine,<sup>70</sup> and none of the Secondary Alexandrian readings.<sup>71</sup> Of course, the fact that Clement's support of the Caesarean reading rests on only one reading significantly minimizes its importance. The anomaly caused by Clement's support of the one Caesarean witness is overcome when the totals of the uniform and predominant readings are combined. The Western readings emerge as the

---

<sup>63</sup> Clement preserves uniform Western readings in Luke 3:13; 9:62 (X2); 10:21; 10:42; 12:11; 12:20; 12:24; 12:30; 17:4. Clement does not preserve uniform Western readings in Luke 6:29; 6:43 (X2); 10:41; 12:19 (X2); 12:49.

<sup>64</sup> Clement preserves uniform Primary Alexandrian readings in Luke 6:38; 6:45; 13:32; 16:9; 16:21; 17:3; 20:34; 24:42. Clement does not preserve uniform Primary Alexandrian readings in Luke 3:23; 6:30; 6:44; 6:45 (X2); 12:22; 12:28; 12:30; 14:16; 14:26; 16:9; 19:8 (X2); 22:31; 24:44.

<sup>65</sup> Clement preserves uniform Byzantine readings in Luke 6:38; 12:28; 19:8. Clement does not preserve uniform Byzantine readings in Luke 3:23; 6:36; 6:38 (X2); 6:45; 9:62; 10:21 (X2); 12:11; 16:16.

<sup>66</sup> Clement does not preserve the uniform Caesarean readings in Luke 3:2; 6:45.

<sup>67</sup> Clement preserves the predominant Caesarean reading in Luke 12:36.

<sup>68</sup> Clement preserves predominant Western readings in Luke 3:22; 6:37; 9:62; 12:20; 12:30; 14:20. Clement does not preserve predominant Western readings in Luke 3:23; 12:27; 12:35; 14:26.

<sup>69</sup> Clement preserves predominant Primary Alexandrian readings in Luke 6:31; 6:36. Clement does not preserve the predominant Primary Alexandrian reading in Luke 6:38; 12:28; 9:62.

<sup>70</sup> Clement preserves the predominant Byzantine reading in Luke 7:28. Clement does not preserve predominant Byzantine readings in Luke 3:22; 12:11; 12:23; 12:28; 12:30; 14:15; 17:4; 20:34.

<sup>71</sup> Clement does not preserve the Secondary Alexandrian readings in Luke 12:24; 12:37.

strongest influence on Clement's text at 59.3%, followed by the Primary Alexandrian readings at 35.7%, and more remotely by the Caesarean and Byzantine readings, respectively at 33.3% and 18.2%. As was also the case in Mark, there is no indication that Secondary Alexandrian readings have any influence on Clement at all.

The conclusions from the first two profiles and the results of the third profile of Clement's text of Luke reveal again a strong, although not completely dominant, Western influence on Clement's text. The data also suggests that the Primary Alexandrian text exerted a limited influence as well. As was the case with Mark, another factor also weighs against prematurely classifying the extent of the Western text's influence on Clement's text of Luke. As noted previously, Mees claims that Clement's Western readings are not uniquely Western but merely the accidental result of Clement's own citation habits as a part of his catechesis.<sup>72</sup> If this is indeed the case, the overall results of the group profile may be misleading. Therefore, until Clement's agreements with the Western readings in the third profile can be examined in detail in the following chapter, no final conclusion can be made about the degree of influence the Western text had on Clement's text of Luke.

#### THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

The group profile analysis of Clement's text of John not only confirms the Alexandrian identification suggested previously by quantitative analysis, but it indicates that Clement's text bears more of a Primary than a Secondary Alexandrian influence. Unfortunately, as the case was in the Synoptics, Clement's highest level of proportional agreement again fails to reach 65%. Table 12 displays the data from the three individual group profiles of the Fourth Gospel.

The first profile reveals a limited number of distinctive and exclusive readings from Clement's text of John. The absence of these textually definitive types of readings limits the strength of this profile's conclusions, since the results are dependent on the more numerous primary readings—readings whose textual distinctiveness is limited by their shared presence in some of the other text-types. The only distinctive readings among the various textual groups are with the Byzantine and Western texts. Of these, Clement does not attest the single Byzantine reading,<sup>73</sup> and he supports only

---

<sup>72</sup> See pp. 42–43.

<sup>73</sup> Clement does not preserve the distinctive Byzantine reading in John 6:40.

TABLE 12  
Group Profile Analysis  
Readings in John

Profile One, Inter-Group Relationships

	<u>Distinctive</u>	<u>Exclusive</u>	<u>Primary</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Prim. Alex.	0/0	0/1 (0.0%)	3/5 (60.0%)	3/6 (50.0%)
Sec. Alex.	0/0	1/2 (50.0%)	2/2 (100.0%)	3/4 (75.0%)
Byzantine	0/1 (0.0%)	0/0 (0.0%)	2/6 (33.3%)	2/7 (28.6%)
Caesarean	0/0	0/0	0/1 (0.0%)	0/1 (0.0%)
Western	1/3 (33.3%)	2/14 (14.3%)	3/14 (21.4%)	6/31 (19.4%)

Profile Two, Intra-Group Relationships

	<u>Uniform</u>	<u>Predominant</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Prim. Alex.	34/47 (72.3%)	11/29 (57.9%)	45/66 (68.2%)
Sec. Alex.	27/33 (81.8%)	19/26 (73.1%)	46/59 (78.0%)
Byzantine	35/52 (67.3%)	6/14 (42.9%)	41/66 (62.1%)
Caesarean	31/44 (70.5%)	9/16 (56.3%)	40/60 (66.7%)
Western	6/10 (60.0%)	8/23 (34.8%)	14/13 (42.4%)

Profile Three, Uniform and Predominant Readings that are also Distinctive, Exclusive, or Primary

	<u>Uniform</u>	<u>Predominant</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Prim. Alex.	2/3 (66.7%)	1/2 (50.0%)	3/5 (60.0%)
Sec. Alex.	0/0	0/0	0/0
Byzantine	1/3 (33.3%)	0/2 (0.0%)	1/5 (20.0%)
Caesarean	0/0	0/0	0/0
Western	2/2 (100.0%)	3/12 (33.3%)	5/14 (35.7%)

one of the three Western readings.<sup>74</sup> The situation slightly changes among the exclusive readings; here Clement does not support the sole exclusive Primary Alexandrian reading,<sup>75</sup> and he only supports two of the fourteen Western readings.<sup>76</sup> Clement does, however, support one of the two Secondary Alexandrian readings.<sup>77</sup> When the greater number of primary readings is taken into consideration, Clement's textual proclivities tilt toward the Secondary Alexandrian readings, although the number of readings upon which it depends is quite small. He preserves both of the Secondary Alexandrian readings (100%),<sup>78</sup> three out of five Primary Alexandrian readings (60%),<sup>79</sup> two out of six Byzantine readings (33.3%),<sup>80</sup> and three out of fourteen Western readings (21.4%).<sup>81</sup> He does not support the sole Caesarean reading.<sup>82</sup>

The disproportional influence of the primary readings on the conclusions of this first profile can be seen when the results from the distinctive, exclusive, and primary readings are combined. Although the varying levels of Clement's proportional agreement with the textual groups fluctuate, the overall ranking of his relationship to the textual groups is identical to the results from the primary readings. This disproportional influence of the primary readings should obviate any firm classification of Clement's text of John based on this first profile alone. The only sure conclusion that can be drawn is that the Western text appears to have played a limited influence on Clement text of John. Out of the seventeen distinctive and exclusive Western readings, Clement supports only

---

<sup>74</sup> Clement does preserve the distinctive Western reading in John 1:4. Clement does not preserve the distinctive Western readings in John 6:51 and 17:23.

<sup>75</sup> Clement does not preserve the exclusive Primary Alexandrian reading in John 1:27.

<sup>76</sup> Clement preserves the exclusive Western readings in John 1:5; 8:34. Clement does not preserve the exclusive Western readings in John 1:18 (X2); 3:6; 5:24; 6:32; 6:33; 7:18; 10:2; 10:8; 10:11; 17:22; 17:23.

<sup>77</sup> Clement preserves the exclusive Secondary Alexandrian reading in John 7:18. Clement does not preserve the exclusive Secondary Alexandrian readings in John 17:25.

<sup>78</sup> Clement preserves primary Secondary Alexandrian readings in John 1:18; 8:35.

<sup>79</sup> Clement preserves primary Primary Alexandrian readings in John 6:47; 17:21; 17:22. Clement does not preserve primary Primary Alexandrian readings in John 1:18; 17:24.

<sup>80</sup> Clement preserves primary Byzantine readings in John 10:27; 17:24. Clement does not preserve primary Byzantine readings in John 4:34; 17:22 (X2); 17:24.

<sup>81</sup> Clement preserves primary Western readings in John 6:40; 6:51; 10:16. Clement does not preserve primary Western readings in John 1:3; 1:17; 6:33; 8:24; 8:35; 8:44 (X2); 10:8; 17:21; 17:23 (X2).

<sup>82</sup> Clement does not preserve the primary Caesarean reading in John 20:29.

three of them. The situation is virtually the same in the primary Western readings, where he attests only three of the fourteen. This limited influence of the Western text on Clement in John is especially noteworthy, since it plays a far stronger role on Clement in Mark and Luke.

When the uniform and predominant readings of Clement's text of John are examined without regard to their presence among the other textual groups, the results from the second profile also identify Clement's strongest proclivity with the Secondary Alexandrian witnesses. While the proportional levels of agreement from the combined uniform and predominant categories do result in such a classification, the nature of the results, once again, however, undermines the strength of the classification of Clement's text of John as Secondary Alexandrian.

Among the uniform readings, Clement's support of the Secondary Alexandrian readings is ranked highest among the uniform readings at 81.8%. The Primary Alexandrian readings rank in second place at 72.3%, followed by the Caesarean (70.5%), Byzantine (67.3%), and Western (60.0%) readings. When these results are compared with the predominant readings, all of the levels of agreement drop significantly. The combination of the uniform and predominant readings only affects the proportional levels of agreement; the ranked order of the textual groups remains the same as it was in the predominant category. Clement's support of the Secondary Alexandrian and Primary Alexandrian readings is 78.0% and 68.2%, respectively.

While the proportional level of agreement of the Alexandrian readings surpasses the 65% threshold for group classification, the large number of predominant readings once again casts some degree of suspicion on the strength of Clement's classification as Secondary Alexandrian in John. A more conclusive classification of Clement's text requires the further analysis that follows in the third profile.

The application of the third profile to Clement's text of John confirms the suspicion that arose in the previous two profiles about the classification of Clement's text as Secondary Alexandrian. The complete absence of any Secondary Alexandrian readings that are also distinctive, exclusive, or primary obviates, of course, the identification of Clement's text with the Secondary Alexandrian witnesses. Instead, Clement's strongest proclivities appear to reside with the Primary Alexandrian witnesses, though, once again, the relatively low level of Clement's strongest proportional agreement fails to reach 65%.

Among uniform readings that are also distinctive, exclusive, or primary, Clement supports the Western readings at 100%,<sup>83</sup> the Primary Alexandrian

---

<sup>83</sup> Clement preserves uniform Western readings in John 1:4; 17:21.



readings at 66.7%,<sup>84</sup> and the Byzantine at 33.3%.<sup>85</sup> No Secondary Alexandrian or Caesarean readings are available for comparison. Clement's textual affinities are aligned differently among the predominant readings. Here Clement supports 50% of the Primary Alexandrian readings<sup>86</sup> and 33.3% of the Western.<sup>87</sup> Clement does not support either of the predominant Byzantine readings, and, once again, no Secondary Alexandrian or Caesarean readings emerge for comparison. When the uniform and predominant categories are combined, Clement's textual proclivities are more closely aligned with the Alexandrian readings (60%) than with the Western (35.7%) or Byzantine (20%) readings.

While Clement's 60% proportional level of agreement with the Primary Alexandrian readings in John falls 5% points below the 65% suggested as the minimal level necessary for group classification, several pieces of evidence indicate that an Alexandrian classification is probably more correct for his text of John than any other classification. (1) Clement's rate of agreement (60.0%) and the margin of difference separating his top two agreements are higher in John than in the Synoptic Gospels. A margin of 24.3% separates Clement's level of agreement between the Primary Alexandrian witnesses and his next closest agreement with the Western tradition (35.7%). (2) The third profile suggests that the various textual traditions play a very minimal influence on Clement's text of John. The only evidence from the third profile for any textual influence beyond the Primary Alexandrian and Western traditions in John is one single Byzantine agreement. (3) Unlike the random nature of the witnesses ranked according to their proportional agreement with Clement in each of the Synoptic Gospels (see tables 1, 3, and 5 in the previous chapter), the Alexandrian witnesses clearly dominate the highest levels of agreement as a unified block. While each of these pieces of evidence is far from conclusive individually, as a whole they make a strong case for an Alexandrian classification of Clement's text of John.

---

<sup>84</sup> Clement preserves uniform Primary Alexandrian readings in John 6:47; 17:21. Clement does not preserve the uniform Primary Alexandrian reading in John 17:24.

<sup>85</sup> Clement preserves the uniform Byzantine reading in John 10:27. Clement does not preserve uniform Byzantine readings in John 17:22 (X2).

<sup>86</sup> Clement preserves the predominant Primary Alexandrian reading in John 17:22. Clement does not preserve the predominant Primary Alexandrian reading in John 1:18.

<sup>87</sup> Clement preserves predominant Western readings in John 6:40; 6:51; 10:16. Clement does not preserve predominant Western readings in John 1:17; 1:18; 3:6; 6:51; 7:18; 8:44; 10:8; 17:22; 17:23.

## CONCLUSION

The application of the comprehensive profile method to Clement's text of the Gospels largely strengthens and clarifies the results that emerged from the quantitative analysis in the previous chapter. Whereas quantitative analysis was able to provide only a basic picture of the nature of Clement's affinities in the Synoptics, the profile method reveals a more precise assessment. In Matthew, the results of the profile method identified Clement's text most closely with the Byzantine readings, with nearly an equal Primary Alexandrian influence. In Mark and Luke, the profile confirmed that the Western text exerted a strong, although not exclusive, influence on Clement's text. In John, quantitative analysis identifies Clement's strongest proclivities as Alexandrian, but it was unable to determine whether his text stands closer to the Primary or Secondary Alexandrian witnesses. The profile method, however, suggests that, while Clement's text in John is likely Alexandrian, his strongest influence is Primary Alexandrian.

In addition to clarifying some of the results from the previous chapter, the comprehensive profile method also raises some additional questions that require further analysis before a more definite conclusion can be made for the classification of Clement's text of the Synoptics. First, how does one assess the primary textual influence in Matthew as Byzantine when Byzantine readings do not appear as a unified text-type until the fourth century? Since it appears that this Byzantine designation in Matthew is based largely on a number of readings shared with other textual groups, would an examination of these shared Byzantine readings reveal a greater affinity with the Alexandrian or Western traditions? Second, while Clement's text of Mark and Luke shows a Western influence, how strong is that influence? Will an examination of the Western readings that Clement supports in the third profile indicate that Clement's Western influence is largely the result of the way he uses the text for catechesis, as Mees suggests? Will the results from these questions have any affect on Clement's textual affinities in the Synoptics? Finally, how does one assess Clement's textual affinities in relation to the transmission history of the New Testament text in Alexandria? Is there such a thing as an "Alexandrian" form of the New Testament Gospels that Clement shares with later Alexandrian fathers? Or does the nature of Clement's text point to a later "Alexandrian" recension? We will explore these questions in the next chapter.

## THE TYPOLOGY OF CLEMENT'S READINGS

### REMAINING QUESTIONS

The analysis of Clement's text of the Gospels yields some intriguing results. Failing to reach at least a 65% level of agreement with any one of the textual groups in the Synoptic Gospels, the data may suggest that at the end of the second century there was not a single dominant text-type in Alexandria—at least for the Synoptics. This preliminary conclusion appears to be collaborated by the fact that Clement's highest level of proportional agreement varies considerably among the Gospels; it switches from being predominantly Byzantine/Alexandrian in Matthew, to Western in Mark 10 and Luke, and then to Alexandrian in John. Although the overall evidence suggesting an Alexandrian classification for his text of John seems undeniable, the situation is not the same with the Synoptic Gospels. Clement's fluctuating affinities and closer levels of agreement between the Byzantine and Alexandrian readings in Matthew and the Western readings in Mark and Luke require further evaluation. This additional analysis is especially needed since a number of the readings that determine Clement's textual classification are shared among the text-types; that is, they are not distinctive or exclusive to any particular textual family.

Therefore, before any final conclusions can be drawn about Clement's textual affinities in the Gospels, several questions remain from the previous chapters that must be addressed: (1) Does Clement's predominant textual affinity in Matthew indicate he is an early witness to the Byzantine text-type, a witness to the Western text in Mark and Luke, and a Primary Alexandrian witness in John? (2) Are Clement's textual affinities an accurate indicative of his dependence on specific textual traditions for certain readings, or are they at times the result of happenstance, due, perhaps, to his own citation habits or even to his reliance on his memory for some of his citations? (3) More significantly, what insight does Clement's textual affinities provide about the nature and transmission of the Gospel text in Alexandria at the end of the second century?

THE TYPOLOGY OF READINGS ATTESTED BY CLEMENT AND USED TO  
IDENTIFY HIS PREDOMINANT AFFINITIES IN THE GOSPELS

In order to answer the first two questions mentioned above, it is necessary to evaluate the typology of the readings that identify Clement's textual affinities in the Gospels—that is, the readings positively identified in the third group profile.<sup>1</sup> This is an important question in Matthew, since Clement's text fails to support a single distinctive or exclusive reading in virtually every textual family—the only exception being a single exclusive Secondary Alexandrian reading in Luke and a few Western readings. In other words, Clement's textual affinities in Matthew almost entirely depend on primary readings—readings shared with other textual families. While the majority of these shared readings are identified in Matthew as Byzantine, are they truly representative of Byzantine readings? Though Clement supports a greater number of Western distinctive and exclusive readings in Mark and Luke, the same question needs to be asked there, since Mees argues that Clement's Western readings are often not truly representative of the Western text.<sup>2</sup> And even though the profile analysis for John was much stronger, the strength of Clement's Alexandrian readings also require closer examination, if only for the sake of completeness. Since Clement's other textual affinities in the Gospels drop below 50%, there is no need to examine them in particular because they clearly play a smaller influence on Clement's text.

In order to ascertain better Clement's predominant readings in the Gospels, I employ a modified form of the methodology and nomenclature used by Zuntz in his analysis of P<sup>46</sup> and more recently adapted by Racine in his study of the Byzantine character of Basil's text in Matthew.<sup>3</sup> Following Zuntz and Racine, I identify each of Clement's variants into one or more of the following categories: word order, short or long omissions, short or long interpolations, word alteration, form alteration, conflation, harmonization, or grammatical changes (case, gender, number). In order to categorize Clement's readings, each variant unit is analyzed to determine which variant most likely represents the "original" reading.<sup>4</sup> Clement's reading is then

---

<sup>1</sup> Mees employs a similar type of analysis in the commentary section of his work on Clement, but in addition to the problems associated with his methodology (see pp. 43–44 above), his choice of reading is far too haphazard. In contrast, the use of readings identified in the third group profile is not only more objective, but it identifies those readings that are most clearly representative of the various text-types.

<sup>2</sup> See Mees, "Payprus Bodmer XIV (P<sup>75</sup>) und die Lukasitate," 112–13. See also pp. 42–43 above.

<sup>3</sup> Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles*, 160–65, 185–212; Racine, "Text of Matthew," 297–361.

<sup>4</sup> The meaning of the phrase "original text" has become problematic, so its use here deserves some qualification. The numerous manuscript discoveries over the last century demonstrate that the discovery of a definite single "original text" is both

identified in relation to the preferred reading. In those cases where Clement's reading reflects the preferred reading, it is classified in comparison to the secondary readings.

While this method builds on the nomenclature and format used by Zuntz and Racine, it serves a different purpose. Whereas Racine attempts to identify the typology of the Byzantine readings in Basil's text of Matthew, this study seeks primarily to determine if Clement's readings identified in the group profile method are genuinely representative of the Byzantine text-type in Matthew, the Western text in Mark and Luke, and the Primary Alexandrian in John. Thus in addition to weighing the external and internal evidence in favor of each variant, discussion of each variant also includes special consideration of Clement's reading and whether it reflects dependence on the identified textual category. While the readings are divided among the three Gospels, they are numbered sequentially.

#### CLEMENT'S BYZANTINE READINGS IN MATTHEW

##### 1. Matt 5:25

A. ΕΝ ΤΗ ΟΔΩ ΜΕΤ ΑΥΤΟΥ Ε Δ Θ Π Ω κ TR

B. \* ΜΕΤ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΕΝ ΤΗ ΟΔΩ Ⲛ B D L f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a b UBS<sup>4</sup> Did  
**Word order**<sup>5</sup>

Variant B has the support of every manuscript tradition outside the Byzantine text, with the sole exception of the Old Latin k and the Caesarean witness Θ. The confluence of Clement with these two witnesses suggests that variant A is not merely a late Byzantine reading; on the contrary, it

---

complicated and at times down right elusive. Therefore, I use the phrase "original text" cautiously; instead of referring to some elusive autograph, the term refers to the reading that is most likely representative of the oldest reading available from the extant evidence—regardless of whether it dates back to a single "original" autograph or an early correction that became dominant.

In light of the difficulties associated with such terminology, Eldon Epp makes a compelling argument for what he calls the "multivalence" of the term *original text*. According to Epp, "there is a real sense in which every intentional, meaningful scribal alteration to a text—whether motivated by theological, historical, stylistic, or other factors—creates a new Textform, a new original" (Eldon J. Epp, "Issues in New Testament Textual Criticism," in *Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism* [ed. David Alan Black; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002], 74–75). For a fuller discussion of the issue, see Epp, "The Multivalence of the Term 'Original Text' in New Testament Textual Criticism," *HTR* 92 (1999): 245–81.

<sup>5</sup> For other instances of variation in word order, see variant readings nos. 6, 9, 14, 16, and 26.

appears to be early. Even if variant A is an early reading, the diversity of the manuscript evidence still clearly favors variant B as the more ancient reading. Variant A may have arisen in the second century to put emphasis further on the quickness of making amends with one's enemy by transposing the word order so *εν τη οδω* immediately follows *εως ουτου ει*.

Whatever the case, the classification of Clement's reading as Byzantine seems appropriate in light of the meager attestation of the variant in any of the other textual families.

## 2. Matt 5:48<sup>6</sup>

A. ο εν τοις ουρανοις (Δ) Θ Π Ω b k TR

B. \* ο ουρανιος Ⲛ B E Lf<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 a UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Did

C. εν ουρανοις D

### Harmonization<sup>7</sup>

On the basis of both the external evidence and transcriptional probability, variant B is the preferred reading. Whereas the Old Latin and Caesarean attestation of variant A suggests it is an early second-century reading, the unanimous support of the Alexandrian witnesses combined with representative witnesses from every other manuscript tradition strongly suggest variant B is at least equally as old, but also the more widespread reading. In addition, the manuscript tradition suggests that scribes often sought to harmonize the distinctly Matthean phrase ο ουρανιος to either the more common New Testament expression εν ουρανοις or the phrase ο εν τοις ουρανοις. In fact, of the seven places where ο ουρανιος occurs in Matthew, the manuscript tradition indicates a scribal "correction" in every case but one!<sup>8</sup> Although later scribes did alter the phrase ο εν τοις ουρανοις in Matt 7:11 and 6:17<sup>9</sup> to ο ουρανιος, this represents a later and more limited attempt at harmonization. Thus, it is unlikely that variant A or C represents the oldest reading.

The attestation of variant A by two Old Latin witnesses and one Caesarean witness suggests that Clement's agreement with the Byzantine

<sup>6</sup> For a comparable case, see variant reading no. 7 below.

<sup>7</sup> For other instances of harmonization, see variant readings nos. 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 15, 24, 25.

<sup>8</sup> The phrase occurs in Matt 5:48; 6:14, 26, 32; 15:13; 18:35; 23:9. The only place where the manuscript tradition is unanimous in its attestation of ο ουρανιος is Matt 6:26. In contrast, of the seven places where the phrase εν ουρανοις occurs in Matthew (5:45; 12:50; 18:10, 14, 19; 19:21), there is no evidence that it was corrected to ο ουρανιος.

<sup>9</sup> The phrase ο εν τοις ουρανοις occurs only in Matt 6:9; 7:11; 16:17. The phrase is altered to ο ουρανιος in MSS M 1424 in Matt 7:11 and in MSS f<sup>13</sup> 788 565 579 in Matt 16:17.

tradition may not merely be due to his own penchant for harmonization, but the reflection of an early minor reading that eventually found its way into the Byzantine text. At the very least, the antiquity of this reading indicates that the scribal tendency for harmonization present in latter manuscripts was already at work in the second century. The Byzantine classification of Clement's reading seems appropriate in light of the reading's isolated attestation in the other textual traditions.

### 3. Matt 10:23

A. την αλλην C D E L Δ Θ Π Ω TR

B. \* την ετεραν ⋈ B f<sup>1</sup> 33 892 1582 UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Ath

C. ετεραν f<sup>13</sup>

**Word alteration**<sup>10</sup>

Variants A and C appear to represent two types of atticizing corrections that arose under the influence of Atticism in the second century.<sup>11</sup> In classical Greek a fine nuance exists between the meaning of αλλος and ετερος. According to Smyth, αλλος "strictly means *other* (of several)," and ετερος "*other* (of two)."<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, in those cases where ετερος is used loosely for αλλος, it is anarthrous. This kind of distinction, as Elliott notes, no longer appears in the New Testament; instead, the two words are synonymous and interchangeable.<sup>13</sup> Thus both variant A and C likely arose as stylistic improvements on variant B.

The combined attestation of variant A by two Secondary Alexandrian witnesses, a Caesarean witness, as well as the one Western manuscript strongly suggests that Clement's reading again represents an early minor reading that ultimately found its way into the later Byzantine text. While this is likely the case, a Byzantine classification is probably still best due to the unanimous support of this reading by the Byzantine witnesses and its isolated support among the other textual groups.

<sup>10</sup> For other instances of word alteration, see variant readings nos. 12, 16, 24.

<sup>11</sup> For a discussion of the role and influence of Atticism on the New Testament, see George D. Kilpatrick, "Atticism and the Text of the New Testament," in *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism* (ed. J. K. Elliott; BETL 96; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990), 15–32; repr. from *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze: Festschrift für Prof. Josef Schmid zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. Josef Blinzler, Otto Kuss, and Franz Mussner; Regensburg: Pustet, 1963), 125–37.

<sup>12</sup> Smyth §1271.

<sup>13</sup> For a number of examples of this type of atticizing correction, including Matt 10:23, see J. K. Elliott, "The Use of ἕτερος in the New Testament," in idem, *Essays and Studies in New Testament Textual Criticism* (EFN 3; Cordoba, Spain: Almendro, 1992), 121–23. Racine notes this same reading in the writings of Basil of Caesarea, and I am indebted to his study for this reference.

**4. Matt 12:36**

A. λαλησωσιν E (L) Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 TR (Or)

B. \* λαλησουσιν ⲛ B C (D) Θ 33 a b k UBS<sup>4</sup>

**Form alteration**<sup>14</sup>

Although the attestation of some Secondary Alexandrian witnesses (L 892), Clement, and Origen may that indicate variant A arose in the second century, the combined weight of the Primary Alexandrian and Old Latin witnesses clearly favors the greater antiquity of variant B. Moreover, the use of the subjunctive mood in variant A appears to be a secondary development, likely prompted by a scribal desire to soften the inevitableness implied in the use of the future indicative. Consequently, the evidence favors variant B as the earlier reading.

