

MIROSLAV MARCOVICH
University of Illinois
Urbana

UDC 821.14'02(049.3)

THE TEXT OF CLEMENT'S *PAEDAGOGUS*

Paedagogus, Books I-III, is preserved virtually in a single manuscript, the famous codex of Arethas, *Parisinus gr.* 451, copied in 913/14 by the scribe Baanes for Arethas, the archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia (= P¹). Arethas himself served as the corrector of Baanes, and he introduced countless corrections, most probably on his own authority (= P²). The hands of Baanes and Arethas are very similar, and they both use the same brown ink, so that sometimes it becomes difficult to distinguish between their hands¹.

Since almost the entire Book I of *Paedagogus* is lost in P (which starts at 1.96.1), we have to rely on two old apographs of P — M= *Mutinensis Misc. gr.* 126: α.S.5.9, XIth century, and F= *Laurentianus V* 24, XIIth century. But M and F are of value for all three books, for they often correct Baanes' text, and the Hymn to Christ at the closing of Book III is preserved in M and F alone. The indirect tradition of *Paedagogus* is insignificant for the text (*Catena* and *Sacra parallela* by John of Damascus, ed. K. Holl).

The codex of Arethas proves to be a lacunose, corrupt and interpolated manuscript, posing difficult textual problems. The first critical edition of *Paedagogus* was prepared by Otto Stählin in 1905, who meticulously collated P, M and F and provided a rich scholarly apparatus of Clement's sources. His edition, however, is far from being satisfactory, for the editor was not attentive enough to the sense of Clement's text. Stählin himself was aware of the shortcomings of his edition when to the first reprint of it (in 1936) he appended a 12-page long list of *Corrigenda et addenda* (7 additional pages were appended by U. Treu and L. Früchtel to the second reprint, in 1972).

¹ On this codex compare A. Harnack, *Die Überlieferung der griechischen Apologeten...* (T.U. I. 1-2, Leipzig, 1882), 24-36; O. Gebhardt, *Der Arethascodex* (T.U. I. 3, Leipzig, 1883), 154-96; O. Stählin, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, I (G.C.S. 12, Leipzig, 1905), XVI-XXIII; K. Mras, *Eusebius, Praeparatio evangelica* (G.C.S. 43.1, Berlin, 1954), XIII-XVIII; M. Marcovich, *Athenagoras, Legatio pro Christianis* (P.T.S. 31, Berlin, 1990), 15-17.

The French edition of *Paedagogus* by H.-I. Marrou and Cl. Mondésert (Sources chrétiennes 70, 108 et 158; Paris 1960; 1965; 1970) proved to be a disappointment: it is a reprint of Stählin's edition of 1905 (cf. I, p. 94) without any apparatus criticus.

Consequently, a new critical edition of Clement's treatise is a scholarly need. Such a one was provided by me (forthcoming in *Supplements to Vigilae Christianae*, Leiden, E. J. Brill). In what follows I am giving a sample of the textual problems involved.

(1) 1.8.2: Πῶς γὰρ οὐ φιλεῖται (sc. ὁ ἄνθρωπος πρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ), δι' ὃν ὁ μονογενῆς ἐκ κόλπων πατρὸς καταπέμπεται λόγος τῆς πίστεως; [‘H del. Staehlin] πίστις ἐκ περιουσίας αὐτὸς σαφῶς ὁ κύριος ὁμολογῶν καὶ λέγων· "Αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ πατήρ φιλεῖ ὑμᾶς, ὅτι ὑμεῖς ἐμὲ πεφιλήκατε" (Jo. 16:27).

Πίστις does not mean here “faith” but “assurance, guarantee”: Christ (Λόγος, Κύριος) is the main *warranty* of God's love for man. Accordingly the middle sentence should read: Πίστις <δὲ ὢν> ἐκ περιουσίας αὐτὸς σαφῶς ὁ κύριος ὁμολογεῖ καὶ λέγει·

(2) 1.13.3: καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα τούτοις οἰκείως ἐπήγαγεν·

Ἐπάγειν means here simply “to quote”. Thus read: καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα τούτοις <ὅμοια> οἰκείως ἐπήγαγεν.

