Two fragments representing two leaves of a single-column papyrus codex. The column in the well-preserved fr. 1 was about 10–10.5 cm wide, while that represented by the narrow fr. 2 may have been about 11–11.5 cm wide. A line of fr. 1, in which the reconstruction is relatively secure, held about 22–25 letters, and the figure for fr. 2 will have been comparable. The line-height measured from the top of one line to the top of the next is about 0.7 cm in fr. 1 and about 0.75 cm in fr. 2, and a reconstruction based on B (Codex Vaticanus) suggests that a page held about 30 lines. The height of the written area will thus have been about 21.5–22 cm. The lower margin is preserved in fr. 1 to a depth of 2.6 cm, and the inner margin survives on the left in fr. 1 to a width of 0.8 cm; no other lateral margins are preserved. The original page dimensions can only be estimated. If the upper margin was about two-thirds as deep as the lower (cf. Turner, Typology 25), a page will have been about 26 cm high. The Pierpont Morgan Iliad (MP3 870), assigned to the fourth century, has similar dimensions: a page measures 12.5–14 × 27 cm and the written area 10 × 23 cm (Turner, Typology 108). Among New Testament papyri, one may compare e.g.𝔓⁴⁷ (Revelation, P. Chester Beatty III), assigned to the third/fourth century, in which a page measures about 13–13.5 × 23.5–24.5 cm and the written area 8.8–10.7 × 18.7–20 cm (P. Malik, P. Beatty III (𝔓⁴⁷) (2017) 31–8). Turner assigns the first of these to his Group 8 and the second to his Group 7 (Typology 19–20). Comparable New Testament papyri from Oxyrhynchus, also assignable to Turner’s Group 7, include XIII 1597 (𝔓²⁹, Acts; 3rd c.), LXVI 4497 (𝔓¹¹³, Romans; 3rd c.), LXVI 4498 (𝔓¹¹⁴, Hebrews; 3rd c.), LXVI 4499 (𝔓¹¹⁵, Revelation; 3rd/4th c.), and possibly LXXXI 5258 (𝔓¹³², Ephesians; 3rd/4th c.).

The page represented by fr. 1 → will have held about 718 letters; in fr. 2, the letter count for the stretch between the start of → 2 and the start of ↓ 2 was about 696, while the stretch between the start of → 22 and that of ↓ 22 was about 644 letters long. Luke as transmitted in B includes about 94,600 letters. The text preceding the foot of fr. 1 ↓ would occupy about twelve pages each containing about 700 letters, while the text following the end of fr. 2 → would take up about 1.6 such pages. About 135 such pages would hold the complete text; if the average page held 675 letters, about 140 pages will have been required. The beginning of Luke may then have fallen on a left-hand page, and if it was the first or only text in the codex, the first page of the codex may have been left blank or given over to a title; cf. X 1229 (𝔓²³, James; 4th c.), LXVI 4498 (𝔓¹¹⁴, Hebrews; 3rd c.).

The hand, of medium professional competence, is a somewhat inelegant example of Turner’s informal round class (GMAW² 21). Most letters fit approximately into a square. The upright of ϕ extends slightly below and more noticeably above the other letters; otherwise the hand is generally bilinear. (There are no preserved examples of ψ.) The component strokes of a letter are sometimes not correctly joined. For example, there may be a gap at the lower right-hand corner of ν (fr. 1 → 6) or between the tail of α and the upper or lower stroke of its loop (e.g. fr. 1 → 3–4). There is sometimes a contrast in fr. 1 between thick vertical and thin
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horizontal strokes, e.g. twice in γ at ↓ 5, but the scribe seems to make little effort to achieve such an effect in fr. 2; for η, cf. → 4, 7. The ends of strokes are commonly decorated, but not consistently. Thus the upper right-hand corner of the second ν in fr. 1 ↓ 3 has a heavy ascending oblique serif, while the first has no decoration there. Letters at the beginnings of lines may be enlarged: note α in fr. 1 ↓ 5 and π and τ with their crossbars extended well into the margin at fr. 1 ↓ 3–4. α, γ, λ, and τ are often linked to the following letter; the crossbar of ε may also be extended to touch the letter to its right. The scribe has some difficulty in keeping the lines of text straight: note for example the upward slope of fr. 1 → 3–4.