The identification of Clement's reading as Byzantine is open to question. The variant has relatively strong support among two of the other textual groups; it has the support of three-fourths of the Caesarean and half of the Secondary Alexandrian witnesses. Rather than positively identifying Clement's reading as Byzantine, it is probably more accurately represents an early and divergent channel of the Alexandrian tradition that was ultimately preserved in the Byzantine text. It clearly has no connection to the Western text.

**5. Matt. 16:26**

A. ωφελειται C D E Δ Π Ω a b TR

B. \* ωφεληθησεται ⲛ B L Θ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 e UBS<sup>4</sup> Or

**Harmonization;**<sup>15</sup> **form alteration**<sup>16</sup>

Variant A is most likely an early scribal harmonization to the parallel passage in Luke 9:25. The widespread diversity behind the attestation of variant B also suggests it is the older reading.

The nearly unanimous attestation of variant A by the Western tradition suggests that the identification of variant A as evidence of the Byzantine character of Clement's text is once again tenuous. The strong support of the Western text as well as one Alexandrian text indicates Clement's reading is very ancient, even if it is not necessarily original. In any case, lack of certainty regarding the distinct textual character of the reading requires that it not be relied on as a primary piece of evidence for identifying Clement's text as Byzantine. The only firm conclusion that can be drawn is that his reading is neither Alexandrian nor Caesarean.

<sup>14</sup> For other instances of form alteration, see variant readings nos. 5, 17, 25, 28, 30.

<sup>15</sup> For other instances of harmonization, see variant readings nos. 2, 7, 9, 10, 11, 15, 24, 25.

<sup>16</sup> For other instances of form alteration, see variant readings nos. 4, 17, 25, 28, 30.



**6. Matt 22:40**

- A. και οι προφηται κρεμανται Ε Δ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> TR  
 B. \* κρεμανται και οι προφηται Ⲭ B D L Θ 33 892 a b e UBS<sup>4</sup>  
**Word order**<sup>17</sup>

In contrast to the early and diverse nature of the manuscript evidence for variant B, support for variant A is limited to the later Byzantine and Caesarean witnesses. Unlike previous examples, Clement is the earliest extant support for this reading. While Clement's support may point to an early date for variant A, it also may be the result of pure serendipity. The latter is possible, since the position of the verb in variant B between its two-part subject (ο νομος κρεμαται και οι προφηται) make it the more difficult reading—and, therefore, a likely target of correction. Thus the transposition of the verb after both subjects in Clement may point only to a "natural" correction more than a dependence upon an early second-century archetype;<sup>18</sup> it is impossible to know for certain. In any case, variant B is clearly the older reading.

Although half of the Caesarean witnesses also support variant A, Clement's reading is best classified as Byzantine. It is possible, of course, that Clement's agreement with the Byzantine reading is merely accidental; like some later scribes, he may have succumbed to the temptation to correct the more difficult reading—whether intentional or not. In any case, the strongly Byzantine character of the reading justifies its classification.

**7. Matt 23:9**

- A. ο εν τοις ουρανις Ε Π Ω TR (a b e)  
 B. ο εν ουρανοις D Δ Θ f<sup>1</sup> 1582 (a b e)  
 C. \* ο ουρανιος Ⲭ B L f<sup>13</sup> 33<sup>vid</sup> 892 UBS<sup>4</sup>

**Harmonization**<sup>19</sup>

Although the manuscript evidence is more equally divided among the three readings, this variant unit largely parallels Matt 5:48.<sup>20</sup>

It is possible that at least half of the Old Latin witnesses may support variant A, since b and k support the same reading in Matt 5:48. Unfortunately, the inability to know with certainty whether the Old Latin witnesses followed a text that included the article or not renders any

<sup>17</sup> For other instances of variation in word order, see variant readings nos. 1, 9, 12, 14, 16, 26.

<sup>18</sup> According to Racine and Brooks, Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nyssa attest variant A in the fourth century.

<sup>19</sup> For other instances of harmonization, see variant readings nos. 2, 5, 9, 10, 11, 15, 24, 25.

<sup>20</sup> See the comments on variant reading no. 2 above.

conclusion uncertain. In any case, both variant A and B appear to reflect an attempt to harmonize the passage with a more common New Testament expression. When it comes to analyzing Clement's support, it is impossible to determine whether his reading reflects a genuine agreement with the Byzantine tradition or an accidental agreement due to his own tendency for harmonization. In spite of this uncertainty, a Byzantine classification is still best, since no other textual group supports this reading.

#### CLEMENT'S WESTERN READINGS IN MARK

##### 8. Mark 10:17

A. λεγων D Θ f<sup>13</sup> a b

B. \* omit ⋈ A B C E Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 579 892 1582 k TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

**Short interpolation**<sup>21</sup>

While it could be argued that early scribes omitted variant A because it was seen as superfluous detail, the extent of the external evidence, which even includes one Old Latin witness, makes it probable that λεγων is a secondary addition. The interpolation of λεγων before the question addressed to Jesus arose either as a scribal assimilation to the parallel in Luke 18:18 or to the occasional use of λεγων to introduce other sayings found in Mark (e.g., 1:40; 15:4).

While λεγων represents a Western reading, it is questionable if it is a genuine indication of the Western nature of Clement's text. The central portion of Clement's citation of Mark 10:17 (προσελθων τις εγονυπετει λεγων) reflects a loose and truncated form of the text. Since Clement's citation does not include the Markan phrase επηρωτα αυτον or one of the other similar expressions in the parallel passages in Matthew or Luke, it may merely be his own paraphrase to introduce the question asked of Jesus. If this is the case, then it does not even represent a harmonization with Luke. In addition, if Clement's reading is genuinely Western, one would expect there to be some sort of continuous verbal agreement with one or more of the Western readings in this section. But this is not the case; there are only a couple of isolated one-word agreements. For these reasons, Clement's use of λεγων cannot be used as a reliable indication of his affinity with the Western text.

<sup>21</sup> For other instances of interpolation, see variant readings nos. 13, 14, 31.

**9. Mark 10:20**

A. πάντα ταυτα D Θ b k Or

B. \* ταυτα παντα ⲛ A B C E Δ Π Ψ f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 a TR UBS<sup>4</sup>**Word order;**<sup>22</sup> **harmonization**<sup>23</sup>

The unanimous support of nearly every representative witness outside the Western tradition suggests that variant B is not only early but the more widespread of the two variants. Variant A appears to have arisen as an early harmonization to the parallel passage in Matt 19:20. While there is also significant support for the reading ταυτα παντα in Matthew, the harmonizing nature of the Western text seems undeniable due to its inclusion of the verb εφυλαξα following παντα ταυτα. The verb εφυλαξα is a defining characteristic of the parallel passage in Matthew, whereas εφυλαξαμην is used in Mark. For these reasons, variant B is preferred.

The fact that the Western text represents a harmonization with the parallel passage in Matthew makes it difficult to determine if Clement's attestation is a genuine indication of the Western character of his text. It is possible that his agreement is accidental—merely the result of his own inclination for harmonization. While the latter is a possibility, the fact that Clement's reading also agrees with the Old Latin MS b immediately before this variant (λεγει αυτω παντα ταυτα) suggests it is probably still best to classify his reading as Western.

**10. Mark 10:21**A. διαδος πτωχοις f<sup>13</sup> (a) (k)]

B. δος πτωχοις A B E Δ Π Ψ Ω 579;

C. \* δος τοις πτωχοις ⲛ C D Θ f<sup>1</sup> 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> [NA: b; Lac. Or]**Harmonization**<sup>24</sup>

It seems obvious that variant A arose as a harmonization to the parallel passage in Luke 18:22. The verb διδωμι is not only distinctive to the account in Luke, but it is also found in only three other places in the New Testament (Luke 11:22; John 6:1; and Acts 4:35). It is more difficult, however, to decide whether variant B or C is to be preferred. The weight of the external evidence for both variants is solid, but the combination of the

<sup>22</sup> For other instances of variation in word order, see variant readings nos. 1, 6, 14, 16, 26.

<sup>23</sup> For other instances of harmonization, see variant readings nos. 2, 5, 7, 10, 11, 15, 24, 25.

<sup>24</sup> For other instances of harmonization, see variant readings nos. 2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 15, 24, 25.

Primary Alexandrian and Western witnesses slightly tips the scales is favor variant C.

The evidence suggests that the classification of Clement's reading as Western may again not be completely accurate. On the one hand, the testimony of the Western tradition is not unanimous. The Western tradition is split between the Old Latin witnesses' support of variant A and Codex Bezae's attestation of the verb *δοξ*. This split between the Western witnesses by itself diminishes the strength of the Western nature of Clement's reading. Clement's tendency for harmonizing his citations also casts further suspicion on the wisdom of relying on this citation to classify his text as Western. Due to this uncertainty, Clement's citation is probably best seen as a result of his own tendency for harmonization, and not a trustworthy indication of the Western character of his text of Mark.

#### 11. Mark 10:27 (1)

A. αδυνατον [εστιν]<sup>25</sup> D a b k

B. \* αδυνατον αλλ ου παρα (τω) θεω & (A) B C E Δ Θ (Π) Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup>  
579 892 1582 (TR) UBS<sup>4</sup>

**Short omission;<sup>26</sup> harmonization<sup>27</sup>**

Was the longer reading of variant B omitted by the Western tradition from variant A because it seemed superfluous in light of the rest of the verse? Or does variant B represent an early gloss that influenced all other witnesses? Although shorter Western readings (Western noninterpolations) are often preferred, in this case variant A most likely represents a secondary reading. In favor of variant B is the overwhelming preponderance of external evidence and the fact that the longer reading in Mark 10:27 seems to be the more difficult (see the variant below). It is possible that the interpolation of *εστιν* in the Western reading arose as a harmonization with the similar reading in the parallel passage in Matt 19:26.

While harmonization with Matt 19:26 may partially explain the origin of the Western reading, it is unlikely that Clement's reading is merely the result of harmonization. The primary connection the Western text shares with Matthew is the presence of the verb *εστιν*. It is precisely this word, however, that is absent from Clement's reading. This, in combination with the clearly Western features of Clement's entire citation of Mark 10:27, indicates it is appropriate to classify his reading as Western.

<sup>25</sup> While *εστιν* is not part of Clement's citation, it is clear that he shares the characteristics of this reading and not the other.

<sup>26</sup> For other instances of short omissions, see variant readings 12, 20, 27, 29, 31.

<sup>27</sup> For other instances of harmonization, see variant readings nos. 2, 5, 7, 9, 15, 24, 25.

**12. Mark 10:27 (2)**

- A. παρα [δε τω] θεω δυνατον D (a) (b) (k)]
- B. \* παντα γαρ δυνατα παρα (τω) θεω (κ) B (C) Θ (892) (UBS<sup>4</sup>)
- C. παντα γαρ δυνατα εστιν παρα τω θεω A E Π Ω f<sup>13</sup> 1582 TR;
- D. παντα γαρ δυνατα τω θεω 579;
- E. omit Δ Ψ f<sup>1</sup>;

**Short omission;<sup>28</sup> word alteration<sup>29</sup>**

Although the unanimous support of the Western tradition indicates variant A is early, it does not likely represent the original reading. In this case, variant B is to be preferred because it best explains the origin of the other variants. Read in connection to the preceding variant, variant B is the most difficult of the readings. On the one hand, there is no verb in variant B; the verb εστιν is merely implied. Variant C likely originated as a later scribal attempt to smooth out this minor difficulty by making what had been implicit explicit—that is, by inserting the verb εστιν. Second, variant B must have also seemed a little redundant to some scribes: “With men it is impossible, but not with God; everything is possible with God.” This likely explains why the entire saying is altered in the Western tradition and replaced with a shortened saying that is more to the point: παρα ανθρωποις αδυνατον εστιν παρα δε τω θεω δυνατον. This might also explain why the entire second half of the phrase is omitted in variant E, though it is possible that it dropped out accidentally because of homoeoteleuton. Variant D is probably the result of a scribal mistake.

The distinctive Western nature of Clement's citation of variant A indicates it is appropriate to classify his reading here as Western.

## CLEMENT'S WESTERN READINGS IN LUKE

**13. Luke 3:13**

- A. πλεον πρασσειν / πρασσετε D a b e
- B. \* πλεον κ A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

**Short interpolation<sup>30</sup>**

The addition of πρασσετε in the Western witnesses is a typical expansion that is characteristic of the Western text. Though the interpolation makes

<sup>28</sup> For other instances of short omissions, see variant readings 11, 20, 27, 29, 31.

<sup>29</sup> For other instances of word alteration, see variant readings nos. 3, 16, 24.

<sup>30</sup> For other instances of interpolation, see variant readings nos. 8, 14, 31.

the passage redundant (since it parallels the same word at the end of the verse), it probably arose in an attempt to express more clearly the command of Jesus. It is unlikely to have been the original reading, since there would have been no discernible reason why it should have been deleted in only the Western tradition. Thus variant B is clearly the preferred reading.

Clement's text is clearly Western here.

#### 14. Luke 3:22

- A. \* υιος μου ει συ [αγαπητος]<sup>31</sup> εγω σημερον γεγεννηκα σε D (a) (b) Or  
 B. συ ει ο υιος μου ο αγαπητος εν σοι ευδοκησα & A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ  
 Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 (e) TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

**Interpolation;<sup>32</sup> word order<sup>33</sup>**

There is little scholarly agreement on whether variant A<sup>34</sup> or B<sup>35</sup> is to be preferred.<sup>36</sup> Though the manuscript attestation favoring variant A is limited to the Western tradition, the reading is earlier and more widespread than the manuscript evidence implies. In addition to Clement, the early church fathers Justin, Origen, and Methodius, as well as the authors of the *Gospel of the Hebrews*, the *Didascalia*, and the *Gospel according to the Ebionites*, were aware of variant A. Its knowledge by several later Fathers, including Hilary and Augustine, also testifies to its wide circulation. On the other hand, variant B has the support of the rest of the extant manuscript tradition.

<sup>31</sup> Though Clement adds αγαπητος, his reading is still cited here as part of the longer quotation, since he is clearly aware of this unique reading in the manuscript tradition of D.

<sup>32</sup> For other instances of interpolation, see variant readings nos. 8, 13, 31.

<sup>33</sup> For other instances of variation in word order, see variant readings nos. 1, 6, 9, 12, 16, 26.

<sup>34</sup> Those favoring variant A include, e.g., Theodor Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Lucas* (2nd ed.; Leipzig, Deicher, 1913), 199–200; Erich Klostermann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (2nd ed.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1929), 55; Martin Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1969), 193–95; Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 62–67.

<sup>35</sup> Those favoring variant B include, e.g., Westcott and Hort, *New Testament in the Original Greek*, appendix, 56–71; I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 154–56; Metzger, *Textual Commentary* (2nd ed.), 112–13; John Nolland, *Luke* (WBC 35; 3 vols.; Nashville: Nelson, 1989), 1:161–65; Darrell L. Bock, *Luke* (BECNT; 2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 1:346–47.

<sup>36</sup> Wieland Willker also discusses the variant but comes to no decisive conclusion on the issue (*Luke* [vol. 3 of *A Textual Commentary on the Greek Gospels*; 3rd ed.]; online: <http://www-user.uni-bremen.de/~wie/TCG/TC-Luke.pdf>).

Since a final decision cannot be made on the basis of the external evidence alone, transcriptional probability and the intrinsic evidence needs to be taken into consideration. It is here that the evidence tips the scales in favor of variant A. Transcriptional probability favors variant A on two accounts: (1) it represents the harder reading, since it deviates from both Mark and Matthew; and (2) the possibility that the text might be understood as supportive of an adoptionistic Christology suggests it is the more difficult reading, one that proto-orthodox scribes would have likely sought to "correct." In addition, the election formula associated with the use of Ps. 2:7 at Jesus' baptism also fits well with similar election-like terminology Luke uses to portray his theological emphasis about Jesus' identity. For example, in material unique to Luke and which refers back to Jesus' baptism, Luke refers to Jesus as the one "chosen"<sup>37</sup> and "anointed"<sup>38</sup> by God. This is not just superfluous material. It indicates the significance that Jesus' baptism has for Luke's portrayal of the ministry of Jesus. As Ehrman notes, Luke sees the baptism as "the point at which Jesus was anointed as the Christ, chosen to be the Son of God."<sup>39</sup>

While a number of arguments are put forward in support of the greater authenticity of variant B, they are not nearly as convincing. For example, the claim that variant A was added by a scribe under the influence of the use of Ps. 2:7 in Acts 13:33 makes little sense.<sup>40</sup> Why would a scribe conform a passage about Jesus' baptism to a passage that is used in relation to his resurrection—and that to a passage not even in the same book? Even if the scribe of D has a tendency to assimilate passages to the LXX, as some also claim,<sup>41</sup> it does not indicate he did so here. Besides, the external evidence in favor of variant B demonstrates the reading is much older than Codex Bezae itself. Such arguments seem far too strained—especially when a far more obvious answer lies at hand. Variant B represents a scribal harmonization with Mark and Matthew.

It is beyond doubt that Clement's reading is Western.

---

<sup>37</sup> ἐκλεγόμεναι is used in association with the transfiguration in Luke 9:35, and ἐκλεκτός in 23:35.

<sup>38</sup> Luke 4:18

<sup>39</sup> Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, 67.

<sup>40</sup> Bock, 1:347.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.; Marshall, 155.

**15. Luke 6:37**

- A. ἵνα μη A D Ψ a c  
 B. \* καὶ οὐ μη P<sup>45vid</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⲛ B C E L Δ Θ Π Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 b TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
 [Lac. 33]

**Harmonization**<sup>42</sup>

Variant A is most likely a harmonization to the parallel saying in Matt 7:1. Therefore variant B represents the original reading.

Clement's tendency for harmonizing his Gospel citations makes it difficult to identify clearly his reading as Western.

**16. Luke 9:62 (1)**

- A. εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω βλέπων καὶ P<sup>45vid</sup> D a (b) c  
 B. \* καὶ βλέπων εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω P<sup>75</sup> ⲛ A B C E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33<sup>vid</sup>  
 579 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
 C. καὶ στραφεὶς εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω 892 Or Did

**Word order;**<sup>43</sup> **word alteration**<sup>44</sup>

Though variant A appears to represent an early reading, its inverse word order makes little sense in light of the whole verse; it is more than likely due to an early scribal mistake.<sup>45</sup> The lack of manuscript support for variant C points to its secondary nature, though its word order does indirectly support variant B. The use of στραφεὶς for βλέπων is likely due to similar sayings that use ἐπιστρέφω before εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω (e.g., Mark 13:16; Luke 17:31). Consequently, variant B likely represents the preferred reading.

The distinctive Western character of Clement's entire citation of Luke 9:62 indicates it is appropriate to classify his reading as Western.

**17. Luke 9:62 (2)**

- A. \* ἐπιβαλλων P<sup>45vid</sup> P<sup>75</sup> A D L Θ a c  
 B. ἐπιβαλων ⲛ B C E Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup> Did  
 C. βαλων Or  
 D. mittit (= ἐπιβαλλει) b

**Form alteration**<sup>46</sup>

<sup>42</sup> For other instances of harmonization, see variant readings nos. 2, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 24, 25.

<sup>43</sup> For other instances of variation in word order, see variant readings nos. 1, 6, 9, 14, 26.

<sup>44</sup> For other instances of word alteration, see variant readings nos. 3, 12, 24.

<sup>45</sup> On this variant, see Metzger, *Textual Commentary* (2nd ed.), 125–26.

<sup>46</sup> For other instances of form alteration, see variant readings nos. 4, 5, 25, 28, 30.



Either variant A or B could represent the oldest reading. While the greater manuscript tradition favors variant B, the diversity of the manuscript tradition for variant A is extremely strong as well. It has the support of a representative from every textual family. Transcriptional probability also provides little help, since the argument could go either way: variant B may be the result of haplography, or variant A dittography—it is impossible to know.<sup>47</sup> A consideration of the use of similar terminology in Luke provides some direction, however. While the aorist form of the participle ἐπιβαλὼν occurs nowhere else in Luke, ἐπιβαλλὼν does appear in Luke 15:12 with the unanimous support of the manuscript tradition, except for P<sup>75</sup>. Furthermore, a computer analysis of the use of present or aorist participles in Luke also shows a preference for the present participle (543 to 422). While the intrinsic evidence is far from conclusive, it tips the evidence slightly in favor of variant A.

The distinctive Western character of Clement's entire citation of Luke 9:62 indicates it is also appropriate to classify his text here as Western.<sup>48</sup>

#### 19. Luke 10:21

A. \* ἐν τῷ πνεύματι P<sup>45vid</sup> Ⳑ D L 33 892 (a) (b) (c) UBS<sup>4</sup>

B. τῷ πνεύματι P<sup>75</sup> A B C E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 1582 TR

**Grammatical change: addition of a preposition**

The strength of the external evidence supporting the presence or omission of the preposition ἐν is nearly equally divided. The even split between the Primary Alexandrian witnesses mitigates to some extent the usual persuasive combination of the Primary Alexandrian and the Western manuscripts as in variant A. Metzger notes that the frequent use of ἐν with ἀγαλλιασθαι in the LXX may support variant A; variant B would then represent an omission originating from stylistic preference. Of course, it could also be argued that variant B is the more difficult reading and that the preposition represents a scribal interpolation in light of the LXX.<sup>49</sup> Though the evidence is far from conclusive, in my opinion it slightly favors variant A.

Although it is difficult to decide between the two readings, Clement's attestation of the preposition is hardly a convincing example of his attestation of the Western text. This is not to say that the preposition is not a prominent feature of the Western manuscripts; it clearly is. The reading is

<sup>47</sup> On these types of scribal errors, see Metzger and Ehrman, *Text of the New Testament*, 254.

<sup>48</sup> Though it is counted as a separate variant, I have chosen not to list Clement's entire citation of Luke 9:62. The Western character of this citation is clearly Western and does not need specific consideration beyond the discussion of the two variants already discussed.

<sup>49</sup> Metzger, *Textual Commentary* (2nd ed.), 8. See also Willker, *Luke*.

simply too minor, however, to make it the decisive factor of Clement's reliance on Western readings. Besides, his support may be simply coincidental—not to mention the fact that the reading is also found in several Alexandrian witnesses. The fact that Clement does not follow the Western witnesses in more substantial variants in the rest of this verse also illustrates the tenuous nature of making too much of his Western attestation here.<sup>50</sup>

## 20. Luke 10:42

A. \* αὐτης Ⲭ B D L 579 (a) (b) (c) UBS<sup>4</sup>

B. αὖ αὐτης P<sup>75</sup> Ⲭ<sup>c</sup> A C E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 892 1582 TR [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

**Grammatical change: omission of a preposition**

Scribes would be more likely to add than omit the preposition αὖτο. Thus, though the preponderance of witnesses supports variant B, it is most likely a scribal expansion to make the text more explicit. The almost unanimous combination of Primary Alexandrian and Western witnesses also attests to the strength of variant A.

The strong support of almost all the Primary Alexandrian witnesses, as well as a couple of Secondary Alexandrian witnesses, again suggests the questionable nature of placing too much importance on the classification of Clement's reading here as Western.

## 21. Luke 12:11

A. πῶς D a b e

B. \* add ἡ τι P<sup>75</sup> Ⲭ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Or [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

**Short omission<sup>51</sup>**

While it is possible that variant B arose as a scribal assimilation to the parallel saying in Matt 10:19,<sup>52</sup> the weight of the manuscript evidence suggests otherwise. The presence of ἡ τι both after πῶς and at the end of the verse with εἰπητε likely seemed redundant to some early scribes. The omission of the first use of ἡ τι would have provided a simple solution to the problem. A similar type of omission in Codex Bezae in the parallel saying in

<sup>50</sup> For example, instead of following Western and Primary Alexandrian readings in supporting τῷ ἁγίῳ after πνεύματι (P<sup>75</sup> Ⲭ B D a b e UBS<sup>4</sup>), Clement supports the primary Byzantine reading ἱησους (A E Δ Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 892 1582 TR).

<sup>51</sup> For other instances of short omissions, see variant readings 11, 12, 27, 29, 31.

<sup>52</sup> E.g., George D. Kilpatrick, "The Greek New Testament Text of Today and the Textus Receptus," in Elliott, *Principles and Practice*, 36; repr. from *The New Testament in Historical and Contemporary Perspective* (ed. Hugh Anderson and William Barclay; Oxford: Blackwell, 1965), 192; Klostermann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 135.

Matthew appears to confirm the probability of this conclusion. On the other hand, if variant B is a secondary development, it would require that the entire manuscript tradition (outside the Western tradition) is assimilated to Matt 10:19—a conclusion that seems far less likely than accounting for the variant as a scribal omission. Thus variant B represents the preferred reading.<sup>53</sup>

It is difficult to determine if Clement's attestation is a genuine indication of the Western character of his text or the result of his own scribal habits. In light of clear evidence to the contrary, it is probably best to classify his reading as Western.

## 22. Luke 12:20 (1)

- A. ουν Clem<sup>pt</sup> D a e
- B. δε Clem<sup>pt</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 b TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup> Or Ath Did [Lac. P<sup>45</sup>]

Since Clement attests both variant A and B, this variant unit is of no value in classifying his text as Western here.

## 23. Luke 12:20 (2)

- A. τινος Clem<sup>pt</sup> D a b e
- B. τινι Clem<sup>pt</sup> P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>  
Or Ath Did [Lac. 33]

Since Clement attests both variant A and B, this variant unit is of no value in classifying his text here as Western.

## 24. Luke 12:24

- A. ουχ / ουχι υμεις διαφερετε D b e
- B. \* ποσω μαλλον υμεις διαφερετε P<sup>45</sup> ⋈ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 579  
1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>
- C. ποσω μαλλον διαφερετε υμεις 892
- D. ποσω μαλλον διαφερετε P<sup>75</sup> [Lac. 33 a]

**Word alteration;<sup>54</sup> harmonization<sup>55</sup>**

<sup>53</sup> On this variant, see Metzger, *Textual Commentary* (1st ed.), 159–60; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 520. Though the letter rating for this variant was a C in the UBS<sup>3</sup>, it no longer occurs in the UBS<sup>4</sup> nor in the second addition of Metzger's textual commentary.

<sup>54</sup> For other instances of word alteration, see variant readings nos. 3, 12, 16.

<sup>55</sup> For other instances of harmonization, see variant readings nos. 2, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 15, 25.

The replacement of ποσῶ μᾶλλον with οὐχ / οὐχι by Clement and the Western text-type probably arose as an assimilation to the parallel passage in Matt 6:26. Whereas Luke's account of the saying ends with an emphatic statement, Matthew ends his account with a question. Thus it seems likely that the Western reading is a harmonization rather than that scribes deliberately altered the reading that is dominant in the manuscript tradition. The differences in variant C and D depend on variant B. Variant B represents the oldest reading.

While there is little doubt that variant A represents the Western text, it is not so clear that Clement's reading is dependent on it. While the two agree on this variant unit, they differ on the following word; where Codex Bezae follows the entire manuscript tradition with πετεινῶν, Clement has the similar-sounding word πτηνῶν. The difference may indicate that Clement is citing from memory rather than depending on the Western tradition. This would be another example of Clement's tendency of harmonization. His agreement with the Western reading would be simply the result of happenstance. Thus it is likely going too far to use this reading as a definitive indication of Clement's textual affinity with the Western text.

#### 25. Luke 12:30 (1)

- A. ζητεῖ D a b
- B. ἐπιζητεῖ P<sup>45</sup> A E Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> 892 1582 TR
- C. \* ἐπιζητουσιν P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ B L f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 UBS<sup>4</sup>
- D. faciunt (= ποιεῖ) e

**Form alteration;<sup>56</sup> harmonization;<sup>57</sup> grammatical change: number**

The confusion behind this variant unit is whether a singular form of the verb should follow the neuter subject τὰ ἐθνη. While this peculiarity is strictly followed in Attic Greek, it is subject to more diversity in Hellenistic Greek.<sup>58</sup> In spite of this later diversity, the New Testament frequently construes ἐθνη with the plural form of the verb.<sup>59</sup> Thus it is difficult to decide whether the plural was changed to the singular by scribes under the influence of Atticism or whether the singular was changed to the plural in conformity to its predominant use with ἐθνη elsewhere in the New Testament. The limited manuscript tradition suggests that variant A is a secondary reading, most probably arising as assimilation to the use of ζητεῶ

<sup>56</sup> For other instances of form alteration, see variant readings nos. 4, 5, 17, 28, 30.

