

IN THE WORKSHOP OF A PREACHER-SCHOLAR?
CHRISTIAN JOTTINGS ON AN OSLO PARCHMENT¹

P.Oslo inv. 1668²

26.5 × 7 cm

V/VI

Provenance unknown

A rectangular parchment strip which bears writing in brown ink by the same hand on both sides. The quality of the writing surface is low. It is so thin that the ink has at places penetrated through to the other side affecting legibility primarily on the flesh side. A crescent-shaped hole at the edge of one of the long sides is due to original construction deficiency; the affected area has been avoided by the scribe who otherwise seems to have been at pains to exploit the entire available surface leaving virtually no margins and a minimum of blank spaces. Physical damage is otherwise restricted to a few small holes.

The hair side preserves 50 ll. of text, while 51 ll. have been preserved on the flesh side. On both sides part of the writing runs at an 180° angle in relation to the rest of the text. After having written 35 ll. of text on the hair side the scribe has turned the sheet upside down and written in opposite direction covering nearly the entire blank space from the top of the sheet to the conclusion of the text already there. On the flesh side 37 ll. have been written in one direction, three lines (68b–70b) have been added in the margin to the right ca. midway through this text, while the rest (ll. 88–101) run in opposite direction. Structurally, the writing is articulated in a variety of ways. End of section is usually signalled by the fact that a formulation is concluded at mid-line. Some sections are delimited by *paragraphoi* or, in some cases, by longish horizontal delimiting lines (more specifically, between ll. 10–11, 27–8, 52–3, 67–8, 70–1, 76–7, 86–7, 98–99 as well as to the left and below 68b–70b). Other articulating devices include a wedge (ll. 31–2), short gaps at mid-line (ll. 3, 9, 15, 18, 25, 43, 54, 56, 65, 69, 96) occasionally filled with an oblique stroke (ll. 3 and 43), and gaps below line (of ca. 3 ll. below l. 45 and of ca. 2 ll. below l. 50). A middle stop has been used once (l. 6).

The wording and the presence of *nomina sacra* (ll. 6, 26, 46, 48–9, 60, 78, 89) point to a Christian product. We have not been able to establish a single thematic thread running through the entire text. The transitions are so abrupt that it seems to us that we are not dealing with a coherent text but with an array of sentences and formulations – some incomplete, even partly incomprehensible – which do not seem to cohere into a textual entity. Theological topics addressed include: eucharist (ll. 20–5), conversion and ascent to God (ll. 45–9 and 51–2), conversion and baptism (ll. 51–2 and 58), man as a creature in the image of God (ll. 73–6). The latter topic is phrased in a manner that indicates that the author of the text may be placed at the interface of Christianity and Neoplatonism (see commentary). Ethical *topoi* include the comforting presence of friends (ll. 64–5), combating evil through fear of punishment (ll. 90–3), being harmed by friends as opposed to being harmed by enemies (ll. 94–8). Our tentative interpretative proposal is that the Oslo parchment furnishes a view of a Christian scholar at work scribbling notes in the manner of a rough draft and trying out formulations while working with another text, perhaps even more than one text.

The rhetorical features in some formulations (rhetorical question ll. 3–6, antithesis ll. 34–5, alliteration and polyptoton l. 38, parallelism and rhyming ll. 45–7, antithesis ll. 51–2, division ll. 68–9, chiasm and repetition of key-terms ll. 73–6, alliteration ll. 71–2) suggest that the text to which these jottings have contributed towards may have been compiled with the aim of convincing and impressing, thus pointing to a sermon, an exegetical or doctrinal work. A couple of passages (primarily ll. 68–9, perhaps also ll. 32–5) could indicate that the text was a sermon intended for oral delivery in front of an audience. However, some markedly classicising formulations (see next paragraph), do not tally well with the oral delivery hypothesis

¹ The editors extend sincere thanks to Prof. C. E. Römer for constructive feedback and for drawing our attention to the P.Oxy. parchments. We also thank Gunn Haaland, curator of the papyrus collection of the Oslo University Library, for permission to publish and to include a photo of the fragment with the edition, and Andrea Gasparini for technical assistance.

² Purchased by H. Ludin Jansen from Nahman junior (Cairo) in January 1954, see <http://ub-fmsserver.uio.no/Acquisition.html>.

and indicate that the final composition may have been a written text with certain literary aspirations, a work intended for publication and reading rather than for aural consumption. As to the order in which the four main parts of the text (hair side ll. 1–35, hair side ↑ ll. 36–50, flesh side ll. 51–87, flesh side ↑ ll. 88–101) were composed, the denouement-like formulation at ll. 34–5 suggests a closure, something which tallies well with the fact that the scribe turns the leaf upside down to continue. Moreover, a thematic link may be detected between ll. 45–9 (end of hair side ↑) and 51ff. (beginning of flesh side), which may also suggest a relation of continuation.

The Greek is fairly competent (note the use of a potential optative in ll. 3–4, the use of the rather uncommon dative form $\phi\epsilon\iota\delta\omicron\iota$ at l. 54 etc.), though not always correct (judging it according to the classical norm at least). Iotacism (ll. 18, 29, 44, 55, 73, 76, 78, 82) and hypercorrection (ll. 12 and 76) are frequent features of the spelling. Phonological features include the interchanges: $\alpha\iota > \epsilon$ (ll. 56 and 99), $\eta > \epsilon$ and vice versa (l. 44) as well as $\omega > o$ (ll. 65–6). Moreover, the scribe declines an $-\acute{\alpha}\omega$ contract verb according to the $-\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ paradigm (ll. 32–3) and commits some errors of syntax (ll. 2, 14, 66). On balance his linguistic capabilities appear uneven.