Other papyri representing the same graphic stream include III 454 + P. Laur. IV 134 + PSI II 119 (Plato; GMAW7 62), copied on the back of a Latin register postdating 111 (ChLA IV 264); VIII 1100 (GLH 206); III 412 (Julius Africanus, Cesti; GLH 234), which dates to the period between 227 and 276; and II 209 (𝔓10, Romans; GBEBP 1a), which ‘was found tied up with a contract dated in 316 AD, and other documents of the same period’. The hand of 412, though somewhat more flattened, seems the closest, and 5478 has therefore been assigned to the third century. A slightly later dating (third/fourth century) could reasonably be supported by comparison with 209. Parallels for the form of the codex are assigned to the third or third/fourth century (cf. above), and there is a probable example at fr. 1 ↓ 3 of μνρ, a nomen sacrum first attested in a papyrus assigned to the third century.

There are no lection signs except a trema on initial ε (fr. 1 → 4) and small apostrophes marking elision (fr. 1 → 4) or the end of a foreign name (fr. 1 → 5). The preserved nomina sacra are πρυ (fr. 1 ↓ 3), χωρ (fr. 2 → 13), and κα (fr. 2 ↓ 14); the scribe probably also used μνρ (fr. 1 ↓ 3), θυ (fr. 1 → 3), and πυ (fr. 2 ↓ 22). The one extant numeral is written out in full (fr. 1 → 6 δωδεκα), but the alphabetical numeral ἵ should probably be restored in a lacuna at fr. 2 ↓ 13.

Sentence-ends are marked by spaces left blank between words in six places (fr. 1 ↓ 5, 6, → 2, 3; fr. 2 → 10, 14). The two spaces left blank in chapter 24 correspond to stops in Ψ75; among the Greek manuscripts assigned to the fourth–fifth centuries, A and W indicate divisions at five of the six places, but not in 24.24 after ετιον (5478 fr. 2 → 10), which falls at line-end in W. 5478 does not appear to have had a blank space at the end of 24.26 (fr. 2 → 16), as would have been expected; there is no break marked in A, but Ψ75 has a stop and W a blank space.

There is a correction at fr. 1 → 6, where the omitted word ετιον was inserted above the line, apparently by the scribe of the main text, but in a smaller, rightward-sloping hand.

The poor quality of the writing surface created difficulties for the scribe. For example, in fr. 1 ↓ 5, the initial α runs across a displaced strip of papyrus, and the τ across a gap in the upper layer: the right-hand side of the crossbar is on the back of the horizontal fibres. In the previous line, the scribe avoids the change in level by leaving a space blank before ετι. For similar cases in Ψ75, cf. Malik, P. Beatty III (𝔓47) 23, with further references. See also below on fr. 2 ↓ 1.

Three other fragments of Luke from Oxyrhynchus have been published, XXIV 2383 (𝔓69), LXVI 4495 (𝔓111), and LXXXIII 5346 (𝔓138), all assigned to the third century. 5478 overlaps Ψ92 (P. Vind. K. 8706, 7th c.) at 2.32 and Ψ75 (P. Bodmer XIV–XV, 3rd/4th c.) in chapter 24.
The text of 5478 nearly always agrees with that of B, though they diverge in seven places:

2.34 (fr. 1 ↓ 5) ηυλογηϲεν 5478: *ευλογηϲεν B
2.42 (fr. 1 → 6) αυτω ετη 5478: *ετων B
24.23 (fr. 1 → 6) αυτω ετη 5478: *ετων B
24.24 (fr. 2 → 9) *καθωϲ και (in lacuna) 5478: καθωϲ B
24.28 (fr. 2 → 9) *καθωϲ και (in lacuna) 5478: καθωϲ B
24.32 (fr. 2 ↓ 8) εν ελαλει 5478: (*ωϲ ελαλει ημιν B
24.33 (fr. 2 ↓ 12) ευροϲεμενουϲ (preverb in lacuna) 5478: *ευροϲεμενουϲ B

The reading adopted by NA²8 in each case is asterisked. 5478 agrees with D against א B in only one of these places, 2.42 (fr. 1 → 6). It would thus fall within what E. J. Epp has termed the B-cluster of early papyri: see B. D. Ehrman and M. W. Holmes (edd.), The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research (²²013) 519–77. The main point of textual interest is the papyrus’ inclusion of the disputed longer reading (‘Western non-interpolation’) at 24.36 (fr. 2 ↓ 20–21, mostly restored), against D and the Old Latin. Except at the places mentioned above, 5478 has the same text as NA²8 throughout.