<sup>57</sup> For other instances of harmonization, see variant readings nos. 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 15, 24.

<sup>58</sup> See BDF §133; Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 73–74; Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 399–401.

<sup>59</sup> BDF §133. The use of the plural verb with ἐθνη can be seen in Matt 6:32; 12:21; Acts 11:1; 13:48; Rom 2:14; 15:12, 27; 2 Tim 4:17; Rev 11:18; 15:4; 18:23; 21:24. A rare use of the singular appears in Eph 4:17.

without the compound preposition in verses 29 and 31. Variant D is likely due to a scribal revision. Though variant B or C may represent the oldest reading, I designate variant C as the preferred reading in light of the more frequent use of the plural verb with εθνη and due to my preference for the Primary Alexandrian witnesses.<sup>60</sup>

See the following variant for an evaluation of the appropriateness of classifying Clement's reading as Western.

#### 26. Luke 12:30 (2)

- A. οιδε (γαρ) ο πατηρ υμων D a (b) e  
 B. \* υμων δε ο πατηρ οιδεν P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579  
 892 1582 TR UBS<sup>4</sup>

#### Word order<sup>61</sup>

The Western reading Clement attests appears to be due to assimilation with the parallel in Matt 6:32. Thus variant B is likely the oldest reading.

Once again it is possible that Clement's agreement with the Western text here, and for the previous variant unit, is not direct, but merely an independent harmonization of his own with Matthew. In this case, however, the evidence for Clement's knowledge of the Western reading is much stronger than in previous examples. This reference not only comes as part of a larger collection of sayings dependent on Luke, but the word order of the entire verse follows much more closely with the Western text. Though this does not prove that the verbatim relationship is evidence of his affinity to the Western tradition, the likelihood seems more plausible than not.

#### 27. Luke 14:20

- A. και a b e  
 B. \* add δια τουτο P<sup>75</sup> ⋈ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR  
 UBS<sup>4</sup>  
 C. διο D

#### Short omission<sup>62</sup>

While the shorter reading is generally preferred, in this case the superfluous nature of the phrase δια τουτο suggests that a few scribes chose to omit it. The near unanimous testimony of the manuscript tradition, outside the few Old Latin manuscripts that support variant A, and the

<sup>60</sup> For Clement's relation to the Western text here, see the following variant unit.

<sup>61</sup> For other instances of variation in word order, see variant readings nos. 1, 6, 9, 14, 16.

<sup>62</sup> For other instances of short omissions, see variant readings 11, 12, 21, 29, 31.

singular reading of D, collaborates the likelihood of this probability. For this reason, variant B represents the better reading.

It is difficult to determine whether Clement's omission of *δια τουτο* reflects a genuine Western influence on his text, or is merely the result of accidental agreement. While the latter is possible, the lack of clear evidence does not warrant such a conclusion—especially since Clement's text of Luke reveals a Western influence elsewhere. Thus without evidence to the contrary, it is best to classify Clement's reading as Western.

#### 28. Luke 17:4

A. αφεξ D a b e

B. \* αφησεις P<sup>75vid</sup> ⋈ A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 892 1582 TR  
UBS<sup>4</sup>]

#### Form alteration<sup>63</sup>

Although the force of the imperatival future and the imperative are not entirely identical, the manuscript evidence indicates that they share enough similarity to have made the two forms problematic for some early Christians scribes.<sup>64</sup> While the imperatival future occurs most frequently in Matthew (often in quotations from the Old Testament), it is still likely the preferred reading here. In addition to the unanimous support of the external evidence, variant B represents the more difficult reading. A later scribe is more likely to have sharpened the sense of Jesus' saying by replacing the future tense of the verb with the imperative than to have replaced the imperative with the future. While the imperatival future is not entirely absent from classical Greek,<sup>65</sup> the fact that it occurs only sparingly also suggests that later scribes would not likely replace αφεξ with αφησεις.

The similarity of meaning between the two variants makes it possible that Clement's agreement with the Western tradition is accidental. The likelihood of this possibility diminishes considerably, however, when Clement's reading is examined in the context of his entire citation. In addition to this single variant, Clement's quotation contains a number of other readings that have a distinct Western influence. This strongly suggests that his use of αφεξ is unlikely the result of mere happenstance but rather a genuine Western reading.

<sup>63</sup> For other instances of form alteration, see variant readings nos. 4, 5, 17, 25, 30.

<sup>64</sup>BDF §362; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 569–70. The difficulty this posed for some early scribes can be seen in a number of places within the manuscript tradition where the future carries an imperatival sense (e.g., Matt 20:27; 1 Pet 1:16).

<sup>65</sup> Smyth §1917.

## CLEMENT'S ALEXANDRIAN READINGS IN JOHN

**29. John 6:47**A. \* πιστευων P<sup>66</sup> Ⲙ B L W Θ 892 UBS<sup>4</sup>B. add εις εμε A D E Δ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 a b e TR Did Cyr**Short omission**<sup>66</sup>

Although the support of variant B is diverse and early, variant A is clearly the preferred reading. If variant B represented the original reading, there is simply no adequate explanation why the entire Primary Alexandrian tradition, half of the Secondary Alexandrian readings, and one Caesarean reading chose to omit it. An accidental omission seems unlikely, since it affects nearly the entire Alexandrian tradition. Beside the eleven places where εις εμε occurs in John, it is never omitted among any of the manuscripts listed in support of variant A, the sole exception being W in John 11:26.

On the other hand, the presence of εις εμε can easily be explained as an addition to the text. The transcriptional evidence suggests that a scribe is more likely to make a passage more explicit. In this case, early scribes likely favored the addition of εις εμε because it not only made explicit what was already implied by the context, but it would also harmonize the passage with the occurrences of the participle ο πιστευων in John (6:35; 7:38; 11:25, 26; 12:44, 46; 14:12; 16:9). The addition of “in God” in the Old Syriac likely arose for this same reason, the only difference being that the Old Syriac assimilated the passage to John 14:1 instead.

What is really surprising about this variant, as Metzger notes, is that the majority of scribes within the Alexandrian tradition “resisted the temptation” to alter a reading that seemed to be “both natural and inevitable.”<sup>67</sup> Clement's reading is clearly Primary Alexandrian.

**30. John 17:21**A. \* πιστευη P<sup>66</sup> Ⲙ\* B C W UBS<sup>4</sup>B. πιστευση Ⲙ<sup>c</sup> A D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f<sup>1</sup> f<sup>13</sup> 33 579 1582 TR Or Cyr**Form alteration**<sup>68</sup>

It is difficult to determine whether variant A or B is to be the preferred reading. The external evidence for variant A is both early and strong—it includes the support of the entire Primary Alexandrian tradition and two

<sup>66</sup> For other instances of short omissions, see nos. 11, 12, 20, 27, 31.

<sup>67</sup> Metzger, *Textual Commentary* (2nd ed.), 183.

<sup>68</sup> For other instances of form alteration, see variant readings nos. 4, 5, 17, 25, 28.

Secondary Alexandrian witnesses. In contrast, except for the Primary Alexandrian tradition, variant B has the support of manuscripts from every textual tradition, plus two Alexandrian fathers. A decision based on the external evidence alone largely depends on one's assessment of the Primary Alexandrian tradition.

Although the internal evidence is also not entirely conclusive, it may slightly favor variant A. First, since the vast majority of subjunctives in John are aorist, variant B may have arisen due to harmonization. In addition, the traditional distinction between the present tense indicating an ongoing activity ("may continue to believe") and the aorist indicating a punctiliar action ("may begin to believe") may explain why scribes preferred the use of the aorist subjunctive. Scribes may have preferred the aorist tense because it made better sense theologically with the purpose of Jesus' prayer for unity among his followers. The idea of the world continuing to believe may have seemed nonsensical in a world that largely did not believe. The problem with this type of argumentation, however, is twofold: (1) it is difficult to base a reading on an author's supposed purpose; and (2) it has been shown that John "can use either tense to refer to both coming to faith and continuing in the faith."<sup>69</sup>

This variant largely parallels the variant in John 20:21, where once again the Primary Alexandrian tradition favors the present active subjunctive in opposition to the remaining textual traditions. Unfortunately, Clement's text is not extant for John 20:21. My preference for the Primary Alexandrian witnesses favors variant A.

The classification of Clement's reading as Alexandrian is certainly appropriate in light of the absence of this reading from the other textual families.

### 31. John 17:22

A. \* εἰς<sup>2</sup> P<sup>66</sup> B C D L W f<sup>1</sup> 33 1582 e UBS<sup>4</sup> Cyr

B. add εσμεν ἵνα A E Δ Θ Π Ψ f<sup>13</sup> a b TR Ath

C. omit ἵνα 579

**Short omission;<sup>70</sup> short interpolation<sup>71</sup>**

Variant A is clearly the preferred reading. The external evidence in support of variant A is stronger and more diversified than the support for either variant B or C. Particularly impressive is the combined support of the Alexandrian tradition and half of Western tradition. While the two Old

<sup>69</sup> D. A. Carson, *The Gospel according to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 662.

<sup>70</sup> For other instances of short omissions, see nos. 11, 12, 20, 27, 29.

<sup>71</sup> For other instances of interpolation, see variant readings nos. 8, 13, 14.



Latin witnesses (a, b) indicate variant B arose at an early time, the extent of its manuscript support is far more limited. The reading of  $\epsilon\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu$  in variant B probably arose as a logical scribal addition that sought to make the text more explicit by supplying the implied verb. It is far more probable that scribes would have added  $\epsilon\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu$  than removed it. While variant C is certainly the shorter reading, the lack of manuscript support suggests its secondary nature.

While variant A has wide support from all of the manuscripts traditions except the Byzantine, the support of the vast majority of the Alexandrian witnesses certainly favors classifying Clement's text as primarily Alexandrian.

#### CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE TYPOLOGY OF CLEMENT'S BYZANTINE, WESTERN, AND ALEXANDRIAN READINGS

The evaluation of Clement's predominant readings in the Gospels indicates that the level of his proportional agreement with the Byzantine text group in Matthew and with the Western tradition in Mark and Luke needs to be adjusted. With the exception of Matthew, the highest textual affinity identified through the group profile method is correct the majority of the time. But even though only a few adjustments are necessary, the change to the level of proportional agreement is significant and provides a clearer picture of Clement's text. In contrast, the clear nature of Clement's Primary Alexandrian readings in John indicates no adjustment is needed to his proportional level of Alexandrian agreement.

In the case of Matthew, two out of Clement's seven agreements with the Byzantine text are not likely truly representative of his affinity with the Byzantine text. While Clement's reading in Matt 12:36 (variant no. 4) is probably not Primary Alexandrian or Western, the strong support of both Caesarean and Secondary Alexandrian witnesses preclude it from being a clear indication of his affinity with the Byzantine tradition. The nearly unanimous attestation of the Western tradition of Clement's reading in Matt 16:26 (variant no. 5) also indicates the questionable nature of classifying Clement's reading as Byzantine. The most that can be said is that Clement's reading is not Alexandrian or Caesarean. When we omit these two readings, the level of Clement's proportional agreement with the Byzantine text-type drops from 53.8% to 45.5%, and his highest level of agreement switches from Byzantine (45.5%) to Primary Alexandrian (46.2%). The differences are displayed in a modified presentation of the data in table 13.

Although this adjustment was minimal, the designation of Clement's text of Matthew as representative of the Primary Alexandrian text-type, though not a particularly strong witness, is more accurate. It would have been amiss to classify Clement as an early representative of the Byzantine text for two reasons. First, Clement's Byzantine readings are neither distinctive

TABLE 13

Adjusted Group Profile Analysis  
Readings in Matthew

Profile Three, Uniform and Predominant Readings that are also Distinctive, Exclusive, or Primary

	Uniform		Predominant		Totals	
Prim. Alex.	3/7	(42.9%)	3/6	(50.0%)	6/13	(46.2%)
Sec. Alex.	1/1	(100%)	1/4	(25.0%)	2/5	(40.0%)
Byzantine	3/8	(37.5%)	2/3	(66.7%)	5/11	(45.5%)
Caesarean	0/2	(0.0%)	0/0		0/2	(0.0%)
Western	8/16	(50.0%)	2/11	(18.2%)	10/27	(37.0%)

nor exclusive. At most they confirm that a number of Byzantine *readings* existed as early as the second century. Instead of being the creation of later Byzantine editors, these readings appear to be minor Alexandrian (variant nos. 3 and 4) or Western (variant no. 2) readings that eventually found their way into the Byzantine text. The presence of some early Byzantine readings in Clement's text is not that unusual. Both Zuntz and Fee discovered similar types of "Byzantine" readings in their respective studies of early New Testament papyri.<sup>72</sup>

The mere presence of a few early Byzantine readings does not, however, demonstrate the existence of an early Byzantine text-type.<sup>73</sup> As Fee notes, "it is all of these [Byzantine] readings *together*, in *combination*, that distinguishes the later MSS from the earlier—and the later Fathers from the earlier."<sup>74</sup> And in the case of Clement, there is simply no evidence that his isolated Byzantine readings fall into such a pattern. Thus while Clement's attestation of some Byzantine readings does not indicate the existence of an early Byzantine text-type, it does confirm the conclusion reached by Zuntz in his study of the Pauline Epistles in P<sup>46</sup>: "Our inquiry has confirmed what was anyhow probable enough: the Byzantines did not hit upon these

---

<sup>72</sup> Gordon D. Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II (P66): Its Textual Relationships and Scribal Characteristics* (SD 34; Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968), 80–81.

<sup>73</sup> This is the fundamental mistake that undermines Harry Sturz's analysis of the early New Testament papyri (Sturz, *Byzantine Text-Type*).

<sup>74</sup> Gordon D. Fee, "A Critique of W. N. Pickering's *The Identity of the New Testament Text*: A Review Article," *WTJ* 41 (1979): 416.

readings by conjecture or independent error. They reproduced an older tradition."<sup>75</sup>

The second indication that a Byzantine categorization of Clement's text of Matthew would not be completely accurate is the fact that Clement's readings identified as Byzantine lack the characteristic features associated with the Byzantine text. Due to a desire for lucidity and completeness, the tendency for expansion rather than contraction is a principal characteristic of the Byzantine witnesses. On the whole, this tends to make Byzantine readings longer than their Alexandrian counterparts.<sup>76</sup> One of the defining marks of expansion, as Metzger points out, is the conflation of "two or more divergent readings into one expanded reading."<sup>77</sup> These peculiarities of the Byzantine text are hardly present in Clement's readings identified as primary Byzantine in Matthew; in addition to the absence of a single conflation of two or more divergent readings, the largest expansion is limited to the addition of one preposition and article (see variant no. 2)!

Thus the picture that begins to emerge based on the adjustments made to Clement's agreements with the various textual groups in Matthew is one of diversity. Clement appears to be aware of a number of different textual streams in circulation in Alexandria with no one dominant tradition. While he is slightly more influenced by a number of Alexandrian readings of Matthew, he also relies on a number of Western readings and even on a few other ancient readings that were eventually preserved in the Byzantine text.

An examination of Clement's Western readings in Mark also reveals the necessity of several adjustments. Two out of the five readings that appeared to suggest a Western influence on Clement's text of Mark were found to be not completely accurate. The paraphrastic nature Clement's citation of the central section of Mark 10:17 (variant no. 8) and the absence of any sort of sustained verbal agreement with one or more of the other Western readings suggests that Clement's agreement with the Western witnesses in the use of λεγων is merely accidental. The identification of Clement's use of διαδος instead of δος in Mark 10:21 (variant no. 10) as Western was also seen as questionable. It was found to be most likely the result of his tendency of harmonization, in this case harmonization with the parallel passage in Luke.

---

<sup>75</sup> Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles*, 55.

<sup>76</sup> For a description of the characteristics of the Byzantine text, see Westcott and Hort, *New Testament in the Original Greek*, 132–35; Metzger, *Textual Commentary* (2nd ed.), 7\*; idem, *Text of the New Testament*, 279–80; Léon Vaganay and Christian-Bernard Amphoux, *An Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism* (trans. Jenny Heimerdinger; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 109; trans. of *Initiation à la critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament* (2nd ed.: Paris: Cerf, 1986); Petzer, "History of the New Testament Text," 15–17.

<sup>77</sup> Metzger, *Textual Commentary* (2nd ed.), 7\*.

TABLE 14

Adjusted Group Profile Analysis  
Readings in Mark

Profile Three, Uniform and Predominant Readings that are also Distinctive, Exclusive, or Primary

	Uniform	Predominant	Totals
Prim. Alex.	1/5 (20.7%)	2/4 (50.0%)	3/9 (33.3%)
Sec. Alex.	0/1 (0.0%)	0/0	0/1 (0.0%)
Byzantine	1/3 (33.3%)	0/2 (0.0%)	1/5 (20.0%)
Caesarean	0/1 (0.0%)	1/3 (33.3%)	1/4 (25.0%)
Western	2/5 (40.0%)	1/3 (33.3%)	3/8 (37.5%)

While the omission of these two readings from the group profile results does not change Clement's overall affinity with the Western text-type in Mark, it does provide a healthful correction to the level of strength we should associate with Clement's witness to the Western text—something that was already indicated by Clement's higher level of agreement with the predominant Western readings in the intra-group profile. The adjusted data in table 14 illustrates how Clement's proportional agreement with the Western text drops significantly from 50.0% to 37.5%. This leaves only a margin of 4.2% with the Primary Alexandrian witnesses at 33.3%. This lower level of Clement's agreement with the Western text suggest that, at least in Mark 10, Clement was not dominated by one textual influence but appears to be aware of two different streams of readings in circulation in Alexandria: Western and Primary Alexandrian.

The examination of Clement's Western agreements in Luke also reveals the necessity of a number of adjustments. Two out of the fourteen readings identified as Western (Luke 12:20, variants nos. 22 and 23) are of no value in classifying Clement's textual affinity as Western, since Clement attests both the Western and non-Western forms of the variant. The classification of four other of Clement's agreements with the Western text is also highly questionable. In Luke 10:21 (variant no. 19) and in 10:42 (variant no. 20) the Western character of the text revolves around the minor distinction of the addition or omission of a single preposition—hardly a definitive Western characteristic. Furthermore, in both cases, the primary Western reading has significant support from members of several of the other textual families. The remaining two questionable variants are in Luke 6:37 (variant no. 15) and Luke 12:24 (variant no. 24). While the non-Western support of these two witnesses is minimal, both variants clearly appear to be the result of

TABLE 15

Adjusted Group Profile Analysis  
Readings in Luke

Profile Three, Uniform and Predominant Readings that are also Distinctive, Exclusive, or Significantly Primary

	Uniform	Predominant	Totals
Prim. Alex.	8/23 (34.8%)	2/5 (40.0%)	10/28 (35.7%)
Sec. Alex.	0/0	0/2 (0.0%)	0/2 (0.0%)
Byzantine	3/13 (23.1%)	1/9 (11.1%)	4/22 (18.2%)
Caesarean	0/2 (0.0%)	1/1 (100.0%)	1/3 (33.3%)
Western	6/13 (46.2%)	4/8 (50.0%)	10/21 (47.6%)

harmonization. While it is possible that Clement is dependent on Western readings for both variants, his own tendency for harmonization makes a Western identification highly uncertain.

When these six readings are eliminated, a more accurate picture of Clement's text of Luke becomes apparent.<sup>78</sup> As the adjusted data in table 15 indicates, Clement does share a significant number of agreements with the Western tradition, but it is not as decidedly Western as the results from the third group profile first suggested. Clement's level of agreement drops from 59.3% to 47.6%.

The diminished influence of the Western text on Clement can also be seen in the overall character of his citations identified as Western. With the exception of the so-called Western noninterpolations, Western readings tend to be longer than other forms of the text.<sup>79</sup> Unlike the Byzantine text, however, the Western tradition is not characterized as much by conflation and harmonization as it is a more free transmission of the text that ranges from trivial alterations to the wholesale inclusion of apocryphal material. While a number of Clement's readings clearly fit this description to a limited

---

<sup>78</sup> Even if Clement's agreement with the Western text in Luke 6:37 (variant no. 15) and Luke 12:24 (variant no. 24) are not eliminated from consideration, the corresponding change in his level of agreement with the Western tradition changes little (47.6% to 50.0%).

<sup>79</sup> For a description of the characteristics of the Western text, see Westcott and Hort, *New Testament in the Original Greek*, 120–26; Metzger, *Textual Commentary* (2nd ed.), 6\*–7\*; idem, *Text of the New Testament*, 276–77; Vaganay and Amphoux, *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*, 109–11; Petzer, "History of the New Testament Text," 18–24.

extent (variant nos. 13, 14, 16, 17), others are clearly only of a more minor stylistic nature.

As was the case in Mark, the evidence once again suggests that in the Synoptic Gospels no single text-type played a dominant influence on Clement's text. Instead, for his text of Luke, Clement appears to draw from two different streams of readings in circulation, Western and Primary Alexandrian.

To summarize, the evaluation of the readings that determine Clement's predominant affinities in the Gospels indicate that the proportional levels of his affinities are somewhat misleading and in need of minor adjustment, at least in the case of the Synoptics. While the readings identified as Primary Alexandrian in John proved to be correct, a number of the readings identified as Byzantine in Matthew and Western in Mark and Luke did not clearly preserve a sufficiently distinctive textual character to be of significance for determining Clement's textual affinity. When Clement's proportional levels of agreement are adjusted in light of these findings, his text reflects a more diverse picture of the textual influences present in Alexandria than the original group profile method was able to indicate in chapter 6.

## THE TRANSMISSION OF THE GOSPELS IN ALEXANDRIA

### CLEMENT AND THE ALEXANDRIAN FATHERS

What insight can our study of Clement's text of the Gospels provide for understanding the transmission of the Gospels in Alexandria? The answer to this question is of particular interest because Clement's text provides a window into the form of the New Testament in Alexandria some two centuries before the manuscripts that have been seen as most representative of the Alexandrian text: Codex Sinaiticus (outside of John 1:1–8:38) and Codex Vaticanus.

The most significant conclusion that can be drawn about the transmission of the Gospels in Alexandria is that Clement's text was not monolithic. Instead of testifying to the dominance of one singular text-type in Alexandria at the end of the second century, Clement's citations suggest that a number of diverse readings were in circulation, and Clement does not appear to have been beholden to the sole influence of any one of them. With this basic picture in mind, we now turn to what observations can be drawn about the presence of each of the representative textual groups in Alexandria during Clement's time.

### THE CAESAREAN TEXT IN ALEXANDRIA

Little needs to be said about Clement's relation to the Caesarean text. While the Caesarean text-type has been isolated only to Mark, the text-type itself is a later development after Clement's time; its inclusion in this study only serves as a means of comparison with other patristic studies. Thus it is of no surprise that the group profile analysis indicates that Clement shares virtually no agreements with Caesarean readings. The level of his agreements with the Caesarean witnesses that emerge from the quantitative analysis are due to the mixed nature of the Caesarean text.

## THE BYZANTINE TEXT IN ALEXANDRIA

One of the surprising results of this study was the high number of agreements Clement shares with Byzantine readings in Matthew. One should not interpret Clement's agreements with Byzantine readings in Matthew, however, as evidence of the existence of the Byzantine text-type in Alexandria at the end of the second century. For one reason, not one of Clement's Byzantine readings is distinctive or exclusive; they are all readings shared with other textual witnesses. As such, some of his so-called Byzantine readings simply reflect minor Alexandrian or Western readings. In addition, even a careful examination of these shared readings identified as Byzantine reveals that some of Clement's agreements are merely accidental, for example, the result of his own tendency toward harmonization. In any case, the Byzantine readings that Clement appears to genuinely support are significant. They demonstrate that Westcott and Hort's total disregard of all Byzantine readings as secondary is too severe.<sup>1</sup> The presence of Byzantine readings in Clement's citations suggest that some Byzantine readings are in fact early, a conclusion Zuntz also found in his study of P<sup>46</sup>. Thus it appears that a few early Byzantine readings were in circulation in Alexandria at the end of the second century. These readings, however, appear to have played only a minor influence, since hardly any are present in Clement's citations outside of Matthew.

## THE WESTERN TEXT IN ALEXANDRIA

Contrary to the findings of Barnard and Burkitt (1899) and Zaphiris (1970), Clement's Gospel citations do not testify to the early "dominance" of the Western textual tradition in Alexandria. This is not to suggest that the Western text played no role at all. That would also be incorrect. The data from both the quantitative and group profile methods clearly demonstrate that Clement has an affinity with the Western text. But the Western text plays only a minor influence on his text of Matthew and John and a slightly stronger influence on his citations from Mark and Luke. Yet in no case does the Western text play such an overly "dominant" role that it would justify the classification of his text as Western. Of course, by "dominant" role, I do not simply mean a higher level of proportional agreement. Clement's highest level of agreement in Luke, for example, is with the Western readings. But his final adjusted level of agreement does not reach even 50%. Moreover, the group profile analysis demonstrates that, of the considerable number of distinctive, exclusive, and even primary Western readings available for

---

<sup>1</sup> Westcott and Hort, *New Testament in the Original Greek*, 132–35.



comparison, Clement fails to support the vast majority of these readings. P. L. Hedley goes too far when he claims that in the Gospels Clement has "an almost pure  $\delta$  text."<sup>2</sup>

Clement's higher levels of agreement with the Western text in Mark and Luke, do suggest, however, that some Western readings were present and influential during the second century in Alexandria. While Clement appears to have had a slightly stronger preference for a number of Western readings in Mark and Luke, a comparison of the current limited results available from recent textual studies of other Alexandrian fathers suggests that the Western tradition was on its way to losing the limited influence it had in Alexandria, at least in the Gospels.<sup>3</sup>

At the same time, as Streeter points out, it needs to be remembered that, unlike some later Alexandrian fathers, Clement was not a native of Alexandria.<sup>4</sup> Thus, though it cannot be proven, it is possible that the stronger Western influences on his text of Luke may not stem from a Western influence in Alexandria but from readings Clement became familiar with before he finally settled in Alexandria. In any case, this, of course, does not suggest that the Gospel text in Alexandria was entirely stable; the evidence clearly indicates otherwise.<sup>5</sup> In summary, while Clement bears witness to the circulation of some Western readings in second-century Alexandria, the Western tradition does not appear to exert a dominant influence on his text as a whole.

#### THE ALEXANDRIAN TEXT IN ALEXANDRIA

While Clement fails to meet the 65% rate of agreement necessary for classification as an Alexandrian witness in the Gospels, one should not automatically conclude that his text reveals little Alexandrian influence.

---

<sup>2</sup> P. L. Hedley, "The Egyptian Text of the Gospels and Acts," *CQR* 118 (1934): 223.

<sup>3</sup> See Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind*, 258–59; Brogan, "Text of the Gospels," 255–58; Raquel, "Text of the Synoptic Gospels," 505–9; and the unpublished data from Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes, *Text of the Fourth Gospel*. If this limited evidence is representative of Alexandria as a whole, it also argues against the position that the Western text began to exert its influence late in Alexandria (see Burnett H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study in Origins* [London: Macmillan, 1936], 60, 118).

<sup>4</sup> Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 57.

<sup>5</sup> For evidence of the instability of the Gospels in the second century, see Helmut Koester, "The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century," in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century* (ed. W. L. Petersen; Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 3; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 37; and Ehrman, "The Text of the Gospels at the End of the Second Century."