(3) 1.41.2: Ἡ τροφή δὲ ἡ κατάλληλος αὕτη καὶ πρόσφορος νεοπαγεῖ καὶ νεοφυεῖ παιδίῳ πρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ τροφέως καὶ πατρὸς τῶν γεννωμένων καὶ ἀναγεννωμένων πονουμένη, οἶον τὸ μάννα οὐρανόθεν ἐπερρέετο τοῖς παλαιοῖς Ἑβραίοις, ἡ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἐπουράνιος τροφή (compare *Exod.* 16; *Ps.* 77:25; *Sap.* 16:20).

The author is speaking of the spiritual food for the Christians (called small children), as manifested in the blood of Christ. But the *verbum regens* is missing. Thus read: Ἡ τροφή δὲ αὕτη ἡ κατάλληλος καὶ πρόσφορος νεοπαγεῖ καὶ νεοφυεῖ παιδίῳ πρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ... πονουμένη <ἐπιρρεῖ>, οἶον τὸ μάννα οὐρανόθεν ἐπερρέετο...

(4) 1.44.1: "Ἀποθέμενοι οὖν πᾶσαν κακίαν καὶ πάντα δόλον καὶ τὴν ὑπόκρισιν καὶ φθόνον καὶ καταλαλίαν, ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε..." (1 *Petri* 2:1-2).

Read with NT: τὸ λογικὸν <ἄδολον> γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε. Clement could not have omitted ἄδολον, first because of the preceding δόλον, and second because he alludes to this passage at *Paed.* 2.110.2: ὁ ἄδολος Ἰησοῦς·

(5) 1.62.3: Εἴ τι μισεῖ ὁ λόγος, βούλεται αὐτὸ μὴ εἶναι· οὐδὲν δὲ ἔστιν ὃ μὴ τὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ εἶναι ὁ θεὸς παρέχεται· οὐδὲν ἄρα μισεῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ·

First, Clement is arguing that nothing can exist that God hates. Consequently, the presence of ὁ λόγος (=Christ) is out of place here: read ὁ θεός instead. And second, read οὐδὲν ἄρα <ὄν> μισεῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, “nothing *that exists* is object of God’s hatred”. For that is what *Sapientia* 11:24 says (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄν μισῶν τι κατεσκεύασας), just paraphrased by Clement (Ἦν γὰρ οὐδὲν ὃ μισεῖ ὁ κύριος).

(6) 1.69.3: “Φόβος γὰρ κυρίου ἀπωθεῖται ἀμαρτήματα, ἄφοβος δ’ οὐ δυνήσεται δικαιωθῆναι, “φησὶν ἡ γραφή (*Sirac.* 1:21-22). Καὶ τὴν κόλασιν ὁ θεὸς οὐχ ὑπὸ ὀργῆς ἐπιφέρει, ἀλλὰ τὸ δίκαιον σκοπεῖ, ὡς οὐ συμφέρει παραλειφθῆναι τὸ δίκαιον δι’ ἡμᾶς.

Read ἄδικος φορ ἄφοβος, as in LXX, for Clement is now moving to the topic of τὸ δίκαιον (justice), as it is witnessed by the next sentence.

(7) 1.96.2: Τὸ μὲν οὖν μέλι γλυκύτερον ὄν χολῆς ἐστι γεννητικόν, ὡς τὸ ἀγαθὸν καταφρονήσεως, ὃ δὴ αἴτιον τοῦ ἐφαμαρτάνειν· τὸ δὲ νᾶπυ καὶ τῆς χολῆς μειωτικόν, τουτέστι τοῦ θυμοῦ, καὶ τοῦ φλέγματος διακοπτικόν, τουτέστι τοῦ τύφου·

It is the *excess* of wellbeing that causes arrogance (καταφρόνησις, τύφος). Consequently, read τὸ ἀγαθὸν <ἄγαν>.

(8) 2.8.4: “οὐδὲ τὰ εἰσιόντα κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐφιόντα τοῦ στόματος” (Mt 15:11).

Obviously τὰ εἰσιόντα <εἰς τὸ στόμα> κοινοῖ should be read with NT, as it is quoted by Clement twice: *Paed.* 2.16.3 and *Stromata* 2.50.2.