The letters, small and drawn with speed and confidence, are often connected though never ligatured. The hand is a variant of the inclined ogival majuscule of the early Byzantine period. It shows similarities with P.Oxy. XIII 1614 (V/ second half, assigned), photo in Cavallo and Maehler 1987, no. 20b and PVindob. G 25949v 30ff. (mid-VI), photo in Cavallo and Maehler 1987, no. 31b. We are inclined to assign it to the late fifth/early sixth century. Trema, mostly inorganic, is noted above Y and I (ll. 2, 14, 41–2, 43, 58, 69b–70b, 92). Abbreviations include: $\kappa(\acute{\alpha}\iota)$ albeit not consistently, infinitive ending $-\sigma\theta(\alpha\iota)$ and final v as a superscript stroke. Elision is marked with apostrophe in the case of conjunctions (ll. 6, 40, 51). For the rest it is sometimes effected but not marked and sometimes not effected at all (compare ll. 48 and 49).

It seems to us that the Oslo parchment shows some remarkable affinities with a number of Christian texts of similar date, above all P.Monts.Roca inv. 995, P.Monts.Roca inv. 65³, P.Monts.Roca inv. 722 and P.Monts.Roca inv. 731.⁴ Points of similarity with the above texts include: firstly, that we are dealing with vertical parchment strips used as loose sheets; secondly, from the point of view of content the incoherent nature of the writing held by all those pieces.⁵ Moreover, in our opinion the hand of the Oslo text shows a remarkable similarity with the hand of P.Monts.Roca inv. 731. We have, however, not identified in the text on the Oslo parchment quotations, as is the case with the Montserrat parchments. As, however, more patristic texts are entered in the TLG the identification of citations on the Oslo fragment may still be an open possibility, as has been the case with the Montserrat fragments.⁶ At any rate, numerous formulations on the Oslo parchment recur in other early Christian texts (see commentary). Given that the Montserrat fragments were acquired by father Ramòn Roca-Puig in Egypt around the same time when the Oslo parchment was purchased, we would like to raise the question whether all these fragments have a common provenance. Other *comparanda* on rectangular parchment strips include: (i) P.Köln VI 256 (VI), penned in a similar hand. The meaning of this Christian piece of writing is “schwer zu erfassen”, to quote its editor; its conclusion (ll. 22–5), at any rate, does not appear to constitute a continuation of the thoughts and formulations which precede it, and (ii) P.Oxy. LXXV 5023 (mid- to late VI) preserving on the flesh side a *chairetismos* to the Virgin, continued onto the hair side after the sheet has been turned over head to foot; this text is followed by a cento of Psalm verses the conclusion of which partly overlaps with another text, written at 180°, starting with the prayer of Zacharias. The similarity with the Oslo parchment pertains to the way in which the text is handled and the fact that the same parchment slip houses different, yet thematically related, shorter texts. The parchment slip seems to have been a favourite format in early Byzantine Egypt as

³ Ed. pr. of P.Monts.Roca inv. nos. 995 and 65 in Torallas Tovar and Worp 2007.

⁴ Ed. pr. of P.Monts.Roca inv. nos. 722 and 731 in Torallas Tovar and Worp forthcoming. We are grateful to our colleagues who very kindly made available their editions and photos of the two parchments ahead of publication.

⁵ Compare Torallas Tovar and Worp 2007, 1024.

⁶ The quotation from Hippolytus’ *De Benedictionibus Isaaci et Iacobi* in P.Monts.Roca inv. 65v has been identified after the ed. pr. See Hagedorn, Torallas Tovar and Worp 2007. The editor of P.Monts.Roca inv. 731 comments on the lack of quotations and parallels for parts of the flesh side, see Torallas Tovar and Worp forthcoming, p. 751.

indicated also by P.Oxy. LXXV 5024 (VI/VII) a prayer to the Lord as well as an unpublished Coptic fragment, P.Lips. inv. 316 (TM no. 112402), as mentioned by the editor of the P.Oxy. pieces. The text of the Oslo parchment, however, as well as the Montserrat fragments display a more advanced degree of sophistication compared with the Köln and Oxford parchments.