As noted previously, Clement's text in the Gospel of John appears to be clearly Alexandrian, though the final results of the group profile reveals only a 60% rate of agreement with the Primary Alexandrian witnesses. The likelihood of this conclusion emerges from several different pieces of evidence. First, unlike the smaller margins of difference separating the various text-types in the Gospels, a significant gap of 24.3% separates Clement's agreement with the Alexandrian witnesses from his next closest agreement with the Western textual tradition (35.7%)—a margin of difference that far surpasses the suggested 5–7% margin that should separate text-types. Clement's only other affinity from the final group profile in John is a mere 20.0% agreement with the Byzantine text. Second, the results of the quantitative analysis also suggest the Alexandrian nature of Clement's text in John. The comparison of Clement's text in John with all the other representative textual witnesses indicates his highest levels of agreement are with the Alexandrian witnesses. As table 7 in chapter 5 indicates, the first ten witnesses (including Origen, Cyril, and Athanasius) are not only Alexandrian, but Clement's rate of agreement with all these witnesses surpasses 65%. Thus it seems likely that Clement's text in John is best classified as Primary Alexandrian, although his lower than ideal rate of agreement suggests he is not a very pure representative of the Alexandrian tradition.

Although the case for an Alexandrian influence in the Synoptics is not as strong as it is in John, the Alexandrian text still plays a important role on Clement's text. In Matthew, Clement's strongest affinities lie with the Primary Alexandrian witnesses, and his support of Alexandrian readings run a close second in Mark 10 and Luke. If one includes Clement's textual affinities with other Alexandrian fathers, there may be even stronger evidence for an Alexandrian influence in the Synoptics. I should make clear, however, that here the evidence is merely circumstantial and quite tenuous.

One of the more interesting findings of this study is the high degree of textual confluence Clement shares with the later Alexandrian fathers. While a comparison of the text of one Alexandrian father with another has been done before, this study provides a specific type of quantitative comparison that has not been done previously; building on the results of recent patristic studies, it examines the level of textual agreement for each Father Gospel by Gospel.<sup>6</sup> As the summary of the quantitative analysis shows in table 16, with

---

<sup>6</sup> This type of comparative analysis was impossible before the methodology developed by Ehrman became the standard for patristic analysis. The publication of the series *The New Testament in the Greek Fathers* (SBLNTGF) will, one hopes, encourage future patristic studies that can build on these comparisons and open the door for a clearer picture of the history of the text of the New Testament.

TABLE 16

Clement's Proportional Agreement with Alexandrian Fathers  
in Genetically Significant Gospel Variants

<b>Matthew</b>	<b>Rank</b>		<b>Total Ag.</b>	<b>Total Var.</b>	<b>% Ag.</b>	<b>Error Corr.</b>
	1.	Ath	7	9	77.8%	30.9%
	2.	Or	43	65	66.2%	11.6%
	14.	Did	22	38	57.9%	15.9%
<b>Mark</b>						
	4.	Or	3	5	60.0%	59.9%
<b>Luke</b>						
	1.	Or	25	35	71.4%	15.2%
	4.	Did	17	29	58.6%	18.2%
	21.	Ath	2	4	50.0%	74.2%
<b>John</b>						
	3.	Or	29	40	72.5%	14.0%
	6.	Cyr	35	50	70.0%	12.8%
	9.	Ath	11	16	68.8%	25.1%
	27.	Did	9	19	47.4%	23.1%

very few exceptions<sup>7</sup> Clement shares his highest levels of agreement with other Alexandrian fathers.

The consistently high rate of agreement between these Fathers should not be dismissed as merely coincidental. When dealing with patristic evidence, one would expect to often find a low rate of agreement between two Fathers.<sup>8</sup> This is due to the inconsistent citation practices and varying preferences for certain New Testament books and passages, as well as the

---

<sup>7</sup> In the case of the Synoptics, the only deviation from this pattern is the lower level of agreement Clement shares with Athanasius in Luke. Little can be made of this lower rate of agreement, however, since only four variants are available for consideration. The only real anomaly in John is the 47.4% rate of agreement Clement shares with Didymus. This also does not undermine the confluence of Clement with the other Alexandrian fathers, since Didymus's text in John, as Ehrman notes, is highly eclectic (see p. 246 above). Clement and the other Alexandrian fathers, however, favor a more strongly Alexandrian text in John.

<sup>8</sup> E.g., the 59.3% rate of agreement shared between Basil and Gregory of Nyssa (see Racine, "Text of Matthew," 283–86).

fact that a vast number of patristic citations tend to be adaptations and loose quotations that drastically reduce the chances of a high rate of agreement.

The comparison of Clement with these other Alexandrian fathers reveals that a significant textual relationship exists among them and the so-called Alexandrian text.<sup>9</sup> While this relationship deserves a far more detailed analysis than is available in this study, it does suggest that Clement's text of the Synoptics may have a stronger affinity to the Alexandrian text than the extant evidence is able to indicate. Further investigation of the rest of Clement's New Testament citations may bring more evidence to bear on this possibility.

As the evidence now stands, although Clement's citations in the Gospels suggest that the Primary Alexandrian text of John was dominant by the end of the second century in Alexandria (although Clement appears to be a rather impure representative of it), there was not yet a dominant text-type of the Synoptics in Alexandria at the end of the second century. Instead, there appears to have been a time of textual fluidity with two major textual streams present: Primary Alexandrian and Western. These two traditions, including a few ancient Byzantine readings, exerted varying levels of influence upon Clement's text—in particular, a stronger Primary Alexandrian influence in Matthew and a slightly stronger Western influence in Mark 10 and in Luke, although in no case was one textual tradition so overwhelmingly influential that it would justify classifying Clement's text as either Alexandrian or Western. The limited influence of the Western text on the Synoptics in Alexandria would be short-lived, however. Within a century, the Western tradition would play little, if any, role on the text of the Gospels in Alexandria. Whether church fathers such as Origen or other unknown forces contributed to this change remains a mystery still waiting to be solved.

---

<sup>9</sup> See the recent textual analysis of each of these Fathers for the Alexandrian nature of their Gospel texts.

## APPENDIX 1

### INDETERMINABLE GOSPEL REFERENCES

The following list contains references to the text of the Gospels in Clement's writings whose precise biblical reference cannot be determined with certainty. The obscure nature of the source of these references are the result of verbatim parallel passages among the Gospels (e.g., Matt 9:22), parallel passages to other New Testament passages or the LXX (e.g., Matt 5:37, 38), harmonizations among the textual traditions of the Gospels (e.g., Matt 3:12), or complex confluences of multiple passages (e.g., Matt 5:3).

Since these references are of no value in determining the textual affinities of Clement's Gospel text, no distinction has been made between quotations, adaptations, or allusions. In spite of their limited value for this study, they are listed here because they illustrate Clement's use of the Gospels and provide secondary references to the text.

#### **Matt 3:3; Mark 1:3; Luke 3:4; John 1:23**

και σωφρονας τας οδους του κυριου παρασκευαζων (*Paed.* 2.112.1)

φωνη του λογου προτρεπτικη εν ερημω βοωσα ... ευθειας ποιειτε τας οδους κυριου (*Protr.* 9.1)

ας ευθειας τοιειν και ευτρεπιξειν παρηγγειλεν Ιωαννης (*Protr.* 85.1)

#### **Matt 3:4; Mark 1:6**

Ιωαννης ... ακριδας και μελι ησθιεν αγριον (*Paed.* 2.16.1)

τας των καμηλων ειλατο τριχας και ταυταις ημπισχετο ... και γαρ μελι ησθιεν και ακριδας (*Paed.* 2.112.1)

#### **Matt 3:7; 12:34; 23:33; Luke 3:7**

δικαιοσυνην γεννηματα εχιδνων κεκληκε που (*Protr.* 4.3)

γεννηματα εχιδνων τους τοιουτους εκαλεσεν (*Strom.* 4.100.3)

#### **Matt 3:9; Luke 3:8**

δυνατος γαρ ο θεος εκ των λιθων τουτων εγειραι τεκνα τω Αβρααμ (*Protr.* 4.2)

**Matt 3:10; Luke 3:9**

αλλά την αξινὴν τὴν ἐαυτοῦ πρὸς τὰς ρίζας τῆς κακίας προσαγαγὼν  
(*Quis div.* 29.3)

**Matt 3:11; Mark 1:7–8; Luke 3:16**

ὁ Ἰωάννης φησιν, ὅτι ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμᾶς ὕδατι βαπτίζω, ἐρχεται δὲ μου [ὁ]  
ὀπίσω ὁ βαπτίζων ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματι καὶ πυρὶ (*Ecl.* 25.1)

**Matt 3:12; Luke 3:17**

τὸ γὰρ πτῦον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ διακαθαίρει τὴν ἀλὼ, καὶ συναΐξει  
τὸν σίτον εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην, τὸ δὲ ἀχυρὸν κατακαύσει πυρὶ  
ἀσβεστῷ (*Ecl.* 25.1)<sup>1</sup>

τὸ γὰρ πτῦον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ τοῦ κυρίου, ὡ ἀποκρίνεται τοῦ πυροῦ τὸ  
ἀχυρὸν τὸ οφειλόμενον τῷ πυρὶ (*Paed.* 1.83.3)

**Matt 3:17; Mark 1:11; Luke 3:22**

αὐτὸς γοῦν ὁ ἡγαπημένος (*Paed.* 1.43.3)<sup>2</sup>

ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστὴς τῆς φωνῆς ἀκούσας οὐκ ἐφοβήθη, ὥς ἂν ἐν  
πνεύματι ἀκούσας συνηθῇ τῆς τοιαύτης φωνῆς (*Exc.* 5.2)

**Matt 4:1–11; Mark 1:12–13; Luke 4:1–13**

ὁ διαβόλος ἰδεὶ ἐλευσόμενον τὸν κύριον, εἰ δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς αὐτὸς εἶη, οὐκ  
ἠπιστάτο: διὸ καὶ ἐπειράζειν αὐτὸν, ἵνα γινῶ: εἰ δυνατὸς ἐστίν,  
εἰς φησὶ: (*Ecl.* 53.2)

**Matt 4:4; Luke 4:4** (cf. Deut 8:3; Hab 2:4)

οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' ἄρτῳ ζήσεται ὁ δίκαιος (*Paed.* 2.7.2)

οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' ἄρτῳ μόνῳ ζήσεται ὁ δίκαιος, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ ῥηματι κυρίου  
(*Paed.* 3.40.1)<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> This could be a quotation from Matt 3:12 because it contains the future tense of the verb συναΐξω and omits the personal pronoun αὐτοῦ. However, since συναΐξει and the omission of αὐτοῦ also appear among some manuscripts of the Luke, it is not certain which passage Clement had in mind.

<sup>2</sup> It is uncertain whether this is a reference to Jesus' baptism or his transfiguration in Matt 17:5 and Mark 9:7.

<sup>3</sup> The clause ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ ῥηματι κυρίου cannot be taken as a reference to Matt 4:4, since some manuscripts within the textual tradition of Luke 4:4 also have a similar phrase.

**Matt 4:8–10; Luke 4:5–8**

πλουσιος δε εις τοσουτον, ως πασαν την γην και το υπερ γης και υπ αυτην χρυσιον υπερηφανησεν συν και δοξη παση διδομενα αυτω προς του αντικειμενου (*Strom.* 2.21.3)

**Matt 4:17; Mark 1:15**

βοα γουν επειγων εις σωτηριαν αυτος ηγγικεν η βασιλεια των ουρανων (*Protr.* 87.3)<sup>4</sup>

**Matt 4:19; Mark 1:17**

αυτη δε βελτιων η αγρα, ην εχαρισατο ο κυριος τω μαθητη καθαπερ ιχθυς δι υδατος ανθρωπους αλιευειν διδασας (*Paed.* 3.52.2)

**Matt 5:3; Luke 6:20**

τινι λαλησει κυριος υμων εστιν η βασιλεια των ουρανων; (*Protr.* 99.4)<sup>5</sup>

μακαριζει δ εμπαλιν τους πενητας (*Strom.* 2.22.4)

ος εαν πτωχος η δια δικαιοσυνην (*Strom.* 4.25.2)<sup>6</sup>

μακαριοι δε και οι πτωχοι ειτε πνευματι ειτε περιουσια δια δικαιοσυνην δηλονοτι (*Strom.* 4.26.3)

τοις θελουσι δια την δικαιοσυνην πτωχευσαι (*Strom.* 4.34.1)

**Matt 5:4; Luke 6:21**

ομοιως δε και ο κλαιων και ο πενθων δια δικαιοσυνην (*Strom.* 4.26.1)<sup>7</sup>

**Matt 5:15; Mark 4:21; Luke 8:16; 11:33**

ουδεις απτει λυχνον και υπο τον μοδιον τιθησιν, αλλ επι της λυχνιας φαινειν τοις της εστιασεως της αυτης κατηξιωμενοις (*Strom.* 1.12.3)

---

<sup>4</sup> It is uncertain whether this is a reference to Matt 4:17 or Mark 1:15, since the phrase βασιλεια των ουρανων is also found in the manuscript tradition of Mark.

<sup>5</sup> The general nature of this reference makes it impossible to determine what reference, if any, Clement might have had in mind (cf. Matt 5:10; 13:31, 33, 44, 45, 47; 19:14; 20:1).

<sup>6</sup> In these final three references, Clement appears to conflate Matt 5:3/Luke 6:20 with the reference to δικαιοσυνη in Matt 5:10.

<sup>7</sup> Clement here conflates Matt 5:4 and Luke 6:21 with the reference to δικαιοσυνη in Matt 5:10.

**Matt 5:27; Exod 20:13; Deut 5:17**

ου μοιχευσεις (*Paed.* 2.51.2)

**Matt 5:29–30; 18:9; Mark 9:47–48**

ο γουν κυριος συντομωτατα ιαται το παθος τουτο, ει σκανδαλιζει σε  
ο οφθαλμος σου, εκκοψον αυτον λεγων (*Paed.* 3.70.1)<sup>8</sup>

καν ο δεξιος σου οφθαλμος σκανδαλιζη σε, ταχεως εκκοψον αυτον  
αιρετωτερον ετεροφθαλμω βασιλεια θεου η ολοκληρω το πυρ  
(*Quis div.* 24.2)

**Matt 5:32** (see **Matt 19:9**)

**Matt 5:38; Lev 24:20**

οφθαλμον αντι οφθαλμου (*Strom.* 8.30.4)

**Matt 5:44; Luke 6:27–28, 35**

ο υπερ των επηρεαζοντων ημας προσευχεσθαι διδασκων (*Paed.* 1.70.3)

υπερ των εχθρων προσευχεσθαι διδαξη (*Strom.* 2.90.1)

το δε αγαπαν τους εχθρους ουκ αγαπαν το κακον λεγει (*Strom.* 4.93.3)

οιδεν γαρ και τον κυριον αντικρυς ευχεσθαι υπερ των εχθρων  
παραγγειλαντα (*Strom.* 7.84.5)

κατα την του κυριου διδασκαλιαν προσευξωνται και υπερ των  
εχθρων (*Strom.* 7.84.7)

ο γε και τους εχθρους αγαπαν παραινων (*Quis div.* 22.4)

**Matt 6:9; Luke 11:2**<sup>9</sup>

εμαθεν λεγειν πατερ ημων (*Ecl.* 19.1)

πατερ ημων ο εν τοις ουρανοις (*Paed.* 1.73.1)

---

<sup>8</sup> The wording of Clement's citation—ει σκανδαλιζει σε ο οφθαλμος σου, εκκοψον αυτον—is not found in the Gospels, but it is very similar to a passage cited by Justin (*Apol.* 15.2). This may be another indication of a shared textual tradition among some early church fathers. See Bellinzoni, *Sayings of Jesus*, 87–88.

<sup>9</sup> The source for these references cannot be identified, since harmonization within the manuscript traditions of Matt 6:9 and Luke 11:2 makes it impossible to determine if Clement had a specific reference in mind.



**Matt 6:10; Luke 11:2<sup>10</sup>**

ΟΠΕΡ ΕΥΧΟΜΕΘΑ ΚΑΙ ΕΠΙ ΓΗΣ ΓΕΝΕΣΘΑΙ ΤΟ ΘΕΛΗΜΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΩΣ ΕΝ ΟΥΡΑΝΩ (*Strom.* 4.66.1)

ΘΕΛΗΜΑ ΘΕΙΟΝ ΕΠΙ ΓΗΣ ΩΣ ΕΝ ΟΥΡΑΝΩ (*Strom.* 4.172.2)

**Matt 6:12; Luke 11:4**

ΔΙΟ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΚΑΙΩΣ ΕΥΧΕΤΑΙ, ΑΦΕΣ ΗΜΙΝ ΛΕΓΩΝ: ΚΑΙ ΓΑΡ ΗΜΕΙΣ ΑΦΙΕΜΕΝ (*Strom.* 7.81.1)<sup>11</sup>

**Matt 6:14–15; Mark 11:25**

ΦΗΣΙΝ Ο ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ... ΑΦΙΕΤΕ ΙΝΑ ΑΦΕΘΗ ΥΜΙΝ (*Strom.* 2.91.2)

ΑΦΕΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΦΕΘΗΣΕΤΑΙ ΣΟΙ (*Strom.* 7.86.6)

**Matt 6:20; Luke 12:33**

ΟΥΚ ΕΝ ΑΛΛΩ ΤΙΝΙ Η ΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ ΚΑΙ ΤΩ ΘΕΩ ΤΟ ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΝ ΘΗΣΑΥΡΙΣΑΣ ΕΝΘΑ ΟΥ ΣΗΣ ΟΥ ΛΗΣΤΗΣ (*Protr.* 105.3)

**Matt 6:21; Luke 12:34**

Ο ΔΕ ΤΩ ΟΝΤΙ ΘΗΣΑΥΡΟΣ ΗΜΩΝ ΕΝΘΑ Η ΣΥΓΓΕΝΕΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΝΟΥ (*Strom.* 4.33.5)

ΟΠΟΥ ΓΑΡ Ο ΝΟΥΣ ΤΙΝΟΣ, ΦΗΣΙΝ, ΕΚΕΙ ΚΑΙ Ο ΘΗΣΑΥΡΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ (*Strom.* 7.77.6)<sup>12</sup>

ΟΠΟΥ ΓΑΡ Ο ΝΟΥΣ ΤΟΥ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ, ΕΚΕΙ ΚΑΙ Ο ΘΗΣΑΥΡΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ (*Quis div.* 17.1)

**Matt 6:22; Luke 11:34**

ΛΥΧΝΟΣ ΓΑΡ ΤΟΥ ΣΩΜΑΤΟΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ Ο ΟΦΘΑΛΜΟΣ, ΦΗΣΙΝ Η ΓΡΑΦΗ (*Paed.* 3.70.4)

**Matt 6:24; Luke 16:13**

ΟΥ ΓΑΡ, ΟΙΜΑΙ, ΕΒΟΥΛΕΤΟ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΗΝ ΤΟΥ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ ΕΝΤΟΛΗΝ ΔΥΣΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΙΣ ΔΟΥΛΕΥΕΙΝ (*Strom.* 3.26.2)

---

<sup>10</sup> See n. 9.

<sup>11</sup> See n. 9.

<sup>12</sup> Although Clement's version of Jesus' saying in *Strom.* 7.77.6 and *Quis. div.* 17.1 is considerably different from the Gospels, it shares several similarities to a citation by Justin (*Apol.* 15.16b). This may be another illustration of a shared textual tradition among early church fathers. See Bellinzoni, *Sayings of Jesus*, 92.

**Matt 6:27; Luke 12:25**

ου γαρ τη ηλικια, φησιν, εκ του φροντιζειν προσθειναι τι δυνασθε  
(*Ecl.* 12.3)

**Matt 6:32; Luke 12:30**

+ οιδεν γαρ ο πατηρ ων χρεϊαν εχετε (*Ecl.* 12.2)<sup>13</sup>

**Matt 6:33; Luke 12:31**

ζητεϊτε γαρ ειπεν και μεριμνατε την βασιλειαν του θεου, και ταυτα  
παντα προστεθησεται υμιν + (*Ecl.* 12.2)<sup>14</sup>

**Matt 7:1; Luke 6:37**

ως κρινετε, ουτως κριθησεσθε: ως χρηστευεσθε, ουτως  
χρηστευθησεται υμιν: + (*Strom.* 2.91.2)

**Matt 7:2; Mark 4:24; Luke 6:38**

+ ω μετρω μετρεϊτε, αντιμετρηθησεται υμιν (*Strom.* 2.91.2)

**Matt 7:7–8; Luke 11:9–10**

τω αιτουντι, φησι, και δοθησεται και τω κρουοντι ανοιγησεται  
(*Paed.* 3.36.3)

τω κρουοντι, γαρ φησιν, ανοιγησεται: αιτειτε και δοθησεται υμιν  
(*Strom.* 5.16.6)

τοις ζητουσι ποριζει και τοις αιτουσι παρεχει και τοις κρουουσιν  
ανοιγει (*Quis div.* 10.2)

**Matt 7:7; Luke 11:9; John 14:13–14; 16:23**

παρεστι μεν γαρ αυτω αιτεισθαι και λαμβανειν ων αν δεηται παρα  
του πατρος των ολων (*Paed.* 3.40.2)

ζητεϊτε γαρ και ευρησετε λεγει (*Strom.* 1.51.4)

αιτεισθε γαρ και δοθησεται υμιν (*Strom.* 2.116.2)

---

<sup>13</sup> Though the vast majority of manuscripts in the Lukan tradition do not follow the word order of οιδεν γαρ ο πατηρ in Matt 6:32, it is impossible to know for certain which passage Clement may have in mind, since the order of those words in Luke 6:30 in Codex Bezae is identical to that of Matthew.

<sup>14</sup> Harmonization within the manuscript tradition of Luke with Matthew makes it impossible to determine with certainty which passage Clement had in mind.

ΔΙΟ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΙΤΕΙΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΔΟΘΗΣΕΤΑΙ ΥΜΙΝ (*Strom.* 3.57.2)

ΖΗΤΕΙ, ΦΗΣΙ, ΚΑΙ ΕΥΡΗΣΕΙΣ (*Strom.* 4.5.3)

ΖΗΤΕΙ ΓΑΡ ΚΑΙ ΕΥΡΗΣΕΙΣ (ΛΕΓΕΙ) (*Strom.* 5.11.1)

ΑΙΤΗΣΑΙ ΛΕΓΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΠΟΙΗΣΩ: ΕΝΝΟΗΘΗΤΙ ΚΑΙ ΔΩΣΩ (*Strom.* 6.78.1)

ΑΙΤΗΣΑΙ, ΦΗΣΙΝ Η ΓΡΑΦΗ, ΚΑΙ ΠΟΙΗΣΩ: ΕΝΝΟΗΘΗΤΙ ΚΑΙ ΔΩΣΩ (*Strom.* 6.101.4)

ΛΕΓΕΙ ΓΑΡ Ο ΘΕΟΣ ΤΩ ΔΙΚΑΙΩ: ΑΙΤΗΣΑΙ, ΚΑΙ ΔΩΣΩ ΣΟΙ: ΕΝΝΟΗΘΗΤΙ ΚΑΙ ΠΟΙΗΣΩ (*Strom.* 7.73.1)

ΖΗΤΕΙΤΕ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΥΡΗΣΕΤΕ, ΚΡΟΥΕΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΟΙΓΗΣΕΤΑΙ, ΑΙΤΕΙΣΘΕ ΚΑΙ ΔΟΘΗΣΕΤΑΙ ΥΜΙΝ (*Strom.* 8.1.2)

**Matt 7:11; Luke 11:13; 2 Cor 1:3**

ΕΙ ΔΕ ΗΜΕΙΣ ΠΟΝΗΡΟΙ ΟΝΤΕΣ ΙΣΜΕΝ ΑΓΑΘΑ ΔΟΜΑΤΑ ΔΙΔΟΝΑΙ, ΠΟΣΩ ΜΑΛΛΟΝ Ο ΠΑΤΗΡ ΤΩΝ ΟΙΚΤΙΡΜΩΝ (*Quis div.* 39.6)

**Matt 7:12; Luke 6:31; 1 Clem 13:2**

ΩΣ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ, ΟΥΤΩΣ ΠΟΙΗΘΗΣΕΤΑΙ ΥΜΙΝ (*Strom.* 2.91.2)

**Matt 7:13; Luke 13:24**

ΔΙΑ ΠΑΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΣΤΕΝΗΣ ΔΙΕΛΘΟΝΤΑΣ ΟΔΟΥ (*Strom.* 4.138.4)

**Matt 7:13–14; Luke 13:24; John 14:6**

ΟΔΟΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ Ο ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΣΤΕΝΗ (*Protr* 100.1) [All]

**Matt 7:16; 12:33; Luke 6:44**

ΑΠΟ ΔΕ ΤΩΝ ΚΑΡΠΩΝ ΤΟ ΔΕΝΔΡΟΝ (*Strom.* 3.44.1)

**Matt 7:21; 12:50; 21:31; Luke 6:46**

ΠΟΙΩΝ ΔΕ ΤΟ ΘΕΛΗΜΑ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ (*Strom.* 2.19.1)

ΤΙ ΜΕ ΛΕΓΕΤΕ ΚΥΡΙΕ ΚΑΙ ΟΥ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ ΤΟ ΘΕΛΗΜΑ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΜΟΥ; (*Strom.* 7.104.4)<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> This adaptation appears to be a conflation of Luke 6:46 with part of the distinctly Matthaean ending from the similar passage in Matt 7:21.

**Matt 7:21, 22; 25:11; Luke 6:46**

ΕΚ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ ΚΑΙ ΦΟΒΟΥ ΠΡΟΚΟΨΑΣ ΕΙΣ ΓΝΩΣΙΝ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ ΟΙΔΕΝ ΕΙΠΕΙΝ  
ΚΥΡΙΕ ΚΥΡΙΕ (*Ecl.* 19.1)

**Matt 8:12; 22:13; 25:30**

ΨΕΥΔΩΝΥΜΟΥ ΓΝΩΣΕΩΣ ΠΡΟΣΗΓΟΡΙΑ ΤΗΝ ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΕΞΩΤΕΡΟΝ ΣΚΟΤΟΣ  
ΟΔΟΙΠΟΡΙΑΝ ΕΠΑΝΗΡΗΜΕΝΟΙ (*Strom.* 3.109.2)

**Matt 8:20; Luke 9:58**

Η ΣΩΤΗΡΙΟΣ ΕΚΕΙΝΗ ΦΩΝΗ: ΑΙ ΑΛΩΠΕΚΕΣ ΦΩΛΕΟΥΣ ΕΧΟΥΣΙΝ, Ο ΔΕ ΥΙΟΣ ΤΟΥ  
ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ ΟΥΚ ΕΧΕΙ ΠΟΥ ΤΗΝ ΚΕΦΑΛΗΝ ΚΛΙΝΗ (*Strom.* 1.23.2)

ΑΙ ΑΛΩΠΕΚΕΣ ΑΡΑ ΦΩΛΕΟΥΣ ΕΧΟΥΣΙ (*Strom.* 4.31.2)

ΠΕΤΕΙΝΑ ΓΑΡ ΟΥΡΑΝΟΥ ΤΟΥΣ ΟΥΡΑΝΩ ΤΩΝ ΑΛΛΩΝ ΟΡΝΕΩΝ  
ΔΙΑΚΕΚΡΙΜΕΝΟΥΣ (*Strom.* 4.31.4)

**Matt 8:22; Luke 9:60**

ΚΑΝ ΣΥΓΓΧΡΗΣΩΝΤΑΙ ΤΗ ΤΟΥ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ ΦΩΝΗ ΛΕΓΟΝΤΕΣ ΤΩ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΩ: ΑΦΕΣ  
ΤΟΥΣ ΝΕΚΡΟΥΣ ΘΑΨΑΙ ΤΟΥΣ ΕΑΥΤΩΝ ΝΕΚΡΟΥΣ, ΣΥ ΔΕ ΑΚΟΛΟΥΘΕΙ ΜΟΙ  
(*Strom.* 3.25.3)<sup>16</sup>

ΝΕΚΡΟΙ ΓΑΡ ΤΟΥΣ ΕΑΥΤΩΝ ΘΑΠΤΟΥΣΙ ΝΕΚΡΟΥΣ (*Strom.* 4.155.4)

ΟΙ ΝΕΚΡΟΙ ΤΟΥΣ ΝΕΚΡΟΥΣ ΘΑΠΤΕΤΩΣΑΝ, ΣΥ ΔΕ ΜΟΙ ΑΚΟΛΟΥΘΕΙ (*Quis div.* 23.2)

**Matt 9:2, 5; Mark 2:5, 9; Luke 5:20, 23; 7:48**

ΑΦΕΩΝΤΑΙ ΣΟΙ ΑΙ ΑΜΑΡΤΙΑΙ (*Paed.* 1.6.4)

---

<sup>16</sup> While it is impossible to know whether this passage refers to Matt 8:22 or Luke 9:60, it is more interesting to note that Philip is not connected to either Gospel story. Ferguson suggests the reference to Philip may be an indication that Clement took this story from a lost Gospel (see Ferguson, *Introduction to Stromateis*, 271 n. 86). Attributing the story to a lost Gospel seems unlikely, since the context, which deals with the misuse of the words of Jesus and the apostles by “heretics” (3.25.1), provides no indication that Clement is referring to another Gospel text. Moreover, in an attempt to undermine the false teachings of other Christians, Clement specifically mentions that their teachings were based on an apocryphal work (3.29.1). Since Clement makes no such charge here, it seems more likely that his reference to Philip is evidence of an otherwise unknown Christian tradition connected to the story.