(9) 2.16.4: ἐπεὶ αἱ μὲν ἀκρότητες σφαλεραί, αἱ μεσότητες δὲ ἀγαθαί· Μέσον δὲ ἐστὶ πᾶν τὸ ἀνευδεὲς τῶν ἀναγκαίων· αἱ γὰρ κατὰ φύσιν ὀρέξεις αὐταρκεῖα περιορίζονται·

Evidently, read πᾶν τὸ ἀνευδεὲς τῶν <οὐκ> ἀναγκαίων, as it is confirmed by αὐταρκεῖα.

(10) 2.32.4: “Ἦλθεν γάρ”, φησὶν, “ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ λέγουσιν· Ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, τελωνῶν φίλος” (Mt 11: 19; Lc 7:34).

Without the addition ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου <ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων>, καὶ λέγουσιν from NT the text remains senseless. Kurt Aland’s *Synopsis of the Four Gospels* does not show that the words were dropped by anybody.

(11) 2.53.4: “Μακάριος” ὡς ἀληθῶς “ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ὀλίσθησεν ἐν στόματι αὐτοῦ καὶ κατενύγη ἐν λύπῃ ἀμαρτίας” (*Sirac.* 14:1), ἦτοι μετανοήσας ἐφ’ οἷς λαλήσας ἤμαρτεν ἢ ἐν τῷ μηδένα λυπήσαι λαλήσας·

After ἤμαρτεν ἢ there is a small lacuna hiding another participle. My guess is that the omitted word is ἡσθεῖς.

(12) 2.58.1: Ἐγὼ δ' ἂν μοι δοκῶ καὶ μέτρον ἐπιθεῖναι φωνῆς τοῖς σὺφροσιν, οἷς γε ἐφείται λαλεῖν, τὸν ἀντιδιαλεγόμενον.

First, read μέτρον <δεῖν> ἐπιθεῖναι. Second, τὸν ἀντιδιαλεγόμενον must be corrupt, since ὁ ἀντιδιαλεγόμενος cannot be identified with μέτρον φωνῆς (“your adversary is the measure of what you say”). Consequently, read: λαλεῖν, <ὡς καὶ> τῷ ἀντιδιαλεγόμενῳ, “and the same measure should be imposed on your adversary.”

(13) 2.62.5: γέγονεν ὁ αὐτὸς (sc. ὁ Ἰούδας) ὑποκριτὴς καὶ φίλημα δεδολωμένον ἔχων, ἄλλον παλαιὸν μιμούμενος ὑποκριτὴν καὶ τὸν λαὸν ἐλέγχων ἐκείνον: “Ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χεῖλεσι φιλοῦσί με, ἡ δὲ καρδιά αὐτῶν πορρωτέρω ἐστὶν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ” (Is. 29:13).

Read τοῖς χεῖλεσι τιμῶσί με, as in LXX and as quoted by Clement himself three times (*Paed.* 1. 76. 4; *Stromata* 2.61.3 and 4.32.4). The presence of φιλοῦσί με can be easily explained by the influence of “the kiss of Judas” from the preceding sentence.

(14) 2.71.1: τρυφᾶν δὲ ἡμῖν (sc. τοῖς Χριστιανοῖς), ὡς ἐν παραδείσῳ, προσῆκεν σωφρόνως τῷ ὄντι παρεπομένοις τῇ γραφῇ.

To follow the Scripture with real continence is nonsensical to say. Read instead: τῷ ὄντι <ζῶσι,> παρεπομένοις τῇ γραφῇ, “if we live in true self-restraint, while following the Scripture”.

(15) 2.77.3: ... καὶ ὁ ἐν τοῖς κλινιδίοις “ἐλέφας ἀπολειπότος ψυχὴν σώματος οὐκ εὐαγὲς” ἀγίοις ἀνθρώποις ἀναπαύσεως τέχνασμα βλακικόν.