Recto: Hair

μή με
 ὑστερέσης εἰς φιλάτης
 ὁμιλίας / πῶς οὖν οὐκ ἂν δι-
 ὠξαιμεν τοσοῦτον ἀγαθὸν
 ᾧ παραπλήσιον ο(ὐ)χ ὅπως ἡμεῖς 5
 τι δυνάμεθα; ἀλλ' οὐδὲ θεός τι
 τοιοῦτον ἕτερον δίδωσιν
 διπλάσιοί ἐσμεν τῇ προθυ-
 μίᾳ [] σωτήριος δουλεία
 ζῶσις νοεροῖς 10
 —
 μαρτυρεῖ τῷδε τῷ θε-
 λήματι τοῦ ἀληθ(ε)ϊνοῦ
 δεσπότης ἀποθνήσκων
 ὑπὲρ τοῦ μή καὶ παραβαίνων
 αὐτό [] ταῦτα μὲν οὖν εἰ ἀσεβῆς 15
 κ(αὶ) ἀλλότριος ὁ δεσπότης εἶη
 ὁ δὲ ἀποστολικὸς λόγος πρὸς τοὺς
 ἐν πίστ(ε)ι διαλέγεται [] διὸ κ(αὶ) πρὸς
 τοὺς δεσπότης λέγει
 προχυθὲν μετὰ τοῦ ῥήματος 20
 τῆς πίστεως ἀναλογῶν
 μέτο(ι)χοι κ(αὶ) τοῦ σώματος
 αὐτοῦ καθιστάμεθα τὴν ἁγίαν
 εἰκόνα τοῦ σώματος τροφήν
 προσφερόμενοι [] κ(αὶ) οὕτως εἰς 25
 ἐν σώμα αὐτῷ καὶ πν(εύμα)τι προσκολ-
 λώμεθα
 —
 οὕτω δὲ μεγάλου κ(αὶ) θείου
 παραδ(ε)ίγματος ἐξήρτ[]ησεν
 ἀλλὰ μή τοί γε τὸ τιμιώτερον 30
 παντάπασιν ἡμελημένον
 >
 ἐκπλήξειν τοῖς ἀκροουμέ-
 νοις ἐπὶ τῇ θεῖᾳ συνέσει κ(αὶ) νῷ
 δῆλα δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰρημένων
 καὶ τὰ ἐσιωπημένα 35

At 180° in relation to the text above
 καὶ τὸν πένητα γυμνὸν τῶν
 πάντων κατέστησεν
 παράνομα παρανόμοις προσθεῖς
 δίκην οὐδεμίαν οὐδεπόποτε γυ-

μνάσας ἀλλ' ἐκ νέας ἡλικίας ἀπραγμοσύ- νη συμβεβιωκῶς ἠνάγκασται προσιέ- ναι τοῖς νόμοις καὶ τα(ῦ)θ' αὐτὸν παροδύρε- σθ(αι) / ὧν ἡ χάρις ὑπερον ἀφηρέ- θη ἠνίκα καὶ τῆς λατρ(ε)ίας ἀφερήθησαν (blank space, 3 ll.)	40
ἐν τῇ ἐνεργῶ πίττει ἐν τῇ πρὸς θ(εὸ)ν ἀπὸ εἰδώλων μετατάσει ἐν ἧ τῇ πρὸς ἄκρον ἀναβάσει τῇ διὰ ὑ(ιο)ῦ πρὸς τὸν π(ατέ)ρα κ(αὶ) οὐκέ- τι δι' ἀγγέλων ἐπὶ θ(εὸ)ν (blank space, 2 ll.)	45
τοῦ θείου λόγου κοσμούμενον	50
Verso: Flesh	
ἴν' ἐπιτρέφοντες ἐν λόγῳ μὴ λυπηθῶσιν ἐν ἔργῳ — κάλλιτον δὲ αὐτοῦ κ(αὶ) σύμφωνον φ'εἶδοι [] ὅπερ ἀφήρει τῆς ἐξουσία ^ς τὸ φοβερὸν τῇ τῆς ὠφελ(ε)ίας ἐνδ(ε)ί- ξει γλυκενομένης [] οὐκέτι προσ- δεχόμενοι τὴν ἐν παρουσίᾳ χρηστότη- τα ὅπερ εἶχον ἐλπίζειν ἐν ὕδασι πολλῇ τι τῇ φιλοστοργίᾳ πείθων αὐτοὺς ἐπιμαρτυρῆσει τοῦ θ(εο)ῦ κ(αὶ) τὴν φειδῶ τὴν περὶ αὐτοὺς ἐμφα- νίζων εἰ φοβερὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐγένετο πα- ραγενόμενος φίλων καλῶν οὖν παρου- σία γλυκὴ [] σωτῆρ ὀρθῶς ὀνο- μασμένος πλήρεις ἀγιασμοῖς προσφιλοῦς γὰρ οἱ λόγοι — ἀμφοτέροις ἢ ἐπιθυμία ἔμοιγε εἰπεῖν, ὑμῖν δὲ ἀκούειν [] ἢ μέρι- μνα ἢ ἐμή	55
— ἀμφοτέροις ἢ ἐπιθυμία ἔμοιγε εἰπεῖν, ὑμῖν δὲ ἀκούειν [] ἢ μέρι- μνα ἢ ἐμή	60
— ἀμφοτέροις ἢ ἐπιθυμία ἔμοιγε εἰπεῖν, ὑμῖν δὲ ἀκούειν [] ἢ μέρι- μνα ἢ ἐμή	65
— ἀμφοτέροις ἢ ἐπιθυμία ἔμοιγε εἰπεῖν, ὑμῖν δὲ ἀκούειν [] ἢ μέρι- μνα ἢ ἐμή	70
To the right of ll. 68–70	
..λι.[3]..πος	68b
εννε.τη πρα-	69b
ὑνομένου	70b
— Below l. 70	
δίδωμι χαίρων τὴν δὲ δωρεὰν δέχου, ὅτι καλὸν τὸ παράδ(ε)ῖγμα λαβό(ν)- τες καλὴν παρασχηκέναι τὴν ὁμοίωσιν. καὶ τὸ μὲν παρά-	75