**Matt 9:6; Mark 2:11; Luke 5:24**

ο σωτηρ αναστα, φησι τω παρειμενω, τον σκιμποδα εφ ον  
κατακεισαι λαβων απιθι οικαδε (*Paed.* 1.6.3)

**Matt 9:13; 12:7; Hosea 6:6**

ως οι προφηται λεγουσιν: ελεον γαρ φησι θελω και ου θυσιαν  
(*Strom.* 4.38.1)

διο και κεκραγεν: ελεον θελω και ου θυσιαν (*Quis div.* 39.4)<sup>17</sup>

**Matt 9:22; Mark 5:34; Luke 8:48<sup>18</sup>**

εφ ην ο κυριος απελυε λεγων: απελθε εις ειρηνην (*Strom.* 4.161.2)

**Matt. 9:22; Mark 5:34; 10:52; Luke 7:50; 8:48; 17:19; 18:42**

η πιστις σου σεσωκεν σε (*Strom.* 5.2.5)

η πιστις σου σεσωκεν σε (*Strom.* 6.44.4)

η πιστις σου σεσωκεν σε (*Strom.* 6.108.4)

**Matt 9:37; Luke 10:2**

ο μεν θερισμος πολυς, οι δε εργαται βραχεις τω οντι (*Strom.* 1.7.1)

**Matt 10:22; 24:13; Mark 13:13**

η των εις τελος υπομειναντων μαρτυρια (*Paed.* 1.22.2)

ο δε<sup>19</sup> υπομεινας εις τελος, ουτος σωθησεται (*Strom.* 4.74.1)

ο υπομεινας εις τελος, ουτος σωθησεται (*Quis div.* 32.6)

---

<sup>17</sup> This reference is most likely taken from Hos 6:6, since it is the beginning of a chain of other Old Testament passages.

<sup>18</sup> The ninth-century MS 1424 indicates πορευου εις ειρηνην was also associated with the manuscript tradition of Matthew.

<sup>19</sup> While the presence of the conjunction δε corresponds to the distinct form of the text in Mark 13:13, the identical reference in *Quis div.* 32.6 without the conjunction makes it impossible to know for certain whether the conjunction here was intentional.

**Matt 10:26; Mark 4:22; Luke 8:17; 12:2**

καν τις λεγει γεγραφθαι, ουδεν κρυπτον ο ου φανερωθησεται, ουδε  
κεκαλυμμενον ο ουκ αποκαλυφθησεται (*Strom.* 1.13.3)

**Matt 10:27; Luke 12:3**

διδαξας μεν αξιολογως επι των δωματων (*Strom.* 6.115.1)

**Matt 10:28; Luke 12:5**

φοβηθητε γουν λεγει τον μετα θανατον δυναμενον και ψυχην και  
σωμα εις γεενναν βαλειν (*Exc.* 14.3)<sup>20</sup>

**Matt 10:30; Luke 12:7**

αλλα και αι τριχες της κεφαλης υμων πασαι ηριθμημεναι, φησιν ο  
κυριος (*Paed.* 3.19.4)

αλλ αι μεν τριχες ηριθμηνται (*Strom.* 6.153.2)

**Matt 10:39; Mark 8:35; Luke 9:24**

ο απολεσας την ψυχην την εαυτου, φησιν ο κυριος, σωσει αυτην  
(*Strom.* 2.108.3)

**Matt 10:40; Luke 10:16**

ο υμας δεχομενος εμε δεχεται, ο υμας μη δεχομενος εμε αθετει (*Quis div.* 30.6)

**Matt 11:3; Luke 7:20**

ει αυτος ει ο Χριστος, η αλλον περιμενομεν + (*Paed.* 1.90.2)

**Matt 11:4–5; Luke 7:22**

+ απελθετε και ειπατε Ιωαννη: τυφλοι αναβλεπουσιν, χωφοι  
ακουουσιν, λεπροι καθαριζονται, ανιστανται νεκροι. + (*Paed.* 1.90.2)

**Matt 11:6; Luke 7:23**

+ και μακαριος εστιν ος εαν μη σκανδαλισθη εν εμοι (*Paed.* 1.90.2)

---

<sup>20</sup> This adaptation appears to be a conflation of Matt 10:32 with Luke 12:38. The primary text seems to be from Matthew, since the only distinctive Lukan element is the presence of βαλειν at the end.

**Matt 11:11; Luke 7:28**

κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ τοῦ μεγίστου ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν Ἰωάννου τὸν  
ἐλαχιστὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν ... εἶναι μείζω λέγει  
(*Quis div.* 31.3)<sup>21</sup>

**Matt 11:12; Luke 16:16**

καὶ βίαστων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (*Strom.* 4.5.3)

ὅτι μάλιστα βίαστων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία (*Strom.* 6.149.5)

**Matt 11:15; 13:9, 43; Mark 4:9, 23; Luke 8:8; 14:35**

ὁ ἔχων ὠτὰ ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω (*Strom.* 2.24.4)

ὁ ἔχων ὠτὰ ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω (*Strom.* 5.2.1)

ὁ ἔχων ὠτὰ ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω (*Strom.* 5.115.3)

ὁ ἔχων ὠτὰ ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω (*Strom.* 6.115.6)

**Matt 11:16–17; Luke 7:32**

ἐν ἀγοραῖς καθημενοὶς καὶ λεγουσιν, ἠυλῆσαμεν ὑμῖν καὶ οὐκ  
ὠρῆσασθε, ἐθρῆνησαμεν καὶ οὐκ ἐκοψασθε (*Paed.* 1.13.3)

**Matt 11:27; Luke 10:22<sup>22</sup>**

θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἐγνώ, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὁ ὢν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ (*Protr.* 10.3)

θεὸν γὰρ οὐδεὶς ἐγνώ, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὁ ὢν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ (*Paed.* 1.20.2)

οὐδεὶς ἐγνώ τὸν πατέρα (*Paed.* 1.74.1)

<sup>21</sup> It is impossible to determine the precise source of this reference. While the order of ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν Ἰωάννου more closely resembles the Lukan manuscript tradition, the presence of the phrase βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν instead of βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ is more typical of Matt 11:11.

<sup>22</sup> In this study of Athanasius's text of the Gospels, Brogan suggests that the Alexandrian fathers might have had a common paraphrase of this verse. On the basis of Mees's work, Brogan notes that the verse is cited in exactly the same form by Clement (*Strom.* 7.109.4 [which Brogan, following Mees, incorrectly cites as 7.100.4]; *Quis div.* 8.1) and Athanasius (*C. Ar.* 1.12, 39; 2.22 [2]): οὐδεὶς γὰρ γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὁ ὢν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ. Brogan's suggestion seems to have been correct, since Raquel's analysis of the Synoptic Gospels in the writings of Origen reveals that Origen also cites the verse in exactly the same form in *Cels.* 6.17; *Comm. Jo.* 1.278 and 32.359.

οτι δι υιου ο πατηρ γνωριζεται (*Strom.* 5.12.2)

και μονος ο παντοκρατωρ ον ουδεις εγνω ει μη ο υιος και ω εαν ο υιος αποκαλυψη (*Strom.* 7.58.4)

μηδεις, φησιν ο κυριος, τον πατερα εγνω, ει μη ο υιος και ω αν ο υιος αποκαλυψη (*Strom.* 5.84.3)

ουδεις γαρ, φησι, γινωσκει τον πατερα ει μη ο υιος και ω αν ο υιος αποκαλυψη (*Strom.* 7.109.4)

ου ουδεις επιγινωσκει ει μη ο υιος και ω αν ο υιος αποκαλυψη (*Quis div.* 8.1)

**Matt 12:8; Mark 2:28; Luke 6:5**

τω κυριω του σαββατου (*Strom.* 3.40.4)

η κυριευουσα του σαββατου (*Strom.* 4.29.3)

**Matt 12:39; 16:4**

ο σωτηρ τους Ιουδαιους γενεαν ειπων πονηραν και μοιχαλιδα διδασκει (*Strom.* 3.90.2)

**Matt 12:44–45; Luke 11:24–26**

επανεισι γαρ εις τον κεκαθαρμενον οικον και κενον, εαν μηδεν των σωτηριων εμβληθη, το προενοικησαν ακαθαρτον πνευμα, συμπαραλαμβανον αλλα επτα ακαθαρτα πνευματα (*Ecl.* 12.8)

**Matt 13:7; Mark 4:7; Luke 8:7** (cf. Matt 13:22, Mark 4:18–19, Luke 8:14)

και μη τι ταυτας εν τη παραβολη του τετραμερους σπορου ηνιξατο τας μεριμνας, το σπερμα του λογου φησας το εις ακανθας και φραγμους πεσον συμπνιγηναι υπ αυτων και μη καρποφορησαι δυνηθηναι (*Strom.* 4.31.5)

ει δε εκ τινος ποιησεως τα της αληθειας οτωδηποτε τροπω λαβοντες σπερματα ουκ εξεθρεψαν τινες, γη δε αγονω και ανομβρια παραδεδοκοτες αγριαις συνεπνιξαντο βοταναις (*Strom.* 6.59.2)

**Matt 13:8; Mark 4:8**

ταυτας εκλεκτας ουσας τας τρεις μονας οι εν τω ευαγγελιω αριθμοι αινισσονται, ο τριακοντα και ο εξηκοντα και ο εκατον (*Strom.* 6.114.3)



**Matt 13:11; Mark 4:11**

υμιν δεδοται γνῶναι το μυστηριον της βασιλειας του ουρανων  
(*Strom.* 5.80.6)<sup>23</sup>

**Matt 13:12; 25:29; Mark 4:25; Luke 8:18; 19:26**

φησι ... τῳ εχοντι δε προστεθισεται (*Strom.* 1.14.1)<sup>24</sup>  
ειρηται γαρ τῳ εχοντι προστεθισεται (*Strom.* 7.55.7)

**Matt 13:16–17; Luke 10:23–24**

και υμεις μακαριοι οι ορωντες και ακουοντες α μητε δικαιοι μητε  
προφηται, εαν ποιητε α λεγω (*Quis div.* 29.6)

**Matt 13:22; Mark 4:19; Luke 8:14**

τας μεριμνας τας ακανθας του βιου, αι το σπερμα της ζωης  
συμπνιγουσιν (*Quis div.* 11.2)

**Matt 13:31; 17:20; Mark 4:31; Luke 13:19; 17:6**

κοκκῳ ναπυος (*Paed.* 1.96.1)

κοκκον σιναπεως (*Strom.* 5.3.1)

κοκκον σιναπεως (*Exc.* 1.3)

**Matt 14:13–21; Mark 6:32–44; Luke 9:10–17; John 6:1–15**

ο κυριος το τληθος εκινο των επι της ποας κατακλιθεντων  
καταντικρυ της Τιβεριαδος τοις ιχθυσι τοις δοσι και τοις ε τοις  
κριθινοις διεθρεψεν αρτοις (*Strom.* 6.94.2)<sup>25</sup>

ταυτη τοι μυστικωτατα πεντε αρτοι προς του σωτηρος κατακλωνται  
και πληθυνουσι τῳ οχλῳ των ακρωμενων (*Strom.* 5.33.4)

---

<sup>23</sup> This reference appears to be a conflation of Matt 13:11 and Mark 4:11. The primary text appears to be from Matthew, since it contains the distinctly Matthean phrase της βασιλειας του ουρανων. The distinctly Markan singular noun μυστηριον, however, has replaced the plural form of the noun found in the manuscript tradition of Matthew.

<sup>24</sup> While these two references might appear to offer support for the variant reading of προστεθισεται in Mark 4:25, the brief nature of these short allusions do not provide a reliable enough indication whether Clement is using a common paraphrase or referring specifically to Mark.

<sup>25</sup> This reference is best seen as a conflation between John and the Synoptics, since it combines the reference to Tiberias and the “barley” (κριθινους) bread from John with the word used in the Synoptics for the fish (ιχθυς).

**Matt 14:19; 15:36; John 6:11; 21:9**

ην μοι δοκει και ο κυριος αινιξασθαι τους αρτους ευλογησας και τους ιχθυας τους οππους, οis κατευωχησε τους μαθητας (*Paed.* 2.13.2)

**Matt 15:2, 9; Mark 7:7** (cf. Isa 29:13)

παραδοσει δε τη των πρεσβυτερων και ενταλμασιν ανθρωπων κατηκολουθηκοτας (*Strom.* 3.90.2)

+ ... ματην δε σεβονται με διδασκοντες διδασκαλιας ενταλματα ανθρωπων (*Paed.* 1.76.4)<sup>26</sup>

**Matt 15:8; Mark 7:6** (cf. Isa 29:13)

ο λαος ουτος τοis χειλεσι φιλουσι<sup>27</sup> με η δε καρδια αυτων πορρωτερω εστιν απ εμου (*Paed.* 2.62.5)<sup>28</sup>

ο νουθετει δε και δια Ησαιου ... ο λαος ουτος τοis χειλεσιν αυτων τιμωσι με, η δε καρδια αυτων πορρω εστιν απ εμου ... + (*Paed.* 1.76.4)<sup>29</sup>

λεγει και ο λαος ουτος τοis χειλεσι με τιμα φησιν, η δε καρδια αυτων πορρω εστιν απ εμου (*Strom.* 2.61.3)

ο γαρ λαος ο ετερος τοis χειλεσι τιμα, η δε καρδια αυτου πορρω απεστιν απο κυριου (*Strom.* 4.32.4)

ο μεν γαρ τοis χειλεσιν αγαπων λαος, την δε καρδιαν μακραν εχων απο του κυριου αλλος εστιν (*Strom.* 4.43.3)

ο λαος ο τοis χειλεσιν αγαπων (*Strom.* 4.112.1)

<sup>26</sup> The context indicates Clement is citing from Isaiah.

<sup>27</sup> Marcovich diverts from the text of P by replacing φιλουσι with τιμωσι in light of the LXX and other passages from Clement.

<sup>28</sup> It is likely that the first four references below are taken from the LXX, since both passages occur within a string of citations or allusions to the Old Testament.

<sup>29</sup> The presence of εστιν in these first three references is identical with the text of Codex Bezae in Matt 15:8. It is unlikely, however, that these represent genuine variants connected to his text of Matthew, since the quotation is here connected to Isaiah, and the others occur within other references to the Old Testament.

**Matt 15:11, 18**

τά γὰρ ἐξίοντα, φησιν, ἐκ τοῦ στόματος κοινοὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον (*Paed.* 2.49.1)

**Matt 15:14; Luke 6:39**

ὁδηγὸς δὲ ἀριστὸς οὐχὶ ὁ τυφλὸς, καθὰ φησιν ἡ γραφή, τυφλοὺς εἰς  
τὸ βαράθρον χειραγωγῶν (*Paed.* 1.9.2)

**Matt 16:24; Mark 8:34; Luke 9:23**

οὗτος τὸν σταυρὸν τοῦ σωτήρος περιφέρων ἐπεται κυρίῳ (*Strom.* 2.104.3)<sup>30</sup>

**Matt 16:26; Mark 8:36; Luke 9:25**

τί γὰρ ὠφέλος, εἰάν τὸν κόσμον κερδήσῃς, φησί, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν  
ἀπολέσῃς (*Strom.* 6.112.3)

**Matt 16:28; Luke 9:27**

εἰσὶ τινες τῶν ὧδε ἐστηκοτῶν, οἱ οὐ μὴ γευσθῶσι θανάτου, ἕως ἂν  
ιδῶσι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν δόξῃ (*Exc.* 4.3)

**Matt 17:1–2; Mark 9:2–3; Luke 9:28–29**

καὶ ὅτε ἐν δόξῃ ὤφθη τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους, οὐ δι' ἑαυτὸν  
ἐποίησεν, δείκνυς ἑαυτὸν (*Exc.* 4.1)

ταυτὴ τοι ὁ κύριος τέταρτος ἀνάβας εἰς τὸ ὄρος ἔκτος γίνεται καὶ  
φῶτι περιλαμβάνεται πνευματικῶ (*Strom.* 6.140.3)

**Matt 17:5; Mark 9:7; Luke 9:35**

διαρρηδὴν παραγγείλας ἡμῖν: οὗτος ἐστὶ μου ὁ υἱός<sup>31</sup> ὁ ἀγαπητός,  
αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε (*Paed.* 1.97.2)

δι' ἐβδόμης ἀνακηρυσσόμενος τῆς φωνῆς υἱὸς εἶναι θεοῦ (*Strom.* 6.140.3)

αὐτὸς γοῦν ὁ ἠγαπημένος (*Paed.* 1.43.3)<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Ferguson notes that Clement might also be referring to Simon of Cyrene in this passage (*Introduction to Stromateis*, 226 n. 410).

<sup>31</sup> Whereas Stählin follows here the reading of P and M, Marcovich follows F and reads ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς μου. This is another example of Marcovich's tendency either to emend the text or to choose the reading that brings it into harmony with the New Testament.

<sup>32</sup> It is uncertain whether this is a reference to Jesus' transfiguration or his baptism in Matt 3:17; Mark 1:11; or Luke 3:22.

**Matt 17:19; 21:21; Luke 17:6; Mark 11:23**

οποιοι ησαν οι αποστολοι, εφ ων την πιστιν ορη μετατιθεναι και  
δενδρα μεταφυτευειν δυνασθαι ειρηται (*Strom.* 5.2.6)

**Matt 17:20; Luke 17:6**

οθεν αισθομενοι του μεγαλειου της δυναμεως ηξιουν προστιθεναι  
αυτοις πιστιν την ως κοκκον σιναπεως (*Strom.* 5.3.1)

**Matt 18:1; Mark 9:34; Luke 9:46**

γενομενης ζητησεως εν τοις αποστολοις οστις αυτων ειη μειζων, +  
(*Paed.* 1.16.1)

**Matt 18:2; Mark 9:36; Luke 9:47**

+ εστησεν ο Ιησους εν μεσω παιδιον (*Paed.* 1.16.1)

**Matt 18:6–7; Mark 9:42; Luke 17:2** (cf. 1 Clem. 46:8;<sup>33</sup> Matt 26:24–25; Mark 14:21; Luke 22:22)

ουαι τω ανθρωπω εκεινω, φησιν ο κυριος: καλον ην αυτω ει μη  
εγεννηθη, η ενα των εκλεκτων μου σκανδαλισαι: κρειττον ην  
αυτω περιτεθηναι μυλον και καταποντισθηναι εις θαλασσαν, η  
ενα των εκλεκτων μου διαστρεψαι (*Strom.* 3.107.2)

**Matt 18:9; Mark 9:47** (see Matt 5:29–30)**Matt 18:16; Deut 19:15**

παν ρημα ισταται επι δυο και τριων μαρτυρων (*Ecl.* 13.1)

**Matt 19:6; Mark 10:9**

και μη πειρασθαι διαλυειν ο συνεζευξεν ο θεος (*Strom.* 3.46.4)

αυτος δε ουτος ο κυριος λεγει: ο ο θεος συνεζευξεν, ανθρωπος μη  
χωριζετω (*Strom.* 3.49.4)

ου γαρ αν ο συνεζευξεν ο θεος, διαλυσειεν ποτε ανθρωπος (*Strom.*  
3.83.4)

**Matt 19:8; Mark 10:5**

προς την σκληροκαρδιαν υμων (φησιν) ο Μωυσης ταυτα εγραψεν  
(*Strom.* 3.47.2)<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Clement's citation is taken from 1 Clem. 46:8, which is quoting Jesus' saying from Matt 18:6–7; Mark 9:42; Luke 17:2.

**Matt 19:9; 5:32; Mark 10:11**

αντικρυς νομοθετει: ουκ απολυσεις γυναικα πλην ει μη επι λογω  
πορνειας μοιχειαν (*Strom.* 2.145.3)

ο δε απολελυμενην λαμβανων γυναικα μοιχεται, φησιν, εαν γαρ τις  
απολυση<sup>35</sup> γυναικα, μοιχεται αυτην τουτεστιν αναγκαζει  
μοιχευθηναι (*Strom.* 2.146.2)

ωστε ο απολυων την γυναικα χωρις λογου πορνειας ποιει αυτην  
μοιχευθηναι (*Strom.* 3.47.2)<sup>36</sup>

**Matt 19:17; Mark 10:18; Luke 18:19**

λεγει, ουδεις αγαθος, ει μη ο πατηρ μου ο εν τοις ουρανοις (*Paed.* 1.72.2)

ουδεις αγαθος, ει μη ο πατηρ αυτου (*Paed.* 1.74.1)

οτι εις αγαθος, ο πατηρ (*Strom.* 5.63.8) [All]

**Matt 19:19; Rom 13:9; Gal 5:14; James 2:8; Lev 19:18**

αγαπησεις τον πλησιον σου ως σεαυτον (*Protr.* 108.5)<sup>37</sup>

**Matt 19:20; Mark 10:20; Luke 18:21**

πασας τας εντολας εκ νεοτητος τητηρηκεναι (*Strom.* 3.55.2)

δε ο πασας πεπτοιηκως εκ νεοτητος τας νομιμους εντολας (*Quis div.* 8.2)<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> It is impossible to determine if this is a reference to Matt 19:8 or Mark 10:5. While it occurs in connection with Matt 19:3–5, the use of the verb *εγραψεν* and its location between Matt 19:3 and 4 make it similar to the parallel account in Mark. On the other hand, it is also similar to the text of Codex Bezae in Matthew, which reads *προς την σκληροκαρδιαν υμων επετρεψεν υμιν Μωυσης*. In any case, the fact that Clement cites only a small portion of Matt 19:3–9 makes it impossible to attribute any genetic significance to this passage.

<sup>35</sup> It is impossible to know with certainty whether *απολυση* indicates Clement's knowledge of the aorist subjunctive in some manuscripts of Matt 5:32, a harmonization with Matt 19:9 or Mark 10:11, or simply derives from his loose reference.

<sup>36</sup> This could be a quotation from Matt 5:32, since it contains the phrase *ο απολυων την γυναικα*. However, since this reference occurs in connection with other passages from Matt 19, it may also represent a conflation of the two verses or a syntactical adaptation. In any case, it is impossible to know with any certainty what passage Clement may have had in mind.

<sup>37</sup> It is impossible to determine if this is a quotation from Lev 19:18 or Matt 19:19, because Clement cites it immediately after several other Old Testament texts and then quotes two sayings from Jesus after it.

αμελει ο παντα τα του νομου πληρωσας εκ νεοτητος (*Quis div.* 10.4)

**Matt 19:21; Mark 10:21; Luke 18:22**

ουτος [ο] τα επιγεια καταπωλησας και πτωχοις επιδους τον  
ανωλεθρον εξευρισκει θησαυρον (*Paed.* 3.34.3)

ει θελεις (*Quis div.* 10.3)

δευρο ακολουθει μοι (*Quis div.* 16.1)

ουτως καλως πωλεις τα υπαρχοντα ... τον πνευματικον πλουτον  
αντιλαβων εχois αν ηδη θησαυρον εν ουρανοις (*Quis div.* 19.6)<sup>39</sup>

**Matt 19:23; Mark 10:24; Luke 18:23**

δια τουτο τοι ο λογος τους τελωνας λεγει δυσκολως σωθησεσθαι  
(*Strom.* 5.28.3)

**Matt 19:23, 24; Mark 10: 23, 24, 25; Luke 18:24, 25**

δια τουτο σπανιαιτατα την βασιλειαν του θεου κληρονομει (*Paed.* 3.37.3)

περι ον οφθαλμιωντες οι πολλοι ουκ αν ποτε εις την βασιλειαν  
παρεισελθοιεν των ουρανων (*Paed.* 2.38.5)

**Matt 19:24; Mark 10:25; Luke 18:25** (cf. textual variants)

τη γραφη λεγουση θαττον, καμηλον δια τρυπηματος βελονης  
διελευσεσθαι η πλουσιον φιλοσοφειν (*Strom.* 2.22.3)

του κυριου φωνης, οτι ραον καμηλος δια τρηματος ραφιδος  
διεκδυσεται η πλουσιος εις την βασιλειαν των ουρανων (*Quis div.* 2.2)

θαττον καμηλος δια βελονης εισελευσεται η ο τοιουτος πλουσιος επι  
την βασιλειαν του θεου παρελευσεται (*Quis div.* 26.7)

**Matt 19:25; Mark 10:26; Luke 18:26**

τι ουν φοβηθεντες λεγουσι, τις δυναται σωθηναι; (*Quis div.* 20.4)

<sup>38</sup> In this and the following reference, the phrase εκ νεοτητος is found in several of the variant readings for Matthew.

<sup>39</sup> The variants in the manuscript tradition of Matt 19:21 and Mark 10:21 make it impossible to identify Clement's source with certainty.