Εὐαγὲς needs a noun; it cannot be τέχνασμα, which has its own epithet βλακικόν. Since Clement is quoting Plato, *Laws* 12, 956 a 1, the answer is at hand: the omitted noun is ἀνάθημα, “a bier made of ivory is not a holy offering for a body bereft of the soul.” This is confirmed by the presence of ἀνάθημα in the same quotation at *Stromata* 5.76.3. Thus read: οὐκ εὐαγὲς <ἀνάθημα>, ἀγίοις <δ'> ἀνθρώποις ἀναπαύσεως τέχνασμα βλακικόν.

(16) 2.110.1: ...τὴν Ἀρετὴν, αἰδοῖ μόνη κεκοσμημένην (τοιαύτην εἶναι χρὴ τὴν πίστιν, ἐνάρετον μετ' αἰδοῦς), θατέραν δὲ τοῦναντίον εἰσάγει (sc. Πρόδικος ὁ Κεῖος), τὴν Κακίαν, περιττῇ μὲν ἐσθῆτι ἡμφιεσμένην, ἄλλοτρίῳ δὲ χρώματι γεγανωμένην...

Πίστιν is a correction of Arethas, Baanes had written πιστήν, and that is the correct reading. A “virtuous faith” (πίστις ἐνάρετος)

is nonsensical, while ἡ πιστή is simply “a Christian woman.” Clement is dealing here with an ideal Christian woman. She should be like Prodicus’ Virtue, not Vice (=84 A 2 Diels-Kranz; Xenoph. *Memorab.* 2.1.27-34).

(17) 3.9.1: Φιλεῖ δέ πως τὸ μὴ λανθάνον δι’ αἰσχύνην τῶν ἐλέγχων ἀφίστασθαι τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων·

Read τὸ μὴ λανθάνειν <δυνατὸν> δι’... “Somehow what cannot be concealed often abstains from sinning out of shame from reproaches.”

(18) 3.20.1: Οὐδ’ ὀπωσιοῦν ἐκτιλτέον παρα τὴν προαίρεσιν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ἐγκατηριθμημένην τῷ αὐτοῦ θελήματι·

Evidently, we should read: τὴν ἐγκατηριθμημένην <τρίχρα> τῷ αὐτοῦ θελήματι, since Clement is hinting at Mt. 10:30, just quoted (3.19.4): “Ἄλλὰ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν πάσαι ἠριθμημένοι.”

(19) 3.22.1: Ταῦτα οἱ σοφοὶ τῶν νόμων ἐπιτρέπουσιν· ἔξεστιν αὐτοῖς ἀμαρτεῖν κατὰ νόμον...

Clement is criticizing the tolerance of prostitution by Greek legislators (οἱ σοφοὶ is employed ironically). Thus read: οἱ σοφοὶ τῶν νο<μοθετ>ῶν ἐπιτρέπουσιν, as it is supported by 3.23.1: “Ἀγαμαὶ τοὺς παλαιοὺς Ῥωμαίων νομοθέτας.

(20) 3.35.3: “Ἐμὲ καρπίζεσθαι ὑπὲρ χρυσίον καὶ λίθον καὶ ἄργυρον· τὰ γὰρ ἐμὰ γενήματα κρείττω ἀργυρίου ἐκλεκτοῦ” (*Prov.* 8:19).

Read with LXX: καὶ ἀργύριον <βέλτιον>· τὰ γὰρ ἐμὰ γενήματα κρείττω...

(21) 3.37.1: Φύσει γὰρ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὑψηλὸν ἐστὶ ζῶον καὶ γαῦρον καὶ τοῦ καλοῦ ζητητικόν, ἅτε τοῦ μόνου <καλοῦ suppl. Staehlin> δημιούργημα, ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ γαστέρα αὐτῷ βίος ἄσεμνός τε καὶ ἐπονειδιστός καὶ εἰδεχθῆς καὶ καταγέλαστος.

Stählin’s supplement καλοῦ cannot be correct, for the expression “man is the creation of the only Beautiful one (i.e. God)” cannot be paralleled. The missing word is simply θεοῦ, as it is confirmed by 2.5.1: τὸν θεὸν παρασκευάσαι τῷ δημιουργήματι, τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ λέγω, σῖτα καὶ ποτὰ...

(22) 3.44.1: Οἱ Σοδομίται ὑπὸ πολλῆς τρυφῆς ἐξοκείλαντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν, μοιχεύοντες μὲν ἀδεῶς, περὶ <δὲ add. Wendland> τὰ παιδικὰ ἐκμανῶς ἐπτοημένοι...