δ(ε)ιγμα τοιούτον, ἢ δ' ὁμοίω{ε}ις	
—	
κατὰ τὸν τοῦ συμφέροντος λόγον τὴν τοῦ πν(εύματο)ς ἐνέργ(ε)ιαν ἀποδιδούς ἐκάτερα δὲ ἀληθῆ κ(αὶ) συνυπάρ- χοντα καὶ ἡ πίστις δεκτικ[]όν	80
τῆς χάριτος τ. συμφερο..... τῆς ἐνεργ(ε)ίας κοινωνία τῆς ἀποστολῆς ἀγαθὸν εγ..[± 2]ας ὁμονοούντος τὸ τοιοῦτο τῆς ἀγάπης κ.....τῶ	85
τῆς ἐ(χ)θρας κ..	
—	
χρή	
At 180° in relation to the text above	
ὡς τύπον ζωζούσης τῆς πρὸς θε(ε)ὸν τιμῆς φόβῳ τὸ κακὸν ἀνακόπτον-	90
τας κατὰ τῆς κολάσεως ἀπειλὰς, τὸ τῆς ἀδικίας ἵταμόν ἀνα- τρέποντας.	
πρὸς ἐχθρῶν μὲν γὰρ εἰ πάσχοι κακῶς οὐ θαῦμα. ὀφείλεται γάρ. [] ἢ δὴ συμ- φορὰ πρὸς τῶν φίλων ἄλγιστα.	95
—	
οὐ γὰρ δυνέμην ἀντίσταθ(αι) δι..ο..[1]. θεοῦ τε κ(αὶ) νεκροῖς ἴσον ὀρατὸς	100

2 ὑστερ-, l. ὑστερήσης 6 δυναμεθα· αλλ' 14 ὑπερ 32–33 l. ἀκροωμένοις 40 αλλ' 41–42 προσίειναι
43 ὑστερον 44 l. ἀφηρέθησαν 51 ιν' 53 l. σύμφωνον 56 l. γλυκαινομένης 58 ὕδασιν
65–6 l. ὠνομασμένον 69b–70b πρᾶϊνονομένου 82 l. κοινωνία 92 ἵταμον 99 l. δυναίμην 101 ἴσον

(Hair)

Do not deprive me/make me fail of your most valued company. How could we not pursue such a great good, similar to which we are in no way able to achieve? But – for God grants no other (good) of this kind – we are twice as willing. A slavery which results in deliverance/salvation for rational/intellectual beings.

Through this (act) (Jesus?) testifies to the will of the real master dying so that he may not contravene it. These things (hold true?) if the master is impious and hostile. But the apostolic discourse addresses the faithful. [blank space] It therefore also speaks to the masters.

Having been shed (Jesus' blood?) together with the word of faith correspondingly we also receive a share in his body as we are offered the holy image of his body as nourishment [blank space] In this way we attach ourselves in one body to Him and to the Holy Spirit.

In this way (God?) attached (us, humans?) from a great and divine prototype.

But, so as the most valuable thing may not be entirely neglected ...

... will/in order to surprise the audience on account of the divine prudence and mind.

Surely also the things that have been passed over in silence will become evident from what has been said.

↑ And he rendered the poor (/beggar) naked of everything, adding unlawful deeds to unlawful deeds, having never practised any sort of justice but having lived since youth in pact with idleness, he is forced to take recourse to the law and to bewail himself as regards these. From these was grace then taken away as they were also deprived of worship.

Through the active faith, through the conversion from idololatriy to God, through the ascent to the peak to the Father through the Son and no longer through the angels to God ...

... of the divine word ordered/ ornamented ...

(Flesh)

... so that when converting in word, they will not have cause to regret in practice.

This is his best (deed?) and in accordance with God's care. This removed the fearful aspect of power by showing the benefit which turned sweet.

... no longer admitting/accepting (they?/humans?) the goodness inherent in (his?) presence something which they could hope for through (baptismal) water.

Convincing them (to believe?) he will bear witness to God's great affection and making evident God's care for them if having been among them he became awesome ...

So the presence of good (?) friends is a sweet thing. Having been rightfully called a saviour filled with sanctification ...

For the words belong to a dear (creature?)

The desire has arisen in both, in me to speak, in you to listen. [blank space] My concern ...

... of (somebody?) pacified

I give with pleasure. Receive my gift because those who have received a fine prototype have also provided a fine imitation. In this case the prototype is of this kind. While the imitation ...

Giving an account of/defining the *energeia* of the holy ghost according to what is convenient

Both are true and co-exist, and faith is receptive of grace [...] of *energeia* by association with the apostleship (of Jesus?) ... a good thing ... when (subject missing) is of one mind ?? of love ... of enmity ...

It is necessary ...

↑ In the belief that the honour due to God preserves a model (of the prototype vs. imitation relationship?)

By fear beating back evil, through threats of punishment, overturning the shamelessness of wrongdoing ...

For it is no wonder if one suffers from enemies. For (this) is due (to happen). Suffering from friends assuredly belongs to the most painful experiences.