**Matt 19:26; Mark 10:27; Luke 18:27**

το αδυνατον εν ανθρωποις δυνατον γινεται (*Quis div.* 2.2)

ο δε κυριος αποκρινεται διοτι το εν ανθρωποις αδυνατον δυνατον θεω (*Quis div.* 21.1)

**Matt 19:27; Mark 10:28; Luke 18:28**

ιδε ημεις αφηκαμεν παντα και ηκολουθησαμεν σοι (*Quis div.* 21.5)

**Matt 19:29; Mark 10:29**

αυτικα ο κυριος εν τω ευαγγελιω φησιν: ος αν καταλειψη πατερα η μητερα η αδελφους και τα εξης ενεκεν του ευαγγελιου και του ονοματος μου, μακαριος ουτοσι (*Strom.* 4.15.4)

**Matt 19:30; Mark 10:31**

εσονται οι πρωτοι εσχατοι και οι εσχατοι πρωτοι (*Quis div.* 26.1)

**Matt 20:22–23; Mark 10:38–39** (cf. Matt 26:39; Mark 14:36; Luke 22:42; John 18:11)

του ιδιου παθους ποτηριον κεκληκεν (*Paed.* 1.46.1)

επιεν το ποτηριον (*Strom.* 4.75.1)

το ποτηριον πιωσιν (*Strom.* 4.75.2)

**Matt 20:28; Mark 10:45**

ουκ ηλθον, φησι, διακονηθηναι, αλλα διακονησαι. δια τουτο εισαγεται εν τω ευαγγελιω κεκηκηκεν, ο καμνων υπερ ημων και δουναι την ψυχην την εαυτου λυτρον αντι πολλων (*Paed.* 1.85.1)

και λυτρον εαυτον επιδιδους (*Quis div.* 37.4)

**Matt 21:8–9; John 12:13**

δρεψαμενοι, φησι, κλαδους ελαιας η φοινικων οι παιδες εξηλθον εις υπαντησιν κυριω και εκεκραγον λεγοντες, ωσαννα τω υιω Δαβιδ, ευλογημενος ο ερχομενος εν ονοματι κυριου (*Paed.* 1.12.5)

**Matt 21:12–13; Mark 11:15–17; Luke 19:45–46; John 2:14–16**

της πατρωας εξεβαλεν αυλης ο κυριος, μη βουλομενος αδικου εμποριας η λογων η των εξ υλης κτηματων οικον ειναι τον οικον του θεου τον αγιον (*Paed.* 3.79.2)

**Matt 21:22; Mark 11:24**

παρεστι μεν γαρ αυτω αιτεισθαι και λαμβανειν ων αν δεηται παρα του πατρος των ολων (*Paed.* 3.40.2)

παν ο αν [ο] αιτηση ο γνωστικος λαμβανει (*Strom.* 7.41.4)

**Matt 22:20; Mark 12:16**

τινος η εικων και η επιγραφη; + (*Exc.* 86.1)

**Matt 22:21; Mark 12:17; Luke 20:25**

τα Καισαρος αποδους τω Καισαρι φυλαξη τα του θεου τω θεω (*Paed.* 2.14.1)

αποδοτε τα Καισαρος Καισαρι και τα του θεου τω θεω (*Paed.* 3.91.3)

τα του θεου τω θεω (*Ecl.* 24.2)

+ Καισαρος (*Exc.* 86.1)

**Matt 22:30; Mark 12:25; Luke 20:35**

μετα την αναστασιν, φησι, ουτε γαμουσιν ουτε γαμιζονται (*Strom.* 3.47.3)

οι υιοι του αιωνος εκεινου ουτε γαμουσιν ουτε γαμιζονται (*Strom.* 3.87.1)

μητε γαμωσι μητε γαμισκωνται (*Strom.* 6.100.3)

ουτε γαμουσιν ουτε γαμισκονται επι (*Strom.* 6.140.1)

**Matt 22:32; Mark 12:27; Luke 20:38; Acts 10:42; Rom 14:9**

ζωντων και νεκρων (*Quis div.* 42.20)

**Matt. 22:37, 39; Mark 12:30–31; Luke 10:27; Deut 6:5; Lev 19:18**

αγαπησεις κυριον τον θεον σου (*Protr.* 108.5)

αγαπησεις κυριον τον θεον σου (*Paed.* 1.59.2)

καν αγαπησης κυριον τον θεον σου και τον πλησιον σου (*Paed.* 2.6.1)

αγαπησεις κυριον τον θεον σου, επειτα τον πλησιον σου (*Paed.* 2.43.1)

ως φησιν ο κυριος, αγαπησεις τον θεον σου εν ολη καρδια σου και εν ολη τη ψυχη σου και εν ολη τη ισχυι σου και τον πλησιον σου ως σεαυτον (*Paed.* 3.88.1) [Ad]



αγαπήσεις κυριον τον θεον σου εξ ολης καρδιας και τον πλησιον σου  
ως σεαυτον: (*Strom.* 2.71.1)

αγαπας τον θεον και τον πλησιον σου (*Paed.* 3.78.1)

θεον αγαπωντες και τον πλησιον (*Paed.* 3.81.2)

αγαπήσεις κυριον τον θεον σου φησιν εξ ολης καρδιας σου και  
αγαπήσεις τον πλησιον σου ως σεαυτον (*Strom.* 4.10.3)

αυτη εστιν η αγαπη το αγαπαν τον θεον και τον πλησιον (*Strom.* 4.111.2)

αυτω δε τω αγαπαν τον πατερα εις οικειαν ισχυν και δυναμιν  
αφθαρσιαν κομιζομενους (*Quis div.* 27.5)

δευτεραν δε ταξει ... λεγει το: αγαπήσεις τον πλησιον σου ως  
σεαυτον (*Quis div.* 28.1)

**Matt 23:4; Luke 11:46**

τα δυσβαστακτα φορτια (*Strom.* 6.44.3)

**Matt 23:12; Luke 14:11; 18:14**

ο ταπεινων εαυτον υψωθησεται, και ο υψων εαυτον ταπεινωθησεται  
(*Paed.* 3.92.1)

πας ο ταπεινων εαυτον υψωθησεται (*Strom.* 2.132.1)

τω γαρ υψουμενω και μεγαλυνουμενω παραπεπηγεν αντιστροφος η  
προς το ταπεινον μεταβολη και πτωσις, ως ο θειος διδασκει  
λογος (*Quis div.* 1.3)

**Matt 23:13; Luke 11:52**

ουτε αυτοι εισιασιν εις την βασιλειαν των ουρανων ουτε ους  
εξηπατησαν εωσιν τυγχανειν της αληθειας (*Strom.* 7.106.1)

**Matt 23:37; Luke 13:34**

Ιερουσαλημ Ιερουσαλημ, η αποκτεινουσα τους προφητας και  
λιθοβολουσα τους απεσταλμενους προς αυτην (*Paed.* 1.79.2)

Ιερουσαλημ Ιερουσαλημ, ποσακις ηθελησα επισυναγαγειν τα τεκνα  
σου ως ορνις τους νεοσσους (*Strom.* 1.29.4)

**Matt 23:38; Luke 13:35**

αφιεῖται ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἐρημος + (*Paed.* 1.79.3)

**Matt 23:39; Luke 13:35**

+ λέγω γὰρ<sup>40</sup> ὑμῖν, ἀπαρτί οὐ μὴ ἴδητέ με, ἕως ἂν εἰπῇτε, εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου (*Paed.* 1.79.3)

**Matt 24:19; Mark 13:17; Luke 21:23**

οὐαὶ δὲ ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσαις καὶ ταῖς θηλαζούσαις ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις (*Strom.* 3.49.6)

**Matt 24:24; Mark 13:22**

διο φησί, καὶ εἰ δυνατόν, τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς μου (*Exc.* 9.1)

**Matt 24:37–39; Luke 17:26–30**

ὥσπερ δὲ ἦν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Νεώ, ἦσαν γαμούντες γαμιζόντες, οἰκοδομούντες, φυτευόντες, καὶ ὥς ἦν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Λωτ, οὕτως ἔσται ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (*Strom.* 3.49.4)

**Matt 24:42; 25:13; 26:38, 41; Mark 13:35, 37; 14:34, 38**

διὰ τοῦτο τοὶ καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐγρηγορεῖν παραγγέλλει (*Strom.* 4.139.4)

ὁ αὐτὸς σῶτηρ παρεγγυα: γρηγορεῖτε (*Strom.* 5.106.1)

**Matt 24:45; 25:21**

οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ δούλος ὁ πιστός, ὁ πρὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἐπαινούμενος. ἔπαν δὲ εἰπῇ πιστὸς δούλος (*Strom.* 2.27.3)

**Matt 25:21, 23**

ὀπιηνικά τοὺς μὲν αὐξήσαντας τὸ ἀργύριον αὐτοῦ τοὺς ἐν ὀλίγῳ πιστοὺς ἀποδεξαμένους καὶ ἐπαγγειλαμένους ἐπὶ πολλῶν καταστήσειν εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου χαρὰν προσεταξέν εἰσελθεῖν (*Strom.* 1.3.1)

**Matt 26:26; Mark 14:22; Luke 22:19**

διὰ τοῦτο οὖν ὁ σῶτηρ ἄρτον λαβὼν πρῶτον ἐλάλησεν καὶ εὐχαρίστησεν: εἶτα κλάσας τὸν ἄρτον προέθηκεν (*Strom.* 1.46.1)

---

<sup>40</sup> Although the presence of the γὰρ is distinct to the Matthaean manuscript tradition, one cannot be certain of Clement's attestation of the conjunction, since it occurs in a loose adaptation of the parallel passages.

**Matt 26:41; Mark 14:38**

το πνευμα προθυμον, η δε σαρξ ασθενης (*Strom.* 4.45.4)

**Matt 26:48; Mark 14:44; Luke 22:48**

και αυτος ουτος ο Ιουδας φιληματι προυδωκε τον διδασκαλον (*Paed.* 2.62.4)

**Matt 27:29; Mark 15:17; John 19:2, 5**

τον κυριον ακανθαις εστεμνον (*Paed.* 2.73.3)

το διαδημα της δικαιοσυνης ... δια της αειθαλους ακανθης (*Paed.* 2.74.1)

ο κυριος μυστικως αυθις αναστεφεται ακανθη (*Paed.* 2.75.2)

**Mark 1:7; Luke 3:16; John 1:27**

Ιωαννης, ουκ αξιος ειναι ομολογων τον ιμαντα των υποδηματων  
λυειν του κυριου (*Paed.* 2.117.4)

ουκ ειμι φησιν αξιος τον ιμαντα του υποδηματος λυσαι κυριου  
(*Strom.* 5.55.1)

**Mark 9:7; Luke 9:35** (cf. textual variants)

ουτος εστιν ο υιος μου<sup>41</sup> ο αγαπητος ακουετε αυτου (*Paed.* 1.97.2)

**Mark 10:17; Luke 10:25; 18:18**

τι ποιησας ζων αιωνιον κληρονομησω (*Paed.* 3.88.2)

**Mark 10:19; Luke 18:20; Luke 10:28**

τας εντολας οιδας απεκρινατο: του δε καταφησαντος τουτο ποιει  
(φησι) και σωθηση (*Paed.* 3.88.2)

**Mark 10:30; Luke 18:30**

εν δε τω ερχομενω ζων εστιν αιωνιος (*Quis div.* 25.8)

**Mark 10:48; Luke 18:38–39**

υιε Δαβιδ, ελεησον με (*Strom.* 6.132.4)

**Mark 12:30; Luke 10:27**

αγαπησεις κυριον τον θεον σου εξ ολης της ψυχης σου και εξ ολης  
της δυναμεως σου (*Quis div.* 27.3)<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Stählin reads ουτος εστι μου ο υιος. Marcovich follows F, not P and M.

**Mark 12:41–44; Luke 21:1–4**

παλιν τε αυ θεασαμενος εις το γαζοφυλακιον τον μεν πλουσιον  
 αναλογως τη κτησει βεβληκοτα, την δε χηραν χαλκους δυο  
 πλειον εφη την χηραν βεβληκεναι παντων: ο μεν γαρ απο του  
 περισσευματος, η δε εκ της υστερησεως συνεισηνεγκεν (*Strom.* 4.35.3)

**Mark 14:36; Rom 8:15; Gal 4:6**

Αββα λεγουσα ο πατηρ (*Protr.* 88.3)

**Luke 15:7, 10**

μεγαλην γαρ χαρα παρα τω πατρι ενος αμαρτωλου σωθεντος, ο  
 κυριος φησι (*Strom.* 2.69.3)

μεγαλην γαρ φησι και ανυπερβλητον ειναι χαρα και εορτην εν  
 ουρανοις τω πατρι και τοις αγγελοις ενος αμαρτωλου  
 επιστρεψαντος και μετανοησαντος (*Quis div.* 39.3)

**Luke 15:23, 30**

ω τον σιτευτον εθυσεν μοσχον (*Exc.* 9.2)

**Luke 19:38; John 12:13** (cf. textual variants)

βασιλευς δε και υπο παιδων απειρω ετι και υπο Ιουδαιων  
 απιστουντων και αγνοουντων αναγορευομενος και προς αυτων  
 προφητων ανακηρυττομενος δεικνυται (*Strom.* 2.21.2)

**John 1:18; 6:46**

λεγει: τον πατερα μου ουδεις εωρακεν ει μη ο υιος (*Exc.* 9.3)

**John 1:26, 29**

ιδου ο αμνος του θεου (*Paed.* 1.24.4)<sup>43</sup>

**John 3:8; 4:24**

ο γαρ θεος πνευμα, οπου θελει πνει (*Exc.* 17.3)

**John 5:26; 17:2**

επιστρεφων τον μαθητην επι τον θεον τον αγαθον και πρωτον και  
 μονον ζωης αιωνιου ταμιαν, ην ο υιος διδωσιν ημιν παρ εκεινου  
 λαβων (*Quis div.* 6.4)

<sup>42</sup> Though Clement introduces this reference with an allusion to the text of Matt 22:36, his citation more closely resembles the form of the text found in the parallel passages of Mark 12:30 and Luke 10:27.

<sup>43</sup> Nothing in the context indicates whether Clement is referring to John 1:29 or 36.

**John 6:32–33, 41; 6:49, 58**

ος εστιν αρτος αληθινος, αρτος ουρανων (*Paed.* 3.40.1)  
 οι μεν ουν τον ουρανιον αρτον φαγοντες απεθανον (*Exc.* 13.2)

**John 6:50–51, 54, 58**

ο δε τον αληθινον αρτον του πνευματος εσθιων ου τεθνηξεται (*Exc.* 13.2)

εγω σου τροφους αρτον εμαυτον διδους, ου γευσασμενος ουδεις επι  
 πειραν θανατου λαμβανει (*Quis div.* 23.4)

**John 8:23; 3:31**

οι κατα τον Ιωαννην ουκ οντες εκ των κατω, παρα δε του ανωθεν  
 ελθοντος το παν μεμαθηκοτες (*Protr.* 59.3)

**John 10:2, 11, 14**

ποιμενα εαυτον προβατων λεγων (*Paed.* 1.84.1)

**John 10:7, 9**

εγω γαρ ειμι η θυρα (φησι που) (*Protr.* 10.2)<sup>44</sup>

**John 10:11, 14**

ταυτη και τον αγαθον ποιμενα ο αγαθος απεστειλεν θεος (*Protr.* 116.1)

κατ εικονα του αγαθου ποιμενος (*Paed.* 1.37.3)

λεγει: εγω ειμι ο ποιμην ο καλος (*Paed.* 1.53.2)

τουτον γαρ μονον ομολογει αγαθον ειναι ποιμενα (*Paed.* 1.85.2)

**John 13:34; 14:27<sup>45</sup>**

καινην ημιν διαθηκην καταλιμπανει: αγαπην υμιν διδωμι την εμην  
 (*Quis div.* 37.4)

**John 14:26; 15:26**

ο τον παρακλητον αποστελλων (*Protr.* 85.3)

**John 17:11, 17**

πατερ αγιε, αγιασον αυτους εν τω ονοματι σου (*Exc.* 9.3)<sup>46</sup>

<sup>44</sup> As an isolated quotation, one cannot know if Clement omits the ending των προβατων after η θυρα in John 10:7 or is merely citing the shortened phrase in 10:9.

<sup>45</sup> Clement appears to have replaced ειρηνην with αγαπην in John 14:27 and then conflated the passage with the reference to the new covenant in John 14:34.

<sup>46</sup> Clement conflates John 17:11, 17 by replacing τηρησον in 17:11 with αγιασον from verse 17.

## APPENDIX 2

### CATENA FRAGMENTS AND LATIN REFERENCES

The following collection of quotations and allusions is from the Greek catenae and Latin references attributed to Clement of Alexandria. Since the reliability of these references are uncertain due to the indirect nature of their textual transmission, they have been separated from the other references to Clement's writings and are not used as part of the analysis of Clement's text of the Gospels. The presentation of the references continues to follow the same threefold classification used previously in the presentation of Clement's text.

**Matt 3:8; Luke 3:8**

qui vero dignos poenitentiae fructus egerint (*Frag.* 69) [Ad]

**Matt 5:8**

hoc enim impossibile est, ut quisque non mundo corde videat deum  
(*Adumbr. Ep. Jud.* 24; *Frag.* 24) [All]

**Matt 5:18**

ταχα δε δια του ιωτα και της κεραιας η δικαιοσυνη κεκραγεν αυτου  
(*Frag.* 58) [All]

ου μη ουν παρελθη απο του νομου ουτε το ιωτα ουτε η κεραια  
(*Frag.* 58) [Ad]

**Matt 6:9; Luke 11:2**

sanctificetur, inquit, nomen tuum (*Adumbr. Ep. 1 Petr.* 3, 15; *Frag.* 24) [C]

**Matt 22:64<sup>1</sup>**

in aliis autem evangeliiis dicit dominus principi sacerdotum interrogatus,  
si ipse esset filius dei, non e contra respondens; sed quid dixit? vos  
dicitis (*Adumbr. Ep. Jud.* 24; *Frag.* 24) [C]

---

<sup>1</sup> Although Clement refers to what Jesus said to the high priest in the "other Gospels" outside of Mark, the actual words attributed to Jesus are closer to Matt 22:64 than to Luke 22:70.

**Mark 1:44; Luke 5:14<sup>2</sup>**

και τον λεπρον εθεραπευσεν και ειπεν: δειξον σεαυτον τοις ιερευσιν  
εις μαρτυριον (*Hyp.* 6.12) [Ad]

δια τουτο ειπεν: απελθε και δειξον σεαυτον τοις ιερευσιν εις  
μαρτυριον (*Hyp.* 6.12) [Ad]

**Matt 13:32; Mark 4:32; Luke 13:19**

ωστε εν τοις κλαδοις αυτης κατασκηνωσαι τα πετεινα του ουρανου  
(*Frag.* 54) [Ad]

**Matt 26:17**

που θελεις ετοιμασωμεν σοι το πασχα φαγειν; (*Pasc.* 28)

**Mark 1:44; Luke 5:14**

και τον λεπρον εθεραπευσεν και ειπεν: δειξον σεαυτον τοις ιερευσιν  
εις μαρτυριον δια τοιαυτην παραδοσιν (*Hyp.* 12) [Ad]

δια τουτο ειπεν: απελθε και δειξον σεαυτον τοις ιερευσιν εις  
μαρτυριον (*Hyp.* 12) [Ad]

**Mark 14:61**

in evangelio vero secundum Marcum interrogatus dominus a principe  
sacerdotum, si ipse esset Christus filius dei benedicti, + (*Adumbr.*  
*Ep. Jud.* 24; *Frag.* 24) [C]

**Mark 14:62**

+ respondens dixit: ego sum, et videbitis filium hominis a dextris  
sedentem virtutis (*Adumbr. Ep. Jud.* 24; *Frag.* 24) [C]

**Luke 3:22**

το πραον της νεας επιφανειας του πνευματος εβουλετο δειξαι τω της  
περιστερας ομοιωματι (*Frag.* 57) [All]

**Luke 10:1**

ενα φησι γεγονεναι των εβδομηκοντα μαθητων, ομωνυμον Πετρω  
τυγχανοντα τω αποστολω (*Hyp.* 4) [All]

**Luke 22:69**

proinde enim cum dicit a dextris dei (*Adumbr. Ep. Jud.* 24; *Frag.* 24) [C]<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> It is impossible to determine whether this is a reference to Mark 1:44 or Luke 5:14, since manuscript D in Mark also places δειξον before σεαυτον.

**John 1:1**

quod semper erat verbum, significatur dicendo in principio erat verbum  
(*Adumbr. 1 John 1, 1; Frag. 24*) [C]

**John 1:3**

in evangelio sic dicit: et quod factum est + (*Adumbr. 1 John 1, 2; Frag. 24*) [C]

**John 1:4**

+ in ipso, vita erat, et vita erat lux hominum (*Adumbr. 1 John 1, 2; Frag. 24*) [C]

**John 2:19**

ο κυριος λυσατε, ειπε, τον ναον τουτον, και εν τρισιν ημεραις εγερω αυτον+ (*Can. ec. 36*) [C]

**John 2:20**

+ ειπον οι Ιουδαιοι, τεσσερακοντα και εξ ετεσιν ο ναος ουτος ωκοδομηθη, και συ τρισιν ημεραις εγερεις αυτον; + (*Can. ec. 36*) [C]

**John 2:21**

+ εκεινος δε ελεγε περι του ναου του σωματος αυτου (*Can ec. 36*) [C]

**John 4:24**

θεος εστιν, ως και ο κυριος λεγει, πνευμα (*Frag. 39*) [C]

**John 16:7**

de quo dominus dixit: nisi ego abiero, ille non veniet (*Adumbr. Ep. 1 Petr. 1, 12; Frag. 24*) [Ad]

**John 18:28**

εωθεν αυτον οι αρχιερεις και οι γραμματεις τω Ριλατω  
προσαγαγοντες ουκ εισηλθον εις το πραιτωριον, ινα μη  
μιανθωσιν, αλλ ακωλυτως εσπερας το πασχα φαγωσι (*Pasc. 28*) [Ad]

---

<sup>3</sup> While Clement has been citing Mark to this point, here he appears to follow the text of Luke.



## APPENDIX 3

### THE GOSPEL TEXT OF CLEMENT'S OPPONENTS

The following collection of quotations and allusions represent the text of the Gospels used by the opponents of Clement. Since it is not always possible to know for certain whether Clement is quoting a text common to him and his opponents or one used solely by his opponents, these references are presented separately from Clement's text and are not used to determine his textual affinities. The decision regarding the origin of these references follows the classification of citations between Clement and Theodotus in the Table analytique des citations found on pages 241–54 in volume 23 of *Sources chrétiennes* 'Extraits de Théodote' as well as the indications presented with Clement's references listed in volume 1 of *Biblia patristica*.

The presentation of these references is limited to quotations, adaptations, and only significant allusions; indeterminable references are not included.

#### **Matt 5:16**

λαμψατω το φως υμων εμπροσθεν των ανθρωπων (*Exc.* 3.1) [C]

λαμψατω το φως υμων (*Exc.* 41.3) [C]

#### **Matt 5:42**

γεγραπται παντι τω αιτουντι σε διδου (*Strom.* 3.27.3) [Ad]

#### **Matt 10:28**

και ο σωτηρ λεγει, φοβεισθαι δειν τον δυναμενον ταυτην την ψυχην  
και τουτο το σωμα το ψυχικον εν γεεννη απολεσαι (*Exc.* 51.3) [Ad]

#### **Matt 10:38**

οθεν ειρηται, ος ουκ αιρει τον σταυρον αυτου και ακολουθει μοι, ουκ  
εστι μου αδελφος (*Exc.* 42.3) [Ad]

#### **Matt 12:29**

και δησαι παραινει και αρπασαι ως ισχυρου τα σκευη (*Exc.* 52.1) [Ad]

#### **Matt 13:25**

εις δε τις των υπ αυτου γεγονοτων επεσπειρεν τα ζιζανια την των  
κακων φυσιν γεννησας (*Strom.* 3.34.3) [All]\*

**Matt 19:11**

ου παντες χωρουσι τον λογον τουτον: + (*Strom.* 3.1.1) [C]<sup>1</sup>

**Matt 19:12**

+ εισι γαρ ευνουχοι, οι μεν εκ γενετης, οι δε εξ αναγκης (*Strom.* 3.1.1) [Ad]

οι δε ενεκα της αιωνιου βασιλειας ευνουχισαντες εαυτους (*Strom.* 3.1.4) Ad]

της τοιαυτης εννοιας ευνουχιζοντα (*Strom.* 3.91.2) [Ad]<sup>2</sup>

**Matt 25:1–2**

και αι παρθενοι αι φρονιμοι (*Exc.* 86.3) [All]

**Matt 26:32**

και προαξω υμας (λεγει) τη τριτη των ημερων εις την Γαλιλαιαν  
(*Exc.* 61.5) [Ad]

**Matt 28:19**

και τοις αποστολοις εντελλεται: περιοντες κηρυσσετε, και τους  
πιστευοντας βαπτιζετε εις ονομα πατρος και υιου και αγιου  
πνευματος (*Exc.* 76.3) [Ad]

**Luke 1:35**

πνευμα αγιον <επελευσεται><sup>3</sup> επι σε ... δυναμις δε υψιστου επισκιασει  
σοι (*Exc.* 60.1) [C]

**Luke 1:41, 44**

και εν τω ευαγγελιω το βρεφος εσκιρτησεν ως εμψυχον (*Exc.* 50.2) [Ad]

**Luke 2:14**

ως φησιν ο αποστολος: ειρηνη επι της γης και δοξα εν υψιστοις  
(*Exc.* 74.2) [Ad]

---

<sup>1</sup> Clement attributes this and the first two references listed under Matt 19:11–12 to the followers of Basilides.

<sup>2</sup> This is part of a saying Clement attributes to a book on celibacy by Julius Cassian, whom he designates as the founder of Docetism.

<sup>3</sup> Stählin's text follows Friedrich Sylburg, who emended the text of L to include *επελευσεται* on the basis of Luke (Friedrich Sylburg, *Klementos Alexandreos ta heuriskomena* [Heidelberg: Commelinus, 1592]).

**Luke 2:40**

το δε παιδιον ηυξανεν και προεκοπτεν εν σοφια (*Exc.* 61.2) [Ad]

**Luke 3:16, Matt 3:11**

ενιοι δε, ως φησιν Ηρακλεων, πυρι τα ωτα των σφραγιζομενων  
κατεσημηναντο (*Exl.* 25.1) [Ad]

**Luke 6:30**

γεγραπται παντι τω αιτουντι σε διδου (*Strom.* 3.27.3) [C]

**Luke 10:19**

εξουσιαν επανω σκορπιων και οφεων περιπατειν (*Exc.* 76.2) [Ad]

**Luke 11:7**

τα παιδια τα ηδη εν τη κοιτη συναναπαυομενα (*Exc.* 86.3) [Ad]

**Luke 12:58**

και απηλλαχθαι αυτου παραινει κατα την οδον, μη τη φυλακη  
περιπεσωμεν και τη κολασει: (*Exc.* 52.1) [All]\*

**Luke 23:46**

πατερ φησι παρατιθεμαι σοι εις χειρας το πνευμα μου (*Exc.* 1.1) [Ad]

εαυτην εις τας χειρας του πατρος παρακατεθετο (*Exc.* 62.3) [All]

**John 1:1**

εν αρχη ην ο λογος και ο λογος ην προς τον θεον και θεος ην ο λογος  
(*Exc.* 6.1) [C]

**John 1:3**

παντα γαρ δι αυτου γεγονεν, και χωρις αυτου γεγονεν ουδεν  
(*Exc.* 45.3) [Ad]

**John 1:4**

ο γεγονεν εν αυτω ζωη ην (*Exc.* 6.4) [C]

**John 1:9**

ο φωτιζει παντα ανθρωπον ερχομενον εις τον κοσμον (*Exc.* 41.3) [C]

**John 1:14**

δοξαν ως μονογενους (*Exc.* 7.3) [C]

**John 1:18**

ο μονογενης θεος, ο ων εις τον κολπον του πατρος, εκεινος  
εξηγησατο (*Exc.* 6.2) [C]

μονογενης υιος εις τον κολπον του πατρος (*Exc.* 6.2) [Ad]

**John 3:29**

του νυμφιου δε φιλος, εστως εμπροσθεν του νυμφωνος, ακουων της  
φωνης του νυμφιου, χαρα χαιρει (*Exc.* 65.1) [Ad]

**John 10:7**

εγω ειμι η θυρα (*Exc.* 26.2) [C]

**John 10:30**

εγω και ο πατηρ εν εσμεν (*Exc.* 61.1) [C]

**John 11:25**

διο και φησιν ο κυριος: εγω ειμι η ζωη (*Exc.* 6.4) [Ad]

**John 14:6**

εγω η ζωη, εγω η αληθεια (*Exc.* 6.1) [Ad]

**John 19:36**

στουν γαρ αυτου ου συντριβησεται, φησι, + (*Exc.* 62.2) [Ad]

**John 19:37**

+ ινα ιδωσιν εις ον εξεκεντησαν (*Exc.* 62.2) [Ad]

## APPENDIX 4

### CLEMENT IN THE APPARATUS OF NA<sup>27</sup> AND UBS<sup>4</sup>

The following two lists indicate readings where Clement's witness should be cited or corrected in future editions of the apparatus of NA<sup>27</sup> and UBS<sup>4</sup>. The lists do not include every variant identified in the apparatus in chapter 4, but only those readings where the editions already provide an apparatus. Clement's reading is given first and identified as either *txt* (indicating agreement with the text of the edition) or *v.1.* (indicating agreement with one of the variant readings cited in the apparatus). A plus (+) indicates readings where Clement's witness is not currently cited but could be included. An asterisk (\*) designates places where the apparatus incorrectly cites the testimony of Clement. The abbreviation "npa" identifies readings Clement supports but where no positive apparatus is present in the NA<sup>27</sup>. Parentheses indicate that Clement's reading differs slightly from the one cited in the apparatus.