The collation text is NA²8 and the supplements printed follow that edition except where otherwise noted. The IGNTP The Gospel According to St. Luke (1984–7) has also been used. The notes record places where the papyrus disagrees or appears to have disagreed with B or with the collation text; for a fuller picture, NA²8 should be consulted.

Fr. 1
↓

[ειϲ] αποκαλε[ψων εθνον και δο] (2.32) 33
ξαν[αου συν] [Ιϲραηλ και ην ο] πη και και ην η[θροιϲμενουϲ] 5
αυτω και ηυλογηϲε[ν αυτουϲ] Συϲεων και ειπε[ν προϲ]

→

[πληρουϲεϲ ωϲ θυϲια και χαρ[ιϲ] [θυ ς ε[π αυτο και επορευοντ]ο] [οι γονε[ϲ] αυτου κατ’ ετοϲ ειϲ η] 5
[ρουϲαλ] ημ’ τη εορτη του παϲχ[α] ετη [και ο] πε εγενετο αυτω δωδεκα [ ] 41
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Fr. 2

... ...

εξημων εξεϲτηϲαν ημαϲ γενο
και ναι ορθων απ ριναϲ ημηϲιϲ ημων
εις ἑρωκεναι οι λεγουϲαι αυ
τοιϲ εξη ̣ ̣ ημων επι το μυνηϲιϲ ημων και ευ
ροιϲ ουτωϲ καθωϲ και αι γυναικεϲ
ειπον αι υτον δε ουκ ιδοϲ και αυ
τοϲ ειπε τριϲτιϲτιϲ ημων και ευ
τοιϲ ουν ειϲ την δο
ξαν αυτωϲ και αρξαμενοϲ απο Μωυ
εις και επαυϲεν αυτοϲ
εν πιϲτευϲεν αυτοιϲ εν αϲαιϲ τα
γραϕαιϲ τα περι εαυτου
οι υλογηϲεν και κλαϲαϲ επε
δια ουδοϲ αυτων και ειπα
ν προϲ αυτων και αυτωϲ αϕαντοϲ εγε

αρτ]ον [ηυλο]
[γηϲεν και κλαϲαϲ επε][διδον αυ]
[τοιϲ αυτων δε διηνοιχθηϲεν [αυ]
[οι υφθαλμοι και επεγνωϲαν [αυ]
[τον και αυτοϲ αϕαιτοϲ εγε[νετο]
[απ αυτων και ειςα[ν προ[ς αλ]
[ληλουϲ ουϲι η καρ đáo]α ημω[ν καιο]
[μενη ην εν ημιν εν τη οδω [ως]
[διηροιγεν ημιν τα]ς γραφ[ας]
[και ανασταντεϲ αυτ]η τη ω[ρα]
[υπεϲτρεϲαν ειϲ Ιερου]σαλημ]
[και ευρον ψωϲωραιϲες]ενο[υϲ τουϲ]
[ια και τουϲ εν αυτοϲ] λεγον[ταϲ]
[στι οντωϲ γνηϲθη ο κ]ς κα[ι ω]

10 [φθη Σιωνι και αυτοι] εξ[γγον]
[το τα εν τη οδιϲ και ω[ς ε]γγον]
[εθη αυτοι εν τη κληϲει[ε]ναυ]
[αρτου ταυτα δε αυτον] λα[λουν]
[των αυτοϲ εκτη εν μ]ς[ω αυ]

15 [των και λεγει αυτοιϲ] ει[ρη]
[ιη υμιν πτοηθεϲ ειϲ και] ___
[εμφοβοι γενομενοι εδ]οϲ[κ αυς πνα]
[θεορειϲ και εις ειϲ[το]ιϲ]

20 [των και λεγει αυτοιϲ] ει[ρη]
[ιη υμιν πτοηθεϲ ειϲ και] ___
[εμφοβοι γενομενοι εδ]οϲ[κ αυς πνα]
[θεορειϲ και εις ειϲ[το]ιϲ]

Fr. 1
↓

2 Ιϲραηλ appears to have been written out in full to judge by the spacing.

3 μ[ιθηρ]. There is no trace of a supralinear bar, but μ[ιθηρ] written out in full would probably be too long for the gap. For this nomen sacrum, cf. LXXI 4805 L. 4 (𝔓¹²¹, John; 3rd c.); A. H. R. E. Paap, Nomina sacra in the Greek Papyri of the First Five Centuries A.D. (1959) 113; K. Aland, Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri i (1975) 424.