I would not be able to withstand

... of god and like the dead visible

1–3 μή με | ὑπερέρης cῆς φιλάτης | ὀμιλίας. For the interchange η > ε after liquid in the form ὑπερέρης see Gignac I 243iii. Forms of this verb with -ε- coexist from the third century onwards with the classical forms with -η- (see Gignac II 257d). The syntax is also peculiar. It seems more appropriate to translate “do not deprive me of”. In classical Greek, however, this would require the verb *στερέω* construed with accusative (for the person deprived of something) and genitive (for the thing one is deprived of), see LSJ s.v., not ὑπερέω which when signifying “fail to obtain, lack” is construed with the genitive only (of the thing one fails to obtain), see LSJ s.v. IV. The construction of this verb with accusative (of the person) and genitive (of the thing) in the sense “make to fail of” is late, see Lampe s.v. This is a case of syntactic and semantic overlap of two originally distinct verbs due to morphological similarity (see Gignac II 256–7).

8–9 διπλάσιοί ἐμμεν τῇ προθυμίᾳ. An earlier occurrence of the formulation in Greek is found in the first century author Onos. *Strateg.* 23.2.3–4 οἱ τε γὰρ φίλιοι τοὺς σφετέρους ἀκούοντες ἐπικυδετέρους ἀναθαρροῦσι καὶ διπλάσιοι γίνονται ταῖς προθυμίαις. The parallel is, however, unrelated to the present context where the topic probably is the manifestation of faith.

9–10 *σωτήριος δουλεία* | *ζῳοῖς νοεροῖς*. It is uncertain whether the dative is governed by the preceding nominative. The expression *ζῳοῖς νοεροῖς* is a key formulation with potential to reveal the theological and philosophical culture of the author of the notes. The expression is employed by Stoics and Neoplatonists to describe the universe (*κόσμος*), God (also the Platonic *Dēmiourgos*) and, last but not least, the stars. Christian fathers use it in definitions of man (e.g. Ps.Athan. *Testimonia e scriptura*, PG 28.77 *τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος; ἄνθρωπός ἐστι ζῶον νοερὸν, αἰσθητικὸν θείου νοῦ, καὶ ζωῆς αἰωνίου δεκτικὸν, καὶ τῇ ταύτης στερῆται θνητόν*). Man is probably also the topic in the present context, especially if the dative complements *σωτήριος δουλεία*.

11–27 Topics addressed in this section include Jesus' sacrifice (?) for mankind and the Eucharist.

11–15 *μαρτυρεῖ τῷδε τῷ θειλήματι ... αὐτό*. The subject, common to the finite verbal form and the participles, is not stated but is probably Jesus.

τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ | *δεσπότης*. A predominantly Christian expression, see e.g. *Apoc.* 6:10b ... *καὶ ἔκραξαν φωνῇ μεγάλη λέγοντες, ἕως πότε, ὁ δεσπότης ὁ ἅγιος καὶ ἀληθινός, οὐ κρίνεις καὶ ἐκδικεῖς τὸ αἷμα ἡμῶν ἐκ τῶν κατοικούντων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; Ignat. Frg. 1. 19 Crehan καὶ πρὸς παράβασιν ἐντολῆς τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ δεσπότης τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸν δοῦλον βιαζόμενος (...), etc. It features in very limited degree in neutral contexts (Them. or. 21 (Βασιανιστῆς ἢ φιλόσοφος), 251c9–d2, p. 30 Downey and Norman ... *ὥσπερ ὁ Αὐτόλυκος τὰ φάρια, τὰ αὐτὰ πανταχοῦ ξυμπεριφέρει, κυδροῦμενός τε καὶ γαυρούμενος πρὸς τοὺς ἀγνοοῦντας αὐτῶν τὸν ἀληθινὸν δεσπότην ...*).*

l. ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ καὶ παραβαίνειν (/παραβῆναι) | αὐτό?

15–16 The adjectives *ἀσεβής* and *ἀλλότριος* occur together also in *Amphil. Icon. Frg.* 9.4ff. (CCSG 3, p. 235 Datema) *ἀσεβῆς ὄντως ἐστὶ καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀλλότριος ὁ μὴ λέγων τὸν Χριστὸν τὸν σωτήρα τῶν ὅλων καὶ ποιητὴν ...* and in *Ps.Joh.Chrys. De ieiunio*, PG 62.731 *ὁ ἀσεβῆς ἀλλότριος Θεοῦ ἐστὶ*. In the above texts the adjective *ἀλλότριος* governs a genitive, whereas in the present text it stands absolutely. The adjective is laden with negative connotations in early Christian literature, referring either to presumed heretics and persons excommunicated from the church or to the relation of Christ's human vs. his divine nature, in particular “what is predicated of Christ's human nature in relation to divinity”, see Lampe s.v. A vs. B. It is, however, uncertain and, in our opinion, rather doubtful whether any of these two highly specific meanings is applicable in the present case. It seems safer to render the word as “alien”, “hostile” (see LSJ s.v. II 1b).