#### CLEMENT IN THE APPARATUS OF NA<sup>27</sup>

Matt	5:4	πενθουντες ( <i>txt</i> ) npa
+ Matt	5:9	αυτοι ( <i>txt</i> )
Matt	5:19	(ος δ αν ποιηση και διδασκη ουτος μεγας κληθησεται εν τη βασιλεια) ( <i>txt</i> ) npa
+ Matt	5:22	ενοχος ( <i>txt</i> )
Matt	5:25	εν τη οδω μετ αυτου ( <i>v.1.</i> )
Matt	5:25	κριτης ( <i>txt</i> )
Matt	5:28	επιθυμησαι ( <i>v.2.</i> )
Matt	5:36	(ποιησαι τριχα λευκην η μελαιναν) ( <i>v.3.</i> )
Matt	5:37	το ναι ναι και το ου ου ( <i>v.2.</i> )
Matt	5:42	δος ( <i>txt</i> )
+Matt	5:42	τον θελοντα ( <i>txt</i> ) npa / δανεισασθαι ( <i>v.1.</i> )
Matt	5:44	ευλογειτε τους καταρωμενους υμας, και προσευχεσθε υπερ των επηρεαζοντων υμιν ( <i>v.1.</i> )

Matt	5:48	ως (txt) ηρα
+ Matt	5:48	εν τοις ουρανοις (v.1.)
Matt	6:24	ουδεις (txt) ηρα
Matt	6:33	βασιλειαν του ουρανων και την δικαιοσυνην (v.2.)
Matt	7:6	καταπατησωσι (v.1.)
Matt	7:13	πλατεια (txt)
Matt	7:13	πολλοι (v.1.)
*Matt	7:14	στενη (v.1.) <sup>1</sup>
Matt	10:10	τροφης (txt) ηρα
Matt	10:23	αλλην (v.1.)
Matt	10:24	διδασκαλον (txt) ηρα
Matt	10:27	κηρυξατε (txt) ηρα
Matt	10:32	του εν ουρανοις (v.1.)
Matt	10:39	ο ευρων την ψυχην αυτου απολεσει αυτην και (txt) ηρα
Matt	10:41	(και ος αν δεξηται δικαιον εις ονομα δικαιου, μισθον δικαιου λημψεται) (txt) ηρα
Matt	10:42	μικρων (txt) ηρα
Matt	11:27	(τον υιον ει μη ο πατηρ, ουδε τον πατερα ει μη ο υιος) (txt) ηρα
Matt	11:28	πεφορτισμενοι (txt) ηρα
Matt	11:29	απ εμου (txt) ηρα
+ Matt	12:36	(αν) λαλησωσιν (v.2.)
Matt	13:13	αυτοις λαλω (txt) ηρα
Matt	13:13	οτι βλεποντες ου βλεπουσι και ακουοντες ουκ ακουουσι (και ου συνιασι) (txt) ηρα
Matt	13:34	ουδεν (txt)

---

<sup>1</sup> Clement's reference is brief and allusionary, making it difficult to determine if he is actually citing the passage or just making a comparison.

*Matt	15:8	ο λαος ουτος (indeterminable; cf. Mark 7:6; Isa 29:13)
*Matt	15:8	απεχει απ εμου (indeterminable; cf. Mark 7:6; Isa 29:13)
Matt	15:11	ου (txt) ηρα
Matt	15:11	κοινοι <sup>1</sup> (txt) ηρα
Matt	16:17	εν τοις ουρανοις (txt) ηρα
Matt	16:26	ωφελειται (v.1.)
Matt	18:10	των μικρων τουτων (txt) ηρα
Matt	18:10	εν ουρανοις (txt) ηρα
+Matt	19:3	εξεστιν (v.1.)
Matt	19:11	τουτον (txt)
Matt	19:13	(προσηνεγκαν) (txt) ηρα
Matt	19:14	ειπεν (txt)
Matt	19:14	με (txt) ηρα
+Matt	19:17	(εις αγαθος) <sup>2</sup> (txt)
Matt	19:21	πτωχοις (v.1.)
Matt	21:16	οτι (txt) ηρα
+Matt	21:22	εαν / αν (v.1.)
Matt	22:14	εκλεκτοι (txt) ηρα
Matt	22:40	ολος (txt) ηρα
+Matt	23:8	διδασκαλος (txt)
Matt	23:9	υμιν (v.1.)
Matt	23:9	ο πατηρ υμων (v.1.)
Matt	23:9	εν τοις ουρανιος (v.1.)
Matt	23:25	ακαθαρσιας (v.3.)
Matt	23:26	ποτηριου (txt)

---

<sup>2</sup> Clement alludes only to part of this variant unit.

Matt	23:26	καθαρον (v.2.)
+Matt	23:27	(ομοιοι εστε) (v.1.)
Matt	23:27	εξωθεν ο ταφος φαινεται ωραιος, (ενδον) δε γεμει (v.2.)
Matt	23:37	ορνις (συναγει) (txt)
Matt	23:37	αυτης Clem <sup>pt</sup> (txt) / omit Clem <sup>pt</sup> (v.2.)
*Matt	23:38	ερημος (indeterminable; cf. Luke 13:35)
Matt	24:35	παρελευσεται (txt) nra
Matt	25:27	το αργυριον (v.1.)
Matt	25:39	ασθενουντα (txt)
Matt	25:40	των αδελφων μου Clem (txt) nra
+Matt	25:41	ο ητοιμασεν (ο κυριος) (v.2.)
+Matt	26:23	μετ εμου (εις το τρυβλιον) (v.2.)
+Matt	26:29	πιω (v.1.)
+Matt	27:46	ηλι ηλι (txt)
Mark	10:19	μη μοιχευσης μη φονευσης (v.1.)
Mark	10:19	ψευδομαρτυρησης (v.1.)
+Mark	10:19	σου (v.1.)
+Mark	10:20	αποκριθεις (λεγει) (v.1.)
Mark	10:21	πτωχοις (v.1.)
Mark	10:21	μοι (txt)
Mark	10:24	τους πεπειθοτας επι χρημασιν (v.1.)
Mark	10:25	της bis (txt)
Mark	10:25	τρυμαλιας (txt) nra
Mark	10:25	βελονης (v.1.)
Mark	10:26	omit Clem <sup>vid</sup> (v.2.)



Mark	10:28	ηκολουθησαμεν (v.1.)
Mark	10:29	(αποκριθεις δε Ιησους) (v.4.)
Mark	10:29	ενεκεν (txt) ηρα
Mark	10:30	νυν (txt) ηρα
Mark	10:31	οι (txt)
Luke	3:22	υιος μου ει συ (αγαπητος), εγω σημερον γεγεννηκα σε (v.1.)
Luke	4:13	(καιρον) (txt)
Luke	6:29	εις (v.1.)
Luke	6:29	σιαγονα (txt) ηρα
Luke	6:30	τω (v.1.)
Luke	6:31	ανθρωποι (txt)
*Luke	6:31	omit ομοιως (indeterminable, see apparatus)
Luke	6:36	καθως (v.1.)
+Luke	6:37	ινα (v.1.)
+Luke	6:38	ω γαρ μετρω (txt)
Luke	6:38	αντιμετρηθησεται (txt)
Luke	6:43	καρπον σαπρον (txt) ηρα
Luke	6:45	καρδιας (txt)
Luke	6:45	το (txt) ηρα
Luke	6:45	(θησαυρου) (v.1.)
Luke	6:46	α (txt) ηρα
Luke	7:25	διαγοντες (v.1.)
Luke	7:28	(προφητης) (v.2/3.)
Luke	9:62	εις τα οπισω βλεπων και επιβαλλων την χειρα αυτου επ αροτρον (v.2.)

Luke	9:62	τη βασιλεια (txt)
*Luke	10:1	omit δυο (indeterminable cf. Luke 10:17) <sup>3</sup>
*Luke	10:17	omit δυο (indeterminable, see Luke 10:1)
Luke	10:21	εν τω πνευματι (v.3.)
Luke	10:21	και της γης (txt) ηρα
Luke	10:37	συ (txt) ηρα
Luke	10:42	Μαρια (v.1.)
Luke	10:42	αυτης (txt)
*Luke	11:33	υπο τον μοδιον (indeterminable, cf. Matt 5:15; Mark 4:21; Luke 8:16)
Luke	11:43	Φαρισαιοι (v.1.)
Luke	12:8	ομολογηση (txt)
Luke	12:8	των αγγελω (txt) ηρα
Luke	12:11	εις (v.1.)
Luke	12:11	συναγωγας και τας αρχας (txt) ηρα
Luke	12:11	(προμεριμνατε) (v.2.)
Luke	12:11	πως (v.1.)
Luke	12:19	(αποκειμενα) (txt) ηρα
Luke	12:20	απαιτουσιν (txt)
Luke	12:22	υμων (v.1.)
Luke	12:22	υμων Clem <sup>pt</sup> (v.1.) / omit Clem <sup>pt</sup> (txt)
Luke	12:23	γαρ (txt)
Luke	12:24	τους κορακας (txt) ηρα
Luke	12:24	ου (txt)

<sup>3</sup> While Clement refers to the εβδομηκοντα in *Strom.* 3.116.3, the allusion is far too remote to attribute it directly to the manuscript tradition of Luke 10:1 or 10:17 on the basis of a one-word agreement.

Luke	12:24	ουδε (txt)
Luke	12:24	αυτους (txt) ηρα
Luke	12:24	υμεις (txt) ηρα
Luke	12:27	ουτε νηθει ουτε υφαινει (v.1.)
Luke	12:27	οτι (v.1.)
Luke	12:28	αμφιεννυσι (v.1.)
Luke	12:29	η (v.1.)
Luke	12:30	(ζητει) (v.1.)
+Luke	12:31	του θεου (v.1.)
Luke	12:35	εστωσαν υμων αι οσφυες περιεζωσμεναι (txt) ηρα
Luke	12:48	εδοθη (txt) ηρα
Luke	12:49	επι (txt) ηρα
Luke	13:32	αποτελω (txt)
Luke	13:32	τη τριτη (txt) ηρα
Luke	14:8	εις γαμους (txt) ηρα
Luke	14:13	ποιης δοχην (v.1.)
Luke	14:15	μακαριος ος (v.1.)
Luke	14:15	αρτον (txt)
Luke	14:16	εποιησεν (v.1.)
Luke	14:20	εγημα (txt) ηρα
+Luke	14:26	πατερα (v.2.)
Luke	14:26	δε (v.1.)
Luke	16:9	εαυτοις φιλους (v.1.)
Luke	16:9	μαμωνα της αδικιας (txt) ηρα
+Luke	16:16	(μεχρις) (txt)
Luke	16:20	τις (txt) ηρα

Luke	16:20	Λαζαρος ( <i>txt</i> )
Luke	16:21	(εκ) ( <i>txt</i> )
Luke	16:21	πλουσιου ( <i>txt</i> ) ηρα
Luke	17:3	αμαρτη ( <i>txt</i> )
Luke	17:4	και το ( <i>v.1.</i> )
Luke	17:4	επτακις ( <i>txt</i> )
Luke	17:4	προς σε ( <i>txt</i> )
Luke	19:8	ημιση ( <i>v.1.</i> )
Luke	19:9	σωτηρια ( <i>txt</i> ) ηρα
Luke	20:34	γαμουσι ( <i>txt</i> ) ηρα
+Luke	22:31	(ο κυριος) ( <i>v.1.</i> )
Luke	24:42	μερος ( <i>txt</i> )
John	1:3	ουδεν εν ( <i>txt</i> ) ηρα
John	1:4	εστιν Clem <sup>pt</sup> ( <i>txt</i> ) ηρα / ην Clem <sup>pt</sup> ( <i>v.1.</i> )
John	1:18	ο μονογενης θεος ( <i>v.1.</i> )
John	1:18	ο μονογενης υιος ( <i>v.2.</i> )
+John	1:27	ουκ ειμι ( <i>v.1.</i> )
John	1:27	αξιος ( <i>txt</i> ) ηρα
John	3:19	το ( <i>txt</i> ) ηρα
John	3:19	ηγαπησαν οι ανθρωποι μαλλον το σκοτος ( <i>txt</i> ) ηρα
John	4:34	ποιησω ( <i>txt</i> )
John	6:27	αλλα ( <i>v.1.</i> )
John	6:32	εδωκεν ( <i>v.1.</i> )
John	6:33	αρτος ( <i>txt</i> ) ηρα
John	6:40	αναστησω αυτον ( <i>v.1.</i> )

John	6:40	εν (txt)
+John	6:47	πιστευων (txt)
John	6:51	αρτος (v.l.)
John	6:51	η σαρχ μου εστιν υπερ της του κοσμου ζωης (txt) ηρα
John	6:51	υπερ (txt)
John	6:55	αληθης (txt)
John	6:55	αληθης εστιν ποσις (txt) ηρα
John	8:24	πιστευσητε (txt) ηρα
+John	8:34	εστιν (v.l.)
+John	8:35	αιωνα (v.l.)
John	8:36	εσεσθε (txt) ηρα
John	8:44	του (txt) ηρα
John	8:44	ουχ εστηκεν (v.l.)
John	8:44	ουκ εστιν αληθεια (txt) ηρα
John	8:44	οταν (txt) ηρα
John	8:56	ιδη (txt) ηρα
John	10:2	εισερχομενος (txt) ηρα
John	10:2	ποιμην εστι (txt) ηρα
John	10:7	η θυρα (txt) ηρα
John	10:8	παντες (txt) ηρα
John	10:11	τιθησιν (txt) ηρα
John	10:16	γενησονται (txt) ηρα
John	10:27	ακουει (v.l.)
John	13:33	μικρον (txt)
John	15:2	(καρποφορουν) (v.l.)
John	15:2	(καρπον πλειω) (txt)

John	15:12	καθως ( <i>txt</i> ) nra
John	16:7	εγω ( <i>v.1.</i> ) Clem <sup>lat</sup>
John	17:21	πατερ ( <i>txt</i> )
John	17:21	ημιν εν ( <i>v.1.</i> )
John	17:21	πιστευη ( <i>txt</i> )
John	17:22	εδωκας ( <i>v.1.</i> )
John	17:22	δεδωκα ( <i>txt</i> ) nra
John	17:22	εν <sup>2</sup> ( <i>txt</i> ) nra
John	17:23	ηγαπησας <sup>1</sup> ( <i>txt</i> ) nra
John	17:24	πατερ ( <i>txt</i> )
John	17:24	ους ( <i>v.1.</i> )
John	17:24	την εμην ( <i>txt</i> ) nra
John	17:24	εδωκας <sup>2</sup> ( <i>v.1.</i> )
John	17:25	πατερ ( <i>txt</i> )
John	20:29	ιδοντες ( <i>txt</i> ) nra
+John	21:4	επι ( <i>v.1.</i> )

CLEMENT IN THE APPARATUS OF UBS<sup>4</sup>

Matt	5:44 <sup>(1)</sup>	Apparatus correct
Matt	5:44 <sup>(2)</sup>	Apparatus correct
Matt	6:33	Apparatus correct
Matt	7:13	Apparatus correct
Matt	7:14	Apparatus correct <sup>4</sup>
Matt	10:23	Apparatus correct
Matt	11:27	Apparatus correct

---

<sup>4</sup> See n. 1 above.

Matt	13:13	Apparatus correct
Matt	13:35 <sup>(2)</sup>	Apparatus correct
Matt	19:11	Apparatus correct
Matt	23:9	Apparatus correct
Matt	23:25	Apparatus correct
Matt	23:26	Apparatus correct
Matt	23:38	Apparatus incorrect (indeterminable; cf. Luke 13:35)
Mark	8:38 <sup>(1)</sup>	Apparatus correct
Mark	8:38 <sup>(2)</sup>	Apparatus correct
Mark	10:19	Apparatus correct
Mark	10:21	Apparatus correct
Mark	10:24	Apparatus incorrect <sup>5</sup>
Mark	10:25	Apparatus correct
+Mark	10:26	omit προς εαυτους (v.3.)
Mark	10:31	Apparatus correct
Luke	3:22	Apparatus correct
Luke	6:31	Apparatus correct
+Luke	7:28	(γυναικων προφητης) <sup>6</sup> (v. 1/2.)
Luke	9:62 <sup>(2)</sup>	Apparatus correct
*Luke	10:1	Apparatus incorrect <sup>7</sup>
*Luke	10:17	Apparatus incorrect <sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Clement attests v.3, not v.4. The apparatus of UBS<sup>4</sup> is incorrect for this variant reading.

<sup>6</sup> The apparatus of UBS<sup>3</sup> is correct for this variant reading.

<sup>7</sup> Clement's witness is indeterminable (see n. 2 above).

Luke	10:21	Apparatus correct
*Luke	11:33	Apparatus incorrect <sup>9</sup>
Luke	12:27	Apparatus correct
Luke	16:21 <sup>(1)</sup>	Apparatus correct
Luke	16:21 <sup>(2)</sup>	Apparatus correct
Luke	17:3	Apparatus correct
Luke	20:34	Apparatus correct
+Luke	22:31	(ο κυριος) (v.1.)
Luke	24:42	Apparatus correct
John	1:3—4	Apparatus correct
John	1:4	Apparatus correct
John	1:18	Apparatus correct
+John	6:47	πιστευων (txt)
+John	8:34	omit της αμαρτιας (v.1.)
John	8:44	Apparatus correct
John	10:11	Apparatus correct
John	10:16	Apparatus correct
John	17:21	Apparatus correct
John	17:23	Apparatus correct
John	17:24	Apparatus correct

---

<sup>8</sup> See Luke 10:1.

<sup>9</sup> It is indeterminable whether Clement refers to Luke 11:33; Matt 5:15; Mark 4:21; or Luke 8:16.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### CRITICAL EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS OF CLEMENT'S WRITINGS

- Barnard, P. Mordaunt. *Clement of Alexandria: Quis dives salvetur*. TS 5.2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897.
- Butterworth, G. W., ed. *Clement of Alexandria: Exhortation to the Greeks, The Rich Man's Salvation, and To the Newly Baptized*. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919.
- Camelot, P. Th., and Henri-Irénée Marrou. *Clément d'Alexandrie: Les Stromates. Stromate II: Introduction, Texte Grec, Traduction et Notes*. SC 108. Paris: Cerf, 1954.
- Casey, R. P. ed. *The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria*. London: Christophers, 1934.
- Descourtieux, Patrick. *Clément d'Alexandrie: Les Stromates. Stromate VI: Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes*. SC 446. Paris: Cerf, 1999.
- Dindorf, William. *Clementis Alexandrini Opera*. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1869.
- Ferguson, John, trans. *Clement of Alexandria: Stromateis Books One to Three*. FC 85. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1991.
- Hoek, Annewies van den, and Claude Mondésert. *Clément d'Alexandrie: Les Stromates. Stromate IV: Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes*. SC 463. Paris: Cerf, 2001.
- Hort, Fenton John Anthony, and Joseph B. Mayor. *Clement of Alexandria, Miscellanies Book VII: The Greek Text*. London: MacMillan, 1902.
- Le Boulluec, Alain. *Clément d'Alexandrie: Les Stromates. Stromate VII: Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes*. SC 428. Paris: Cerf, 1997.
- Le Boulluec, Alain, and Pierre Voulet. *Clément d'Alexandrie: Les Stromates. Stromate VI: Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes*. SC 278. Paris: Cerf, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Clément d'Alexandrie: Les Stromates. Stromate VII: Introduction, texte Critique, traduction et notes*. SC 278. Paris: Cerf, 1981.
- Marcovich, Miroslav. *Clementis Alexandrini Protrepticus*. VCSup 34. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Clementis Alexandrini Paedagogus*. VCSup 61. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Marrou, Henri-Irénée, and Marguerite Harl. *Clément d'Alexandrie: Le Pédagogue. Livre I: Introduction, texte grec, traduction et notes*. SC 70. Paris: Cerf, 1960.
- Mondésert, Claude. *Clément d'Alexandrie: Introduction a l'étude de sa pensée religieuse a parti de l'écriture*. Paris: Montaigne, 1944.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Clément d'Alexandrie: Le Protreptique—Introduction, traduction et notes*. 2nd ed. SC 2. Paris: Cerf, 1949.

- Mondésert, Claude, and Marcel Caster. *Clément d'Alexandrie: Les Stromates. Stromate I: Introduction, traduction et notes*. SC 108. Paris: Cerf, 1951.
- Mondésert, Claude, and Henri-Irénée Marrou. *Clément d'Alexandrie: Le Pédagogue. Livre II: Texte grec, traduction et notes*. SC 108. Paris: Cerf, 1965.
- Mondésert, Claude, Henri-Irénée Marrou, and Chantal Matray. *Clément d'Alexandrie: Le Pédagogue. Livre III: Texte grec, traduction et notes*. SC 158. Paris: Cerf, 1970.
- Nardi, Carlo. *Eclogae Propheticae*. Biblioteca Patristica 4. Florence: Nardini, 1985.
- Oulton, John E. L., and Henry Chadwick, eds. *Alexandrian Christianity: Selected Translations of Clement and Origen*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1954.
- Potter, John. *Klémentos Alexandreôs ta euriskomena Clementis Alexandrini Opera quae extant*. Vol. 2. Oxford: Sheldon, 1715. Repr. in PG 8–9.
- Sagnard, François. *Clément d'Alexandrie: Extraits de Théodote—Texte grec, introduction, traduction et notes*. 2nd ed. SC 23. Paris: Cerf, 1970.
- Stählin, Otto. *Protrepticus und Paedagogus*. Vol. 1 of *Clemens Alexandrinus*. 3rd ed. Edited by Ursula Treu. GCS 12. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Register*. Vol. 4 of *Clemens Alexandrinus*. 2nd ed. Edited by Ursula Treu. GCS 39. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Stromata Buch I–VI*. Vol. 2 of *Clemens Alexandrinus*. 3rd ed. Edited by Ludwig Früchtel. GCS 52. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Stromata Buch VII und VIII, Excerpta ex Theodoto, Eclogae Propheticae, Quis Dives Salvetur, Fragmente*. Vol. 3 of *Clemens Alexandrinus*. 2nd ed. Edited by Ludwig Früchtel and Ursula Treu. GCS 17. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1979.
- Sylburg, Friedrich. *Klementos Alexandreos ta euriskomena*. Heidelberg: Commelinus, 1592.
- Wilson, William, trans. *Clement of Alexandria*. American reprint of the Edinburgh edition of the Ante-Nicene Fathers 2. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.
- Wood, Simon P., trans. *Clement of Alexandria: Christ the Educator*. FC 23. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1954.

## BIBLICAL MANUSCRIPTS, EDITIONS, AND COLLATIONS

- Aland, Kurt, ed. *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*. 15th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2001.
- Aland, Kurt, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, Barbara Aland, and with the Institute for the Study of the Text of the New Testament, eds. *Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece*. 27th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996.
- Aland, Kurt, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren. *The Greek New Testament*. 4th ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1993. (UBS<sup>4</sup>)
- Anderson, Amy. *The Textual Tradition of the Gospels: Family One in Matthew*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

- Barnard, P. Mordaunt. *The Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria: In the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles*. TS 5.5. Intro. F. C. Burkitt. Cambridge University Press, 1899. Repr., Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus, 1967.
- Beermann, Gustav, and Caspar René Gregory, eds. *Die Koridethi Evangelien*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1913. (Gregory Θ)
- Brogan, John Jay. "The Text of the Gospels in the Writings of Athanasius." Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1997.
- Brooks, James Arthur. "The Text of the Pauline Epistles in the *Stromata* of Clement of Alexandria." Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1966.
- Bywater, I. "Critical Notes on Clement of Alexandria." *JP* 4 (1872): 203–18.
- Champlin, Russell. *Family E and Its Allies in Matthew*. SD 28. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1966.
- Cunningham, Arthur. "The New Testament Text of St. Cyril of Alexandria." 2 vols. Ph.D. diss., University of Manchester, 1995.
- Ehrman, Bart D. *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels*. SBLNTGF 1. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Ehrman, Bart D., Gordon D. Fee, and Michael W. Holmes. *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen*. SBLNTGF 3. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Geerlings, Jacob. *Family E and Its Allies in Luke*. SD 35. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Family E and Its Allies in Mark*. SD 31. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Family II in John*. SD 23. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Family II in Luke*. SD 22. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Family II in Matthew*. SD 24. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Family 13—The Ferrar Group: The Text according to John*. SD 21. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Family 13—The Ferrar Group: The Text according to Luke*. SD 20. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Family 13—The Ferrar Group: The Text according to Matthew*. SD 19. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1961.
- Hansell, Edward H., ed. *Novum Testamentum Graece: Antiquissimorum Codicum Textus in Ordine Parallelo Dispositi Accedit Collatio Codices Sinaitici*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1864. (Gregory A, B, C, D, and Ⲙ)
- Harris, J. Rendel. "An Important Manuscript of the New Testament." *JBL* 9 (1890): 31–59. (Gregory 892)
- Jülicher, Adolf. *Itala: Das Neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung*. Berlin: de Gruyter & Co., IV, 1963; I–III, eds. Kurt Aland and Walter Matzkow, 1970. (Old Latin MSS a b c k)
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Johannes-Evangelium*. Vol. 4 of *Itala: Das Neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung*. Assisted by Walter Matzkow and Kurt Aland. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963. (Old Latin MSS a b c)
- H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ. Oxford, 1873. Repr., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, n.d. (TR)
- Kenyon, Frederic George. *The Gospels and Acts: Text*. Fasc. 2 of *The Chester Beatty Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible*. London: Walker, 1933. (Gregory P<sup>45</sup>)

- Lake, Helen, and Kirsopp Lake, eds. *Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus: The New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1911. Repr., Detroit: Brown & Thomas, 1982 (X)
- Lake, Kirsopp. *Codex 1 of the Gospels and Its Allies*. TS 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902.
- . “Texts from Mount Athos.” Pages 89–185 in vol. 5 of *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1903. (Gregory Ψ)
- Lake, Kirsopp, and Silva Lake. *Family 13 (The Ferrar Group): The Text according to Mark*. SD 11. London: Christophers, 1941.
- Lake, Kirsopp, and Silva New. *Six Collations of New Testament Manuscripts*. Harvard Theological Studies 17. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932. Repr., New York: Kraus, 1969. (Gregory Ω)
- Lake, Silva. *Family Π and the Codex Alexandrinus: The Text according to Mark*. SD 5. London: Christophers, 1937.
- Legg, S. C. E., ed. *Novum Testamentum Graece: Evangelium Secundum Marcum*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1935.
- . *Novum Testamentum Graece: Evangelium Secundum Matthaeum*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1940.
- Lyon, R. W. “A Re-examination of Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus.” *NTS* 5 (1958–59): 260–272.
- Martin, Victor, ed. *Papyrus Bodmer II: Évangile de Jean 1–14*. Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1956. (Gregory P<sup>60</sup>)
- . *Papyrus Bodmer II, Supplément: Évangile de Jean chap. 14–21*. Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1958. (Gregory P<sup>60</sup>)
- Martin, Victor, and J. W. B. Barns, eds. *Papyrus Bodmer II: Évangile de Jean 1–14. (Nouvelle édition augmentée et corrigée)*. Cologny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1962.
- Martin, Victor, and Rudolph Kasser, eds. *Papyrus Bodmer XIV–XV*. Cologny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961. (Gregory P<sup>75</sup>)
- Mees, Michael. “Das Matthäus-Evangelium in den Werken des Clemens von Alexandrien.” *Div* 12/3 (1968): 675–98.
- . “Papyrus Bodmer XIV (P<sup>75</sup>) und die Lukaszitate bei Clemens von Alexandrien.” *Lateranum* 34 (1968): 97–119.
- . *Die Zitate aus dem Neuen Testament bei Clemens von Alexandrien*. Quaderni di “Vetera Christianorum” 2. Rome: Istituto di Letteratura Christiana Antica, 1970.
- Mullen, Roderic L. *The New Testament Text of Cyril of Jerusalem*. SBLNTGF 7. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Racine, Jean-François. “The Text of Matthew in the Writings of Basil of Caesarea.” Ph.D. diss., Toronto School of Theology, 2000.
- . *The Text of Matthew in the Writings of Basil of Caesarea*. SBLNTGF 5. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.
- Raquel, Sylvie Taconnet. “The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Writings of Origen.” Ph.D. diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 2002.
- Rettig, H. C. M., ed. *Antiquissimus quatuor evangeliorum canonicorum Codex Sangallensis Graeco-Latinus interlinearis*. Zurich: Shulthess, 1836. (Gregory Δ)

- Sanders, Henry A, ed. *The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection, Part 1: The Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels*. New York: MacMillan, 1912. (Gregory W)
- Schmidtke, Alfred, ed. *Die Evangelien: Eines alten Unzialcodex*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903. (Gregory 579)
- Scrivener, Frederick H. A. *A Full Collation of Codex Sinaiticus*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Deighton Bell, 1867.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Novum Testamentum: Textus Stephanici A.D. 1550*. Cambridge: Deighton Bell, 1877.
- Soden, Hermann von. *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihren ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt: Text mit Apparat*. Vol. 2. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913.
- Swanson, Reuben J. "The Gospel Text of Clement of Alexandria." Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus: John*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Tischendorf, Constantin, ed. *Monumenta Sacra Inedita*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1846. (Gregory L)
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Novum Testamentum Graece: Editio Octava Critica Maior*. Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869–72.
- Tregelles, Samuel P, ed. *The Greek New Testament: Edited from Ancient Authorities, with Their Various Readings in Full*. 7 vols. London: Bagster and Sons, 1857–79. (Gregory 33)
- Zaphiris, G rassime. *Le texte de l vangile selon saint Matthieu d'apr s les citations de Cl ment d'Alexandrie compar es aux citations des p res et des th ologiens grecs du II  au XV  si cle*. Gembloux: Duculot, 1970.