5 ευλογηϲ[ες]. The spelling with ηυ- rather than ευ- is shared with W W Ι 047 349 579 713 1510 2542. See e.g. Gignac, Grammar ii 240–41.

→

3 ειϲ αυτο. D has εν αυτο, but this seems excluded here. The first trace is a spot of ink on the line, and of α, only part of the left-hand arc survives, joined to the crossbar of τ, but ω would be slightly too wide, and we would expect to see traces of the central cusp and right-hand curve in the upper half of the line.

4–5 ι[ς] ροϲαλ[ημ]. Only the first dot of the trema survives.

6 αυτω ε[τθ]. αυτω ετθ is the reading of D L 579 a b l q; NA28 adopts the usual reading ετων. For the use of δωδεκα rather than the alphabetical numeral αβ, see Z. J. Cole, Numerals in Early Greek New Testament Manuscripts (2017) 175–8, esp. 177.
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Fr. 2

No lateral margins are preserved, and the line-divisions printed above are uncertain. It is not usually possible to choose on grounds of space between supplements of similar length.

5 [тели]δῆν: the usual reading. Ψ75 and B* have θῆναι.

7 D alone has καὶ after τὰ ἔρχεται. It would give a long line, but it is just possible that it was written here.

9–10 καθος και αἱ | γυναικεῖς εἰς πον. The reconstruction follows NA28. B and Ψ75 have καθος αἱ γυναικεῖς εἰς πον, but this may well be too short. D’s οὐκ εἰς πον αἱ γυναικεῖς cannot be accommodated.

19 The line as restored has a higher letter-count (31), but the reconstructed line-length is similar to that of line 16: the supplement there includes several wide letters, while the present line includes four iotas and no examples of ιτοι or οὐ.

20 ἡγισάω: the usual reading. Ψ75 and B have ἡγισάω.

Dr Henry observes: "The uppermost layer has come off on the left- and right-hand sides, leaving only a narrow strip on which the text is preserved. The fibres visible where the preserved surface is blank only a narrow strip on which the text is preserved. The fibres visible where the preserved surface is blank have been lost with the original top surface. The physical situation on the left is more complicated. The surface on which the text stood on the far left is missing, but a layer of horizontal fibres remains stuck to the surface, and the scribe writes over the right-hand part of that layer of horizontal fibres, in 10 (τη), 17 (τοι, with the οι continuing on the vertical fibres to the right), and the lines below. It seems that a reinforcing patch or sheet was stuck here, and the vertical fibres facing outwards were removed from a narrow strip on the right of the upper sheet so that the change in level would present less of an obstacle to the writer. The scribe will then have begun each line on vertical fibres (now missing) and proceeded to horizontal fibres one layer further down and finally to vertical fibres another layer further down."

1–2 ἔρχεται [τοῦ δῶμα, the traces could be otherwise assigned (τοῦδωμα, επετεί], but considereations of spacing favour the arrangement adopted above.

[γυναικεῖς] was probably given the temporal augment, as in KAD Ψ etc., cf. fr. 15 5.

2–8 ἡμῖν καὶ αὐτοῖς] μελεῖ ην ἐν ἡμῖν εν τῇ οἴκῳ. NA28 prints ἡμῖν καὶ αὐτοῖς ὡς ἑλάλει ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ οἴκῳ, but this is clearly too long for the gap whether the doubtful en ημῖν is included or omitted (with Ψ75 B D εις δυνατόν). The text on the line would be of suitable length if the scribe skipped forward from the first ημῖν to the second by parablepsy, omitting οὐκ ἑλάλει ημῖν, as in a B ff 114 and in Greek in a catena fragment printed in PG LXXII 753Α (‘Cyrill von Alexandrien III’ fr. 79 in J. Reuss, Lukas-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche (1984) 293). The omitted phrase may however have been restored above the line, cf. fr. 1 6. For a similar omission due to parablepsy, cf. e.g. Or. Commm. Jn. 1.50, 10.105, Hom. in Jer 20.8 (GCS III² 191.13), which has καὶ καὶ ἔλαλε ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ οἴκῳ, omitting εν ημῖν ὡς ἑλάλει ημῖν before εν τῇ οἴκῳ.