17 *ὁ δὲ ἀποστολικὸς λόγος*. The expression refers to the teachings of the apostles either in general or as encapsulated in a specific part of the NT, see Lampe s.v. *ἀποστολικός* B 4a. Parallels in which the expression functions as the subject are to be found in the following works, many of which are exegetical: *Greg. Nyss. Epist.* XVII 10 (Greg. Nyss. op. 8.2, p. 53 Pasquali); *Vita Mosis* II 32 (SC 1^{bis}, p. 40 Daniélou); *Dialog. de anima et resurrectione*: PG 46.156; *Epiph. Pan. haer.* 49, 3.3 (GCS 31, p. 244 Holl and Dummer); *Ps.Athan. Sermo mai. de fide, Frg.* 79 Nordberg; *Homil. de passione et cruce domini*, PG 28.189 and 205; *Bas. Caes. Epist.* 38.7 (vol. I, p. 90 Courtonne); *Severian. In centur. et contra Manich. et Apollin.* 17; *Ps.Joh. Chrys. In Psalm.* 92, PG 55.616; *Theod. Cyr. Interpret. in Psalm.* 48: PG 80.1224; *Interpret. in Mich.*: PG 81.1760; *Cyrill. Alex. De sancta trin. dial.* VII (SC 246, 164 de Durand); *Comm. in Matth., Frg.* 41 Reuss; *Diadoch. Sermo de ascens.*, p. 166 des Places; *Cat. in epist. ad Hebr. (cat. Nicetae)*, p. 345 Cramer; *Cat. in epist. ad Rom.*, p. 526 Cramer.

18–19 One would expect a quotation after this formulation though not necessarily if we take *λέγει* in the sense “addresses”.

20–21 *τοῦ ῥήματος* | *τῆς πίστεως*. A Pauline expression (*Ep.Rom.* 10:8), recycled in both exegetical works on the passage (*Clem. Alex. Strom.* IV, XVI 99.1 (SC 463, p. 222 Mondésert); *Orig. Comm. in Rom.* 10:8 (p.

110 Bauernfeind); Athan. *Contr. gentes* 30 (p. 82 Thomson) etc.) and in other, independent contexts in early patristic literature (Greg. Nyss. *Contra Eunom.* 1.1.158 (Greg. Nyss. op. 1, p. 70 Jaeger); Bas. Caes. *Epist.* 226.3 and 238.1 (vol. III, pp. 27 and 58 Courtonne) etc.).

21 ἀνάλογον. Genitive plural cannot be accommodated syntactically. Perhaps neutrum ἀνάλογον, used in adverbial sense (see LSJ s.v. ἀνάλογος) was intended. Alternatively, ἀνὰ λόγον “in proportion”, an expression admittedly not attested in NT or the Christian fathers but for which we have a Platonic parallel (*Phd.* 110d), see LSJ s.v. ἀνά IV.

22–25 μέτο(ι)χοι ... προσφερόμενοι. The eucharist is in all probability the topic here. The food offered as “the holy icon of the body” may refer to the bread which symbolically stands for the body of Christ, the tasting of which makes the faithful “partake of the body [*sc.* of Christ]” (μέτοχοι ... τοῦ σώματος). The primary reference passage from the NT is 1 Cor. 10:16–17 τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία ἐστὶν τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ; τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστὶν; ὅτι εἰς ἄρτος, ἐν σῶμα οἱ πολλοὶ ἐσμεν, οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν. Similar formulation in Hebr. 3:14 μέτοχοι γὰρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ γεγόναμεν, ἐάνπερ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν, but this passage speaks of participation in Christ, not in his body. When discussing holy communion in terms of μετοχή the author seems to conform with the view of Apollinaris of Laodiceia (*Frg. in Matth.* 134 Reuss ... ἐνταῦθα δηλοῖ, ὅτι εἰς ὑπὲρ πολλῶν πάσχει. τύπον δὲ ποιεῖ Ἀπολινάριος τῆς μετοχῆς τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τῆς ἐν πνεύματι τελουμένης εἰς τοὺς πιστεύοντας ἐκτυπῶσας καὶ τῷ ἄρτῳ τὸ σῶμα καὶ τῷ οἴνῳ τὸ αἷμα (...) ἢ βρῶσις οὖν καὶ ἢ πόσις ἐδήλωσε τὴν μετοχὴν τὴν οὐκ ἄνευ σώματος γινομένην (...), and not with the remarks of John Chrysostom who argued for the use of the term κοινωνία (Joh. Chrys. *In epist. i ad Corinth. homil.* 24 (PG 61.200) ὁ ἄρτος, ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστὶ; διὰ τί μὴ εἶπε, μετοχή; ὅτι πλέον τι δηλώσαι ἠβουλήθη, καὶ πολλὴν ἐνδείξασθαι τὴν συνάφειαν. οὐ γὰρ τῷ μετέχειν μόνον καὶ μεταλαμβάνειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ ἐνοῦσθαι κοινωνοῦμεν. καθάπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ἐκεῖνο ἦνωται τῷ Χριστῷ, οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ ἄρτου τούτου ἐνούμεθα).

30–31 ἀλλὰ ... ἡμελημένον. Elliptic and incomplete formulation. Our rendering assumes that subjunctive ἦ has been omitted and that the perfect tense equals a present with future reference.

32–35 The entire passage, especially the final two lines, have an air of a denouement. This tallies well with the fact that the rest of the writing on this side of the sheet is in opposite direction. The topic is, however, far from clear as the subject of ἐκπλήξειν and the identity of “the listeners” remain obscure. It could be the author of the text and his audience, but it could equally well be the author of another text on which the present textual product is parasitic.