A *verbum regens* is missing: read ἐξώκειλαν for ἐξοκείλαντες. The scribe got carried away by the participles.

(23) 3.46.2: Περιττὸν δὲ τὸ τῆς ἀλέας, ἐξὸν δὴ (scripsi: δὲ P) καὶ ἄλλως παραμυθεῖσθαι τὸ κατεσκληκὸς ὑπὸ κρύους·

Read: τὸ κατεσκληκὸς ὑπὸ κρύους <σῶμα>. The word σῶμα recurs at 3.46.3.

(24) 3.49.5: "... χεῖρας δὲ αὐτῆς διήνοιξεν πένητι (sc. γυνὴ ἀνδρεία), καρπὸν δὲ ἐξέτεινεν πτωχῶ" (*Prov.* 31:20)· τὴν καλλίστην (Stählin : μάλιστα P) διακονίαν οὐκ ἐπησχύνθη ζηλώσασα Σάρραν, ὑπουργῆσαι τοῖς ὀδοιπόροις.

Stählin's καλλίστην for μάλιστα is violent. Read instead: τὴν <γάρ> μάλιστα <ἀξίαν> διακονίαν.

(25) 3.53.2: ... ἄγει καὶ φέρει πρὸς σωτηρίαν (sc. ὁ Παιδαγωγὸς) τὸν ἵππον τὸν ἀνθρώπειον, τὸ ἄλογον μέρος τῆς ψυχῆς τὸ περὶ ἡδονὰς καὶ ὀρέξεις ἐπιψόγους καὶ λίθους καὶ χρυσίον καὶ ἐσθῆτα ποικίλην καὶ τὴν ἄλλην χλιδὴν ἐκθηριούμενον·

Read: τὸ ... ἐκθηριούμενον <χαλινῶν>. The verb recurs at 3.53.7: χαλινωτέον δὲ τὰς ἀλόγους τῶν ὀρμῶν.

(26) 3.57.1: Δίδωσιν οὖν αὐταῖς (sc. ταῖς γυναίξιν) δακτύλιον ἐκ χρυσοῦ ... Εἰ γὰρ οἱ πάντες ἦσαν παιδαγωγούμενοι, οὐδεν τῶν σφραγίδων ἔδει, ἐπ' ἴσης ὄντων δικαίων καὶ οἰκετῶν καὶ δεσποτῶν· ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ ἀπαιδευσία πολλὴν ἐνδίδωσι ροπήν εἰς ἀδικίαν, σφραγίδων ἐδεήθημεν·

First, read: Δίδωσιν οὖν αὐταῖς <ὁ παιδαγωγὸς> δακτύλιον and compare: Δίδωσιν οὖν ἡμῖν ὁ παιδαγωγὸς ἐσθῆτι χρῆσθαι τῇ λιτῇ. Second, read: οἱ πάντες ἦσαν <θεῶ> παιδαγωγούμενοι, since Clement is not dealing with any education but with the divine one. This is confirmed by 3.58.3: τοῖς θεῶ μὲν παιδαγωγούμενοις, θεῶ δὲ εἰσπεποιημένοις.

(27) 3.61.1: ... τὰς δὲ τοῦ γενείου (sc. τρίχας) μηδέν τι παραλυπούσας οὐκ ἐνοχλητέον, σεμνότητα μὲν τοῦ προσώπου [καὶ] καταπλήξεως (Stählin: καὶ κατάπληξιν P) γεννητικὴν ἐμποιούσας.

Stählin's change of καὶ κατάπληξιν in [καὶ] καταπλήξεως may be supported by 3.35.4: ἔξωθεν κεχρισμένοι (sc. τινὲς γυναῖκες) καταπληκτικῶς εἰς σεμνότητα, τὰ ἔνδον ἄθλιοι. But the solution of Joseph B. Mayor (read γενναίαν for γεννητικὴν) is simpler. The γενναία κατάπληξις is a "genuine amazement" (cf. 3.23.2 τὸ γένειον, τὸ κάλλος τὸ σύμφυτον, τὸ γενναῖον κάλλος).