10 οὐν] τοῦ ὡς [ιν]. The decipherment is uncertain, but the traces are clearly incompatible with λυπομένου, which follows αὐτοῖς αὐτοῖς in D c e sa.


13 ιν. To judge by the space available, the alphabetical numeral will have been used, as in Ψ75 D.

20–21 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς] εἰς [τη] ημῖν. This sentence is omitted in D and in several Old Latin manuscripts (c e b d ff 1 1). For the problem, see e.g. J. Hernández in C. E. Hill & M. J. Kruger (edd.), The Early Text of the New Testament (2012) 137.
πτοηθεϲ, the majority reading, is supplied from NA²⁸, but the variants θροηθεϲ (𝔓⁷) B 1241) and ϕοβηθεϲ (א W) would fit equally well.

πνα was probably written as a nomen sacrum: the unabbreviated πνευμα seems too long.

B. W. GRIFFIN / L. H. BLUMELL

5479–80. Pseudo-Chrysostom

The fame of the golden-mouthed patriarch of Constantinople attracted the spurious attribution of various works in the manuscript tradition. Both those and his genuine works are attested to a limited extent among the papyri. One of the copies of the spuria already bears the attribution to Chrysostom in its title (Hom. in titulum Ps. 50 (PG LV 565–75; CPG 4544)): P. Berol. 6788 A, ed. K. Treu, in Studia Patristica XII (1975) 71–5 (van Haelst 635; Aland, Repertorium ii KV 51). The genuine works are not so far preserved as continuous texts. There are only excerpts from Homily 29 on John (PG LIX 163–72; CPG 4425.29) in P. Vind. G 26132 B (MPER NS IV 54; Aland, Repertorium ii KV 50), from In illud: Domine, non est in homine (PG LVI 153–62; CPG 4419) in the margin of a passage from Clement of Alexandria, Stromata, P. Köln VII 297 (Aland, Repertorium ii KV 9a–b + 5oa), and from In epistulam I ad Corinthios (PG LXI 9–382; CPG 4428) in BKT IX 15, and paraphrases of De virginitate (ed. B. Grillet and H. Musurillo (1966); CPG 4313) in P. Mon. Roca IV 55–6. (P. Ant. III 111 is Basil, not Chrysostom: Aland, Repertorium ii KV 7.) Various copies of spurious works survive besides that of the homily on Psalm 50 cited above. De eleemosyna (PG LX VII 707–12; CPG 4618) was identified in MPER NS IV 58 r. (van Haelst 1164) by A. Papathomas, ZPE 163 (2007) 71–4, and there are three copies of In decollationem praecursoris et baptistae Joannis (PG LIX 483–90; CPG 4570): XIII 1603 (cf. R. Harris, BRL 5 (1919) 386–7, and S. G. Mercati, Biblica 2 (1921) 229–39 = Collectanea Byzantina (1970) ii 100–110; van Haelst 634; Aland, Repertorium ii KV 52); P. Bodl. I 6 (cf. C. Römer, APF 4 (1998) 132–3); and BKT IX 175 (cf. A. Papathomas, MH 58 (2001) 47–53). For papyrological witnesses to Coptic versions, see in general S. J. Voicu, in P. Buzi and A. Camplani (edd.), Christianity in Egypt: ... Studies in Honor of Tito Orlandi (2011) 575–610.

The authenticity of the homilies represented in the two papyri published here has long been in doubt, and they have recently been assigned to an anonymous Cappadocian active at the end of the fourth century, along with 35 other homilies including that on the beheading of John the Baptist of XIII 1603: cf. S. J. Voicu in M. Girardi and M. Marin (edd.), Origen e l’aleusantrismo cappadoce (III–IV secolo) (2002) 342, and in A. M. Piazzoni (ed.), Studi in onore del Cardinale Raffaele Farina ii (2013) 1200. They were published first by F. du Duc, Sancti Ioannis Chrysostomi . . . Panegyrici Tractatus XVII (1601) 369–409, then by H. Savile, S. Ioannis Chrysostomi Opera Graece (1613) v 656–9 and 703–7, and again by du Duc, Sancti Patris nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitanii, De diversis utrisque Testamenti locis Sermones LXXIII . . . Tomus sextus (1624) i34–48. B. de Montfaucon included them in his Sancti Patris nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi . . . opera omnia vi (1724) 603–11, and they