ἀκροουμένοις, *l.* ἀκροωμένοις. For the interchange ω > ου before nasal see Gignac I 210ii. The intrusion of the -έω in the -άω paradigm is amply documented in the papyri (examples in Gignac II 363–4 A.1 and discussion in 364–5).

We take δῆλα δὴ (έστι) in future sense.

36–44 The subject and topic of this section remain obscure, but in any case it seems to be different than in ll. 1–35. Perhaps the subject is the unbeliever.

36 It is unclear whether the word πένης in the present context signifies the poor or the beggar. Both meanings are to be found in NT and in patristic literature as opposed to classical Greek where the word is only used with reference to poverty.

38 παράνομα παρανόμοις προσθείς. Alliteration of /p/ and polyptoton. Compare Theod. Cyr. *Interpret. in Psalm.* 2, PG 80.884 ... καὶ παρανομία παρανομίαν διεδέξατο.

39–40 δίκην ... γυμνάσας. The expression occurs also in Bas. Caes. *Epist.* 155 (vol. II, p. 81 Courtonne) εἰ δέ τινα δίκην γυμνάσει ὁ χολαστικὸς ὁ δεινὰ, ἔχει δικαστήρια δημόσια καὶ νόμους and in Severian. *In Iob*, PG 56.576 παρέλθοι ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ πάθους τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ γυμνάζω τὴν δίκην ...

44 ἀφερήθησαν (l. ἀφηρέθησαν). For the interchange unaccented η > ε before liquid see Gignac I 243iii; for the interchange accented ε > η see Gignac I 246iv.

45–49 The topic here is likely to have been conversion from paganism, the crucial formulation being ἐν τῇ πρὸς θε(ο)ν ἀπὸ εἰδώλων μετατάσσει as in Ps. *Amphil. Frg.* 3 (CCSG 3, p. 265 Datema) ... καὶ παρὰ ἀνθρώποις, διὰ τὴν αὐτῶν ἐξ εἰδωλολατρείας ἐπὶ τριαδικὴν θεογνωσίαν μετάστασιν and Cyrill. *Alex. Comm. in Ioan.* II, p. 308 Pusey ἐπειδὴ δέ πως θερμότερα πολὺ πρὸς μετάστασιν τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄμεινον ἢ τῶν εἰδωλολατρῶν ἐστὶ διάνοια (...). We meet the same topic in ll. 51–2 (beginning of text on flesh side), which suggests that that section is a sequel to the present one.

48–49 κ(α)ὶ οὐκέτι δι' ἀγγέλων ἐπὶ θε(ο)ν. Christ's superiority over the angels is affirmed in *Hebr.* 1: 5–14 and *Colos.* 2:18 which have been interpreted as criticism against angelological christologies with Jewish or other roots, see *Attridge* 1989, 49–53.

51–52 ἴν' ἐπιτρέφοντες ... The conversion topic continues in the two first lines of this section at the very least. The verb occurs in a similar sense in P.Oxy. LXXV 5024.11 and 12–13.

54–55 τῆς ἐξουσίας ἢ τὸ φοβερόν. An earlier, unrelated occurrence of this expression is D.H. 6.39.2.

60–61 τοῦ θε(ο)ῦ κ(α)ὶ ἢ τὴν φειδώ. “God's care” for the humans (also mentioned in l. 4 above) through his salvation plan is discussed in similar terms at *Epiph. Pan. haer.* 48. 6.2 (GCS 31, p. 227 Holl and Dummer); *Did. Caec. Comm. in Psalm. 34:15*, cod. p. 219.6–7 *Gesché* and *Gronewald*; *Cyrill. Alex. Comm. in Os.* 10.9–10 (vol. I, p. 215 Pusey); *Proc. Gaz. Comm. in Is.*, PG 87, 2.2373 τὴν περὶ ἡμῶν δὲ φειδῶ παρίστησι τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸ τὴν ἡμετέραν οἶονεὶ ὦτηρίαν.

62 εἰ φοβερὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐγένετο. The expression is also used by John Chrysostom with reference to Paul's change of topic and style in the letter to the Romans (*Joh. Chrys. In epist. ad Rom.*, PG 60.425) ἐπειδὴ γὰρ φοβερὸς ἐγένετο καὶ βαρὺς, περὶ κρίσεως καὶ τῆς μελλούσης διαλεγόμενος κολάσεως, εὐθέως οὐκ εἰς τὸ προσδοκώμενον ἐνέβαλε τὴν τιμωρίαν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ ἡδύτερον ἔτρεψε τὸν λόγον, τὴν τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀντίδοσιν, οὕτω λέγων. Here, however, the subject seems to be different – probably God. Can the reference incident be God's vocal manifestation to Adam and Eva in LXX *Gen.* 2:8ff. (see esp. *Gen.* 2:10–11 τὴν φωνὴν σου ἤκουσα περιπατοῦντος ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ καὶ ἐφοβήθη)?

66 l. πλήρης ἀγιασμοῦ?

68–69 ἀμφοτέροις ... ἔμοιγε εἰπεῖν, ὑμῖν δὲ ἀκούειν. *Distributio* and *antithesis*. The personal pronouns may refer to the author and his audience, in which case the contrast between εἰπεῖν and ἀκούειν should be understood in the context of oral delivery.