(28) 3.66.3: ... "ὑποτασσομένας (sc. τὰς γυναῖκας) τοῖς ἰδίους ἀνδράσιν, ὡς καὶ εἴ τινες ἀπειθοῖεν τῷ λόγῳ, διὰ τῆς τῶν γυναικῶν ἀναστροφῆς ἀνευ λόγου κερδηθήσονται, ἐποπτεύσαντες τὴν ἐν λόγῳ ἀγνὴν ἀναστροφήν ὑμῶν· ὦν ἔστω οὐχ ὁ ἔξωθεν

ἐμπλοκῆς καὶ περιθέσεως ξρυσίων ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων κόσμος, ἀλλ' ...“ (1 *Petri* 3:1-4).

Obviously, we should read with NT ἐποπτεύσαντες τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν, since the scribe was under the influence of the preceding τῷ λόγῳ and ἄνευ λόγου. Moreover, again with NT, we should supplement ἔξωθεν ἐμπλοκῆς <τριχῶν> καὶ...

(29) 3.69.2: “Μέλι γὰρ ἀποστάζει ἀπὸ χειλέων γυναικὸς πόρνης, ἢ πρὸς χάριν λαλοῦσα λιπαίνει σὸν φάρυγγα...” (Prov. 5:3).

Λαλοῦσα is an explanatory gloss to be deleted: it is absent both in LXX and at *Stromata* 1.29.6.

(30) 3.80.3: ... μᾶλλον δὲ ἐλέγχονται, τὴν ἐπίπλαστον ἀποθέμενοι τῆς σεμνότητος ὑπόκρισιν, οἳ οἶοντες ἐλελήθεσαν.

Clement speaks of the hypocritical Christians sinning again as soon as they leave the church. Read: ἐλέγχονται <εἶναι>... οἳ οἶοντες ἐλελήθεσαν.

(31) 3.80.4: τοῦτο δὴ ἄδοντες καὶ ἀντάδοντες αὐτοὶ (sc. the hypocritical Christians) οἱ πρόσθεν ἐξυμνοῦντες ἀθανασίαν, ἐπὶ τέλει τὴν ἐξωλεστάτην κακοὶ κακῶς ψάλλοντες παλινωδίαν· “Φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν· αὔριον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκομεν” (1 *Cor.* 15:32).

Again, the scribe was carried away by participles: read ψάλλουσι for ψάλλοντες.

(32) 3.83.3: “Μὴ τις ἡμᾶς μωμήσῃται· προνοούμενοι γὰρ καλὰ οὐ μόνον ἐνώπιον κυρίου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνώπιον ἀνθρώπων” (2 *Cor.* 8:20-21).

Read with NT: προνοοῦμεν γὰρ καλὰ...

(33) 3.88.3: Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ διαιρετικώτερον τὸ φιλάνθρωπον τοῦ παιδαγωγοῦ διὰ τῶν ποικίλων καὶ σωτηρίων ἐντολῶν παραθετέον, ὡς ἔχοιμεν πρὸς ἀφθόνου σωτηρίας καὶ τῆς διατάξεως τῶν γραφῶν ἐτοιμοτέραν τὴν εὔρεσιν.

This is the text of P. The word σωτηρίας is out of place. Stählin's solution is drastic and unconvincing: πρὸς ἀφθόνου διατάξεως τῶν γραφῶν καὶ τῆς σωτηρίας ἐτοιμοτέραν τὴν εὔρεσιν. For “a plentiful distribution of the Scriptures” (ἀφθονος διάταξις τῶν γραφῶν) is nonsensical.

The original text was: πρὸς ἀφθόνου χορηγίας, “through the abundant (God's) assistance”. The presence of σωτηρίας may be explained by the influence of the preceding σωτηρίων. The suggested solution may be strongly supported by *Protrept.* 70.1 (Πόθεν ἢ τῶν λόγων ἀφθονος χορηγία τὴν θεοσέβειαν μαντεύεται;) and *Stro-*

mata 2.86.1 (τοῦ θεοῦ... τοῦ πᾶσιν ἀφθόνως χορηγούντος τὰς τροφάς).