## NEW TESTAMENT TEXTUAL CRITICISM

- Aland, Barbara. "The Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri in Early Church History." Pages 108–21 in *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels: The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex P<sup>45</sup>*. Edited by Charles Horton. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Aland, Kurt, ed. *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*. AFNT. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1987–.
- Aland, Kurt, and Barbara Aland. *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*. 2nd ed. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
- Amphoux, C.-B. "Les premi res  ditions de Luc. II. L'histoire du texte au II  si cle." *ETL* 68 (1992): 38–48.
- Baarda, Tjitze. "Clement of Alexandria and the Parable of the Fisherman: Mt 13,47–48 or Independent Tradition?" Pages 582–598 in *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*. Edited by Camille Focant. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993.

- Bengel, Johann Albrecht. *Novum Testamentum Graecum*. 2nd ed. London: Bowyer, 1763.
- Birdsall, J. Neville. "The New Testament Text." Pages 308–77 in vol. 1 of *The Cambridge History of the Bible*. Edited by Peter R. Ackroyd and Christopher F. Evans. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- . "The Recent History of New Testament Textual Criticism (from Westcott and Hort, 1881, to the Present)." *ANRW* 26.1:99–197.
- Blass, F., A. Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translation and revision of the 9th–10th German edition incorporating supplementary notes of A. Debrunner. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Luke*. 2 vols. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- Boismard, M.-É. Review of Gérard Zephiris, *Le texte de l'Évangile selon saint Matthieu d'après les citations de Clément d'Alexandrie comparées aux citations des pères et des théologiens grecs du II<sup>e</sup> au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle*. *RB* 80 (1973): 612–13.
- Brooks, James A. *The New Testament Text of Gregory of Nyssa*. SBLNTGF 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Carson, D. A. *The Gospel according to John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Casey, Robert P. "The Patristic Evidence for the Text of the New Testament." Pages 69–80 in *New Testament Manuscript Studies*. Edited by Merrill M. Parvis and Allen P. Wikgren. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.
- Cate, James Jeffrey. "The Text of the Catholic Epistles and the Revelation in the Writings of Origen." Ph.D. diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1997.
- Clarke, K. D. "Textual Certainty in the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament," *NovT* 44 (2002): 105–33.
- Colwell, Ernest C. "Genealogical Method: Its Achievements and Its Limitations." *JBL* 66 (1947): 109–133. Repr. as pages 63–83 in idem, *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1969.
- . "Method in Locating a Newly-Discovered Manuscript within the Manuscript Tradition of the Greek New Testament." Pages 757–77 in *Studia Evangelica: Papers Presented to the International Congress on "The Four Gospels in 1957" Held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1957*. Edited by Kurt Aland et al. TU 73. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959. Repr. as pages 26–44 in idem, *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1969.
- Colwell, Ernest C., and Ernest W. Tune. "The Quantitative Relationships between MS Text-Types." Pages 25–32 in *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey*. Edited by J. Neville Birdsall and Robert W. Thomson. Freiburg: Herder, 1963. Repr. as pages 56–62 in Colwell, *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1969.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *The Gospel according to Saint Mark: An Introduction and Commentary*. Rev. ed. CGTC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Danker, Frederick W. Review of Gérard Zephiris, *Le texte de l'Évangile selon saint Matthieu d'après les citations de Clément d'Alexandrie comparées aux citations des pères et des théologiens grecs du II<sup>e</sup> au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle*. *CBQ* 35 (1973): 129–30.

- Davies, W. D. and Dale C. Allison. *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew*. ICC 26. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
- Ehrman, Bart D. "Heracleon and the 'Western' Textual Tradition." *NTS* 40 (1994): 161–79.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Methodological Developments in the Analysis and Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence." *NovT* 29 (1987): 22–45.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Problem of Textual Circularity: The Alands on the Classification of New Testament Manuscripts." *Bib* 70 (1989): 377–88.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Theodotians as Corruptors of Scripture." *StPatr* 25 (1993): 46–51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Text of the Gospels at the End of the Second Century." Pages 95–122 in *Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunel Colloquium, June 1994*. Edited by D. C. Parker and C. -B. Amphoux. NTTS 22. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Text of Mark in the Hands of the Orthodox." Pages 19–31 in *Biblical Hermeneutics in Historical Perspective*. Edited by Mark Burrows and Paul Rorem. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Use and Significance of Patristic Evidence for NT Textual Criticism." Pages 118–35 in *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Early Church History*. Edited by Barbara Aland and Joël Delobel. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Use of Group Profiles for the Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence." *JBL* 106 (1987): 465–86.
- Ehrman, Bart D, and Michael W. Holmes, eds. *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. SD 46. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Elliott, J. K. *A Bibliography of Greek New Testament Manuscripts*. 2nd ed. SNTSMS 109. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Supplement I to J.K. Elliott, *A Bibliography of Greek New Testament Manuscripts*." *NovT* 46 (2004): 376–400.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Use of ἑρεπός in the New Testament." Pages 121–23 in idem, *Essays and Studies in New Testament Textual Criticism*. EFN 3. Cordoba, Spain: Almendro, 1992.
- Epp, Eldon J. "The Claremont Profile Method for Grouping New Testament Minuscule Manuscripts." Pages 211–20 in Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee, *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The International Greek New Testament Project: Motivation and History." *NovT* 39 (1997): 1–20.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Issues in New Testament Textual Criticism." Pages 17–76 in *Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism*. Edited by David Alan Black. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Multivalence of the Term 'Original Text' in New Testament Textual Criticism." *HTR* 92 (1999): 245–81.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Papyrus Manuscripts of the New Testament." Pages 3–21 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status*

- Quaestionis. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*. SNTSMS 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.
- Fee, Gordon D. "Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John: A Contribution to Methodology in Establishing Textual Relationships." *NTS* 15 (1968–69): 23–44.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Critique of W. N. Pickering's *The Identity of the New Testament Text*: A Review Article." *WTJ* 41 (1979): 397–423.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Origen's Text of the New Testament and the Text of Egypt." *NovT* 28 (1982): 348–64.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Papyrus Bodmer II (P66): Its Textual Relationships and Scribal Characteristics*. SD 34. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "P<sup>75</sup>, P<sup>66</sup>, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria." Pages 19–45 in *New Dimensions in New Testament*. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenney. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974. Repr. as pages 247–73 in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Edited by Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee. SD 45. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Text of John and Mark in the Writings of Chrysostom." *NovT* 26 (1979–80): 525–47.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Methodology in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations." *Bib* 52 (1971): 357–94.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Text of John in the Jerusalem Bible: A Critique of the Use of Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism." *JBL* 90 (1971): 163–73.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Use of Greek Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism: The State of the Question." Pages 344–59 in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Edited by Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee. SD 45. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Use of the Greek Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism." Pages 191–207 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- France, R. T. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Früchtel, L. "Neue Textzeugnisse zu Clemens Alexandrinus." *ZNW* 36 (1937): 81–90.
- Geerlings, Jacob, and Silva New. "Chrysostom's Text of the Gospel of Mark." *HTR* 24 (1931): 121–42.
- Grant, Robert M. "The Citation of Patristic Evidence in an *Apparatus Criticus*." Pages 117–24 in *New Testament Manuscript Studies*. Edited by Merrill Parvis and Allen P. Wikgren. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.
- Greenlee, J. Harold. *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*. Rev. ed. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1995.
- Greer, Thomas C., Jr. "Analyzing and Categorizing New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Colwell Revisited." Pages 253–67 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. Edited by



- Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. SD 46. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Griesbach, Johann Jacob. *Novum Testamentum Græce, Textum ad fidem Codicum Versionem et Patrum recensuit et Lectionis Variatatem*. 2nd ed. Translated by Samuel Sharpe (1840). 2 vols. London and Halle, 1796, 1806.
- Hannah, Darrell D. *The Text of 1 Corinthians in the Writings of Origen*. SBLNTGF 4. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Hedley, P. L. "The Egyptian Text of the Gospels and Acts." *CQR* 118 (1934): 23–39, 188–230.
- Hort, Fenton John Anthony, and Brooke Foss Westcott. *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1882. Repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1988.
- Hug, Johann Leonhard. *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*. 4th ed. Stuttgart: Cotta, 1847.
- Hurtado, Larry. *Text-Critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.
- Hutton, Edward Ardron. *An Atlas of Textual Criticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911.
- Kenyon, Frederic G. *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1926.
- Klostermann, Erich. *Das Lukasevangelium*. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1929.
- Kilpatrick, George D. "Atticism and the Text of the New Testament." Pages 15–31 in *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. BETL 96. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990. Originally published as pages 125–37 in *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze: Festschrift für Prof. Josef Schmid zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Josef Blinzler, Otto Kuss, and Franz Mussner. Regensburg: Pustet, 1963.
- . "The Greek New Testament Text of Today and the Textus Receptus." Pages 33–52 in *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. BETL 96. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990. Originally published as pages 189–208 in *The New Testament in Historical and Contemporary Perspective*. Edited by Hugh Anderson and William Barclay. Oxford: Blackwell, 1965.
- Lagrange, Marie-Joseph. *Introduction à l'étude du Nouveau Testament*. 2 vols. Paris: Gabalda, 1935.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Martini, Carlo M. "Is There a Late Alexandrian Text of the Gospels?" *NovT* 24 (1977–78): 285–96.
- McCall, Chester H., Jr. *Sampling and Statistics Handbook for Research*. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1982.
- McReynolds, Paul R. "The Claremont Profile Method and the Grouping of Byzantine Manuscripts." Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1968.
- Metzger, Bruce M. "The Caesarean Text of the Gospels." *JBL* 64 (1945): 457–89. Repr. as pages 42–72 in *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Leiden: Brill, 1963.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Patristic Evidence and the Textual Criticism of the New Testament." *NTS* 18 (1971–72): 379–400.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of G rassime Zaphiris, *Le texte de l' vangile selon saint Matthieu d'apr s les citations de Cl ment d'Alexandrie compar es aux citations des p res et des th ologiens grecs du II  au XV  si cle*. *JTS* 24 (1973): 227.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament (3rd ed.)*. London: United Bible Societies, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament (4th ed.)*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1994.
- Metzger, Bruce M., and Bart D. Ehrman. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Mink, Gerd. "Editing and Genealogical Studies: the New Testament," *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 15 (2000): 51–56.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Problems of a Highly Contaminated Tradition: the New Testament." Pages 13–85 in *Studies in Stemmatology II*. Edited by P. van Reenen, A. den Hollander, and Margot van Mulken. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Eine umfassende Genealogie der neutestamentlichen  berlieferung." *NTS* 39 (1993): 481–99.
- Moore, David S., and George P. McCabe. *Introduction to the Practice of Statistics*. 4th ed. New York: Freeman, 2003.
- Moule, C. F. D. *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- Moulton, James H., and Nigel Turner. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. 4 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1906–76.
- Nestle, Eberhard. *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Translated by William Edie. London: Williams & Norgate, 1901. Repr., Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 2001.
- Nolland, John. *Luke*. WBC 35. Nashville: Nelson, 1989.
- Osburn, Carroll. *The Text of the Apostolos in Epiphanius of Salamis*. SBLNTGF 6. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Text of the Pauline Epistles in Hippolytus of Rome." *SecCent* 2 (1982): 97–124.
- Parker, David C. *Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and Its Text*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Comparison between the *Text und Textwert* and the Claremont Profile Method Analyses of Manuscripts in the Gospel of Luke." *NTS* 49 (2003): 108–38.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Principio Project: A Reconstruction of the Johannine Tradition." *FgNT* 13 (2000): 111–18.
- Petzner, J. H. "The History of the New Testament Text: Its Reconstruction, Significance and Use in New Testament Textual Criticism." Pages 11–36 in *New*

- Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Early Church History*. Edited by Barbara Aland and Joël Delobel. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994.
- Plummer, Alfred, *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew*. 10th ed. ICC. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914.
- Rese, Martin. *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas*. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1969.
- Richards, W. Larry. *The Classification of the Greek Manuscripts of the Johannine Epistles*. SBLDS 35. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977.
- . "An Examination of the Claremont Profile Method in the Gospel of Luke: A Study in Text-Critical Methodology." *NTS* 27 (1980): 52–63.
- . "Manuscript Grouping in Luke 10 by Quantitative Analysis." *JBL* 98 (1979): 379–91.
- . "Test Passages or Profiles: A Comparison of Two Text-Critical Methods." *JBL* 115 (1996): 251–69.
- Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. 3rd ed. Nashville: Broadman, 1934.
- Royse, James R. "Scribal Tendencies in the Transmission of the Text of the New Testament." Pages 239–252 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Scrivener, F. H. A. *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament for the Use of Biblical Students*. 4th ed. 2 vols. Edited by Edward Miller. London: Bell, 1894.
- Streeter, Burnett Hillman. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*. London: Macmillan, 1936.
- Sturz, Harry A. *The Byzantine Text-Type and New Testament Textual Criticism*. Nashville: Nelson, 1984.
- Suggs, M. Jack. "The Use of Patristic Evidence in the Search for a Primitive New Testament Text." *NTS* 4 (1957–58): 131–57.
- Taylor, Vincent. *The Gospel according to Mark*. London: Macmillan, 1957.
- Turner, C. H. *The Gospel according to St Mark*. New York: Macmillan, 1931. Vol. 3 in *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*. London: SPCK, 1928.
- Vaganay, Léon, and Christian-Bernard Amphoux. *An Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*. 2nd ed. Translated by Jenny Heimerdinger. English ed. amplified and updated by Amphoux and Heimerdinger. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Willker, Wieland. "A Textual Commentary on the Greek Gospels." 3rd ed. Online: <http://www-user.uni-bremen.de/~wie/TCG>.
- Wisse, Frederik. "The Claremont Profile Method for the Classification of Byzantine New Testament Manuscripts: A Study in Method." Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1968.
- . *The Profile Method for the Classification and Evaluation of Manuscript Evidence, as Applied to the Continuous Greek Text of the Gospel of Luke*. SD 44. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Zuntz, Günther. "The Byzantine Text in New Testament Criticism." *JTS* 43 (1942): 26–28.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum.* Schweich Lectures 1946. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY: STUDIES ON CLEMENT, PATRISTICS, AND EARLY  
CHRISTIANITY

- Allenbach, J. et al., eds. *Biblia patristica: Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique.* Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1975.
- Bardy, G. "Aux origines de l'école d'Alexandrie." *RSR* 27 (1937): 65–90.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Clément d'Alexandrie. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1926.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Pour l'histoire de l'école d'Alexandrie, *Vivre et penser* (1942): 80–109.
- Bauer, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity.* Translated and edited by Robert Kraft et al. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971. Repr., Mifflintown, Pa.: Sigler Press, 1996. Translation of *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum.* 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1964.
- Bell, John. "Statistics for Practical People." Online: <http://proaxis.com/~johnbell/sfpp/sfpp6.htm>.
- Bellinzoni, Arthur J. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr.* Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- Brambillasca, G. "Citations de l'écriture sainte et des auteurs classiques dans le Πο-  
τεπτικός πρὸς Ἑλληνας de Clément d'Alexandrie." *StPatr* 11 (1972): 8–12.
- Broek, Roelof van den. "The Christian 'School' of Alexandria in the Second and Third Centuries." Pages 39–48 in *Centres of Learning.* Edited by Jan Willem Drijvers and Alasdair A. MacDonald. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Brooks, J. A. "Clement of Alexandria as a Witness to the Development of the New Testament Canon." *SecCent* 9 (1992): 41–55.
- Camelot, P. Th. "Clément d'Alexandrie et l'écriture." *RB* 53 (1946): 242–48.
- Campanhausen, Hans von. "Clement of Alexandria." Pages 29–39 in *The Fathers of the Greek Church.* New York: Pantheon, 1959.
- Chadwick, Henry. "Clement of Alexandria." Pages 168–81 in *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy.* Edited by A. H. Armstrong. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Liberal Puritan." Pages 31–65 in *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition: Studies in Justin, Clement, and Origen.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Clark, Elizabeth. *Clement's Use of Aristotle: The Aristotelian Contribution to Clement of Alexandria's Refutation of Gnosticism.* New York: Mellen, 1977.
- Cox, Patricia. *Biography in Late Antiquity: A Quest for the Holy Man.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983.
- Daniélou, Jean. *Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture.* Translated by J. A. Baker. A History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea 2. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Typologie et allégorie chez Clément d'Alexandrie." Pages 50–57 in *Studia patristica 4: Papers Presented to the Third International Conference on Patristic Studies Held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1959.* Edited by Frank Leslie Cross. TU 79. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961.

- Davison, J. E. "Structural Similarities and Dissimilarities in the Thought of Clement of Alexandria and the Valentinians." *SecCent* 3 (1983): 201–17.
- Dawson, David. *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992.
- Edwards, M. J. "Gnostics and Valentinians in the Fathers of the Church." *JTS* 40 (1989): 29–47.
- Faye, Eugène de. *Clément d'Alexandrie: étude sur les rapports du christianisme et de la philosophie grecque au II<sup>e</sup> siècle* 2. 2nd ed. Paris: Leroux, 1906. Repr., Frankfurt: Minerva, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Les 'Stromates' de Clément d'Alexandrie." *RHR* 36 (1897): 307–20.
- Ferguson, John. *Clement of Alexandria*. New York: Twayne, 1974.
- Festugière, A. J. "Notes sur les extraits de Théodote de Clément d'Alexandrie et sur les fragments de Valentin." *VC* 3 (1949): 193–207.
- Fisher, Ronald A. *Statistical Tables*. 6th ed. New York: Hafner, 1963.
- Freund, W. H. C. *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church*. New York: New York University Press, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Rise of Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Früchtel, Ludwig. "Neue Textzeugnisse zu Clemens Alexandrinus." *ZNW* 36 (1937): 81–90.
- Goodspeed, Edgar J. *A History of Early Christian Literature*. Rev. ed. Edited by Robert M. Grant. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Grant, Robert M. "Alexandrian Allegorists." Pages 85–91 in *The Letter and the Spirit*. New York: Macmillan, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Early Alexandrian Christianity." *CH* 40 (1971): 133–44.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Gnosticism and Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Theological Education in Alexandria." Pages in *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*. Edited by Birger A. Pearson and James E. Goehring. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- Haas, Christopher. *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1997.
- Hanson, R. P. C. *Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture*. Richmond: Knox, 1959. Repr. with introduction by J. W. Trigg. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002.
- Harnack, Adolf von. *Die Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*. 2nd ed. Edited by K. Aland. 2 vols. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *History of Dogma*. 7 vols. Translated by Neil Buchanan. New York: Dover, 1961.
- Heussi, Carl. "Die Stromateis des Clemens Alexandrinus und ihr Verhältnis zum Proteptikos und Pädagogos." *ZWT* 45 (1902): 465–512.
- Hoek, Annewies van den. "The Catechetical School of Early Christian Alexandria and Its Philonic Heritage." *HTR* 90 (1997): 59–87.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Clement of Alexandria and His Use of Philo in the Stromateis*. VCSup 3. Leiden: Brill, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Clement of Alexandria on Martyrdom." *StPatr* 26 (1993): 324–41.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Clement and Origen as Sources on 'Non-canonical' Scriptural Traditions during the Late Second and Earlier Third Centuries." Pages 93–113 in *Origen-*

- iana sexta: Origène et la Bible*. Edited by Gilles Dorival and Alain Le Boulluec. Leuven: Peeters, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Divergent Gospel Traditions in Clement of Alexandria and Other Authors of the Second Century." *Apocrypha* 7 (1996): 43–62.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "How Alexandrian Was Clement of Alexandria? Reflections on Clement and His Alexandrian Background." *HeyJ* 31 (1990): 179–94.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria: A View of Ancient Literary Working Methods." *VC* 50 (1996): 223–43.
- Hornschuh, Manfred. "Das Leben des Origenes und die Entstehung der alexandrinischen Schule." *ZKG* 71 (1960): 1–25, 193–214.
- Kannengiesser, Charles. "Clement of Alexandria (CA. 150–215)." Pages 507–15 in vol. 1 of *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity*. Edited by Charles Kannengiesser. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Klijn, A. F. J. "Jewish Christianity in Early Christian Egypt." Pages 161–75 in *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*. Edited by Birger A. Pearson and James E. Goehring. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- Koch, Hugo. "War Klemens von Alexandrien ein Priester." *ZNW* 20 (1921): 43–48.
- Koester, Helmut. "The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century." Pages 19–37 in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century*. Edited by W. L. Petersen. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 3. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- Krause, Wilhelm *Die Stellung der frühchristlichen Autoren zur heidnischen Literatur*. Vienna: Herder, 1958.
- Kutter, Hermann. *Clemens Alexandrinus und das Neue Testament*. Giessen: Richer, 1897.
- Le Boulluec, Alain. *La notion d'hérésie dans la littérature grecque, IIe–IIIe siècles*. Paris: Etudes augustinienes, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "De l'usage de titres 'néotestamentaires' chez Clément d'Alexandrie." Pages 191–202 in *La Formation des canons scripturaires*. Edited by Michel Tardieu. Paris: Cerf, 1993.
- Lilla, Salvatore R. C. *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- McDonald, Lee. *The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*. Rev. ed. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1995.
- McDonald, Lee, and James Sanders, eds. *The Canon Debate*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002.
- Méhat, A. "Apocatastase: Origène, Clément d'Alexandrie, Act. 3,21." *VC* 10 (1956): 196–214.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Etude sur Les 'Stromates' de Clément d'Alexandrie*. PatSor 7. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1966.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.
- Mondésert, Claude. *Clément d'Alexandrie: Introduction à l'étude de sa pensée religieuse à partir de l'écriture*. Paris: Editions Montaigne, 1944.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Le symbolisme chez Clément d'Alexandrie." *RSR* 26 (1936): 158–80.
- Munck, Johannes. *Untersuchungen über Klemens von Alexandria*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933.

- Neiryneck, Franz. "Note on Patristic Testimonies." Pages 605–6 in *The Interrelations of the Gospels*. Edited by David L. Dungan. BETL 95. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990.
- Osborn, Eric F. "Arguments for Faith in Clement of Alexandria." *VC* 48 (1994): 1–24.
- . "Clement and the Bible." Pages 121–32 in *Origeniana sexta: Origène et la Bible*. Edited by Gilles Dorival and Alain Le Boulluec. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1995.
- . "Clement of Alexandria: A Review of Research 1958–1982." *SecCent* 3 (1983): 219–44.
- . *The Philosophy of Clement of Alexandria*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957.
- . "Teaching and Writing in the First Chapters of the Stromateis." *JTS* 10 (1959): 335–43.
- Pagels, Elaine. "The Orthodox against the Gnostic: Confrontation and Interiority in Early Christianity." Pages 61–73 in *The Other Side of God: A Polarity in World Religion*. Edited by Peter Berger. New York: Anchor Books, 1981.
- Patrick, John. *Clement of Alexandria*. The Croall Lecture for 1899–1900. Edinburgh: Blackwood & Sons, 1914.
- Pearson, Birger A. "Earliest Christianity in Egypt: Some Observations." Pages 132–59 in *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*. Edited by Birger A. Pearson and James E. Goehring. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- . *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity*. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Porter, Stanley E. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Procter, Everett. *Christian Controversy in Alexandria: Clement's Polemic against the Basilideans and Valentinians*. American University Studies, Theology and Religion 172. New York: Lang, 1995.
- Roberts, Colin H. *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*. London: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Roberts, Louis. "The Literary Form of the Stromateis." *SecCent* 1 (1984): 211–22.
- Ruwet, J. "Clément d'Alexandrie, Canon des écritures et apocryphes." *Bib* 29 (1948): 77–99, 240–68, 391–408.
- Scholten, Clemens. "Die alexandrinische Katechetenschule." *JAC* 38 (1995): 16–37.
- Smyth, Herbert W. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Stewart, John William. "Doctrinal Influence upon the New Testament Text of Clement of Alexandria." Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1966.
- Titus, Eric L. *The Motivation of Changes Made in the New Testament Text by Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria. A Study in the Origin of New Testament Variation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945.
- Tollinton, R. B. *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Liberalism*. 2 vols. London: Williams & Norgate, 1914.
- Torrance, Thomas F. "The Hermeneutics of Clement of Alexandria." *TS* 7 (1988): 61–105. Repr. as pages 130–78 in idem, *Divine Meaning: Studies in Patristic Hermeneutics*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995.

- Treu, Ursula. "Etymologie und Allegorie bei Klemens von Alexandrien." Pages 191–211 in *Studia patristica 4: Papers Presented to the Third International Conference on Patristic Studies Held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1959*. Edited by Frank Leslie Cross. TU 79. Berlin : Akademie-Verlag, 1961.
- Valentin, Pierre. *Clément d'Alexandrie: Eglise d'hier et d'aujourd'hui*. Paris: Éditions ouvrières, 1963.
- Wagner, Walter. "Another Look at the Literary Problem in Clement of Alexandria." *CH* 37 (1968): 251–60.
- . "A Father's Fate: Attitudes and Interpretations of Clement of Alexandria." *JRH* 7 (1971): 209–31.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Walzer, Richard. *Galen on Jews and Christians*. London: Oxford University Press, 1949.
- Wendland, Paul. Review of Eugène de Faye, *Clément d'Alexandrie: Étude sur les rapports du Christianisme et de la philosophie grecque au IIe siècle*. *TLZ* 25 (1898): 652–58.
- Wilken, Robert. "Alexandria: A School for Training in Virtue." Pages 15–30 in *Schools of Thought in the Christian Tradition*. Edited by Patrick Henry. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Williams, Frank, trans. *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*. 2 vols. NHMS 35–36. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Zahn, Theodor. *Supplementum Clementinum*. Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur. Erlangen: Deichert, 1884.