73–76 Note the chiasm and antithesis τὸ παράδειγμα λαβόντες – παρασχῆκεναι τὴν ὁμοίωσιν. However, the terms παράδειγμα and ὁμοίωσις here do not seem to be rhetorical *termini technici* (in rhetorical theory the latter term constitutes the genus and the former one of its varieties, see e.g. *Trypho Gramm. Peri tropôn* in *Spengel Rhet.* vol. III, p. 200). They rather seem to denote a relation between a prototype and its imitation or representation, and their use is probably rooted in theology (*Ep. Jac.* 3:9 ... τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τοὺς καθ' ὁμοίωσιν θεοῦ γεγονότας), philosophy, or in both – perhaps in Christian Neoplatonism (compare e.g. *Plot.* 1.2.7; *Procl. In Ti.* Vol. 1, p. 434 *Diehl*; *Joh. Philop. De aetern. mundi* p. 551 *Rabe* etc.). It is noteworthy that the two terms occur in combination with ἐνέργεια (a term present in the next paragraph, l. 78) in a treatise on the Holy Spirit – precisely the topic of the next paragraph – by Basil of Caesarea (*De spiritu sancto* III

5 (p. 22 Johnston)) which seeks to cast doubt on the habit of some to discuss the creation of the world in terms analogous to the actions of a human artisan who “observes an already existing prototype and directs energy to make a representation of it” (... πρὸς ἥδη ἐκκείμενον παράδειγμα ἀποβλέπων, καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν ἐκείνου τὴν ἐνέργειαν κατευθύνει). Although it is far from certain that ἐνέργεια in the following passage has the same reference as in the passage from Basil, the use of the same terms may indicate that our excerpt discusses the Holy Spirit or the creation.

79–80 ἀληθῆ κ(αὶ) συνυάρχοντα. It is not entirely clear which are the two things that coexist and are true – “faith” is in all probability the one thing, while the other could be either “the energeia of the ghost” or “the expedient things”. Other passages which contain the same terminology discuss the coexistence of father and son in the frame of the doctrine of the holy trinity (Eus. *Ep. ad Euphrat.* 1 (Athanasius Werke III 1.1, p. 4 Opitz); ps.Gelas. *Hist. Eccles.* II 15.3 (GCS N.F. 9, p. 51 Hansen)) and the logical incompatibility that opposites may coexist and are at the same time true (Alex. Aphr. *in Top.* = *Comm. in Arist. Graeca* 2.2, p. 183 Wallies). So, what we would expect is that the two things that co-exist here have opposite qualities or nature.

81–83 τὰ συμφέρογτα δὲ | τῆς ἐνεργ(ε)ίας κοινωνία τῆς | ἀποστολῆς ἀγαθὸν ἐνεργ[γί]ας (l. ἐνεργείας)?

88–89 The worship of God is a reminiscent of the relationship of prototype and imitation?

90–91 ἀνακόπτοντας This seems preferable to ἀνακόπτον | τὰς in view of the absence of a neutrum subject and of the presence of another participle in accusative plural two lines further down, although no particles indicate that the two are connected.

κατὰ τῆς κολάσεως ἀπειλὰς. A possible parallel is Greg. Nyss. *In Canticum canticorum hom. 1* (Greg. Nyss. op. VI, p. 15–16 Langerbeck) ἔστι μὲν γὰρ καὶ διὰ φόβου τις γινομένη ἢ σωτηρία, ὅταν πρὸς τὰς ἀπειλὰς τῆς ἐν τῇ γεέννῃ κολάσεως βλέποντες τοῦ κακοῦ χωριζώμεθα.

Reference list

- Attridge, H. W., *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* [Hermeneia. A critical and historical commentary on the Bible, ed. H. Koester], (Philadelphia) 1989.
- Cavallo, G. and H. Maehler, *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period, A.D. 300–800* [Institute of Classical Studies, Bulletin Suppl. 47] (London) 1987.
- Gignac, F. T., *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, vol. I: *Phonology*, vol. II: *Morphology* [Testi e documenti per lo studio dell’antichità 55, 1–2] (Milan) 1976 and 1981.
- Hagedorn, D., Torallas Tovar, S. and K. A. Worp, P.Monts. Roca inv. 65verso again. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 160 (2007) 181–2.
- Torallas Tovar, S. and K. A. Worp (2007), New Literary Fragments from Montserrat: (1) A Fragment of Johannes Chrysostomos *De Virginitate*, Ch. 73 and (2) A New Papyrus of the *Comparatio Menandri et Philistionis*, in Frösén, J., Purola, T. and E. Salmenkivi (eds.), *Proceedings of the 24th Congress of Papyrology*, Helsinki, 1–7 August, 2004 [Comm. Hum. Litt. 122: 1–2], (Helsinki) 2007, 1020–31.
- Torallas Tovar, S. and K. A. Worp, John Chrysostomos and Methodios at Montserrat, in Schubert, P. (ed.), *Actes du 26e Congrès international de papyrologie (Genève 2010)*, Genève (forthcoming, 2012 or 2013) 745–53.

Anastasia Maravela, Dept. of Philosophy, Classics, History of Art and Ideas, University of Oslo
anastasia.maravela@ifikk.uio.no

Glenn Wehus, MF Norwegian School of Theology
Glenn.O.Wehus@mf.no