(34) 3.93.3: Τὴν δὲ μετάνοιαν τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ ἀσπάζεται, τὴν ἐπομένην ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις μετάνοιαν ἀγαπῶν· μόνος γὰρ ἀναμάρτητος αὐτὸς ὁ λόγος·

Read μεταβολὴν for the second μετάνοιαν.

(35) 3.97.3: Πολλὰ δὲ καὶ δι' αἰνιγμάτων, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ διὰ παραβολῶν τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν ἕξεστιν ἔφελεῖσθαι.

Read: διὰ παραβολῶν <εἰρημένα> τοῖς and compare *Stromata* 5.32.1: τὰ δι' αἰνιγμάτων εἰρημένα·

(36) 3.98.2: ... ὁ ἰώμενος ἡμῶν καὶ σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν, τὸν <ἀ>ἴδιον ἄνθρωπον, Ἰησοῦς...

Ἄϊδιον is Wilamowitz's emendation of the transmitted ἴδιον, accepted by Stählin (who in his turn suggested ὄλον with reference to 1.6.2 ὄλον τὸ πλάσμα). But the transmitted ἴδιον is correct. Man is called "Jesus' own man" because man is His creation, as is confirmed by *Stromata* 7.21.4: τὸ ἴδιον γέννημα.

(37) 3.101.3: ... καλῶς ἂν ἔχοι ἡμᾶς... μισθὸν εὐχαριστίας δικαίας κατάλληλον ἀστείου παιδαγωγίας αἶνον ἀναπέμψαι κυρίῳ.

Read: μισθὸν εὐχαριστίας δικαίας <ἀποδόντας> κατάλληλον... and compare *Protrept.* 115.1: ἀποδῶμεν καὶ μὴ δεομένῳ (sc. θεῷ) μισθὸν εὐχάριστον εὐπαθείας...

(38) Clement's treatise closes with a Hymn to Christ consisting of 66 brief anapestic lines. Verses 29-32 read:

[ἡγοῦ del. Bouvy]
 Προβάτων λογικῶν
 ποιμὴν ἅγιε,
 ἡγοῦ, βασιλεῦ
 παίδων ἀνεπάφων.

Ἄνεπάφων is against the meter. Read ἀπαλῶν instead and compare 1.19.3: Ἦπιος οὖν ὁ νήπιος καὶ ταῦτῃ μᾶλλον ἀταλός, ἀπαλός καὶ ἀπλοῦς καὶ ἄδολος καὶ ἀνυπόκριτος...; 1.19.4: ἀταλοὶ δὲ ἡμεῖς οἱ ἀπαλοὶ πρὸς πειθῶ... The corruption progressed as follows: ἀπαλῶν > ἐπαλῶν > ἐπάφων > ἀνεπάφων.

(39) Scholia in M and F have preserved another Hymn to Christ, this time a spurious Byzantine piece of poetry consisting of 28 iambic trimeters. Lines 13-16 (addressed to Christ) in Stählin's edition read:

- ἔδειξας αὐτὸς ἡμέραν τε καὶ φάος
καὶ τὸν πολοῦσιν ἄστρα νημερτῆ δρόμον,
15 εἰπὼν θ', ὅποι γῆ καὶ θάλασσα προσμένοι,
τροπῶν τε καιρὸν εὐστόχως δῆσας κύκλω...

These lines are full of scribal errors. First, in line 13 ἔδειξας is W. Dindorf's emendation of the transmitted ὁ δείξας, which should be kept. Second, in line 14 πολοῦσιν ἄστρα is nonsensical. R. Jacobs was right when suggesting πόλου for πολοῦσιν. Thus read the line: καὶ τὸν πόλου γ' ἄστροισι νημερτῆ δρόμον. Finally, in line 15 εἰπὼν θ' is Stählin's emendation of the transmitted εἶτω θ'. But the emendation ἐνταῦθ', suggested by J. Fell (in 1683) is correct. Furthermore, the verb προσμένοι means here "to be attached to, to cling to" and requires a dative. Consequently, read the line: ἐνταῦθ' ὅπου τῇ γῆ θάλασσα προσμένοι. When τῇ was dropped somebody added καὶ.