

→

[ε ν τ] η κ υ β ι α [τ ω ν α ν θ ρ ω π ω ν ε ν π α ν ο υ ρ] 4.14
 [γ ι α π ρ ο ς τ η ν μ ε θ ο δ ε] ι α ν [τ η ς π λ α ν η ς α λ η θ ε ι α ν δ ε] 4.15
 [π ο ι ο υ ν τ ε ς ε ν α γ α π η α] υ ξ [η] ζ . . ε ν [ε ι ς α υ τ ο ν τ α π α ν τ α ο ς]
 [ε ς τ ι ν χ ρ] ε ξ ο υ π α ν τ ο ς ω μ] α ς υ . . . [] 4.16

↓

1 ε ν [χ] ρ (ι ε τ) [ω] : so D¹ K L P Ψ 104^c. 630. 1241^s. 1505. 2464 ℵ vg^{mss} sy sa^{mss} bo^{ms}; Cass: και εν χριτω \mathfrak{P}^{46} Ⲭ A B C (D* F G) 0278. 6. 33. 81. 104*. 365. 614. 1175. 1739. 1881 vg sa^{mss} bo

4 An ink stroke is visible to the right of the lacuna above the τ. The stroke may belong to an interlinear correction now largely lost. The hue of the ink is slightly lighter than the black ink of the body text, which may indicate that a second scribe is responsible for the mark; however, the ink may simply have faded. See for example the hue of the faded η on the same line.

→

1 κ υ β ι α : l. κ υ β ε ι α .

2 There is not enough room in the lacuna for του διαβολου after της πλανης, a reading found only in A.

2-3 The reconstruction [α λ η θ ε ι α ν δ ε] | [π ο ι ο υ ν τ ε ς] (F G *ex lat.*?) fits best within the available space; the reading α λ η θ ε υ ο ν τ ε ς δ ε (all other MSS) is less likely.

3 α] υ ξ [η] ζ . . ε ν . The transmitted text has here ανξηρωμεν, but the ink traces of two letters that are visible between ζ and εν do not resemble the expected ωμ. The papyrus is quite damaged here and some of the inked fibres may have come loose.

3-4 The available space in the lacuna suggests that **5258** may omit a word here. It is possible that **5258** lacked (η) κεφαλη after εστιν, as in the supplement here provided *exempli gratia*, or that an accidental omission occurred.

4 All manuscripts read συναρμολογουμενον, but I can only make out cv followed by traces of three or four letters that do not clearly resemble the expected ΝΑΡΜ; an attempt to restore that reading is also difficult because it gives little space for the ν and requires an unusual ρμ ligature. It is possible that **5258** preserves an irrecoverable singular reading.

G. S. SMITH

5259. I TIMOTHY 3:13-4:8105/194(b)
 \mathfrak{P}^{133} Fr. 2 2.6 × 8.1 cm
Fr. 3 4.5 × 16.3 cmThird century
Plate II

Three fragments from a leaf of a papyrus codex, with 28 lines on ↓ and 25 lines on →. Fr. 1 and 2 (↓ 3:13-15; → 4:3-5) nearly join. Fr. 3 (↓ 3:16-4:3; → 4:3-8) is reconstructed from three pieces that join and preserves a bottom margin measuring 3.4 cm. Since there is only one line missing between Fr. 1+2 and Fr. 3 (line 11 ↓ and 10 →), the edition below treats them as a single piece with consecutive line

numbering. Reconstruction based on the text of Nestle–Aland’s 28th edition of the *Novum Testamentum Graece* suggests an average of 18 letters per line on ↓ and 16 on →. The codex seems to have had about 29 lines per page, since only one line is missing between ↓ and →. Although all three principal fragments do not join, the total height of the leaf can be estimated at about 27 cm, assuming a top margin of at least 3 cm. Column width, considering the average number of letters per line and evident spacing, can be estimated at between 10 and 11 cm. The total width of the leaf, if we assume left and right margins of at least 1.5 cm each, would thus be about 13 cm. The codex would then fall into Turner’s group 8 (*Typology* 20), where breadth seems to be about half the height.

This fairly large hand is a Biblical Majuscule, datable to the third century, probably the latter half. It is mostly bilinear, with ρ and γ dipping below the baseline and φ extending above and below the lines. The letters are generously spaced. In particular note the size of the head of ρ, slightly larger than the average for the Biblical Majuscule. There is a clear contrast between the light horizontal strokes and the heavy vertical strokes. Similar contrast is evident between the thicker right-hand diagonal and the thinner left-hand diagonal of γ, as well as between the thicker descending diagonal of χ and its thinner ascending one. Moreover, observe the contrast between the central part of the arc of ε and its extremities, which are thinner than the central stroke, and the contrast between the body of θ and its thinner central horizontal. The hand can be compared to LXII **4327**, assigned to the third century on the basis of a cursive document on the back (cf. P. Orsini, *Manoscritti in maiuscola biblica* (2005) 111–12, 199).

A high dot is used as a punctuation mark in → 25. Spaces recur in ↓ 14, 15, and 16 (and probably also in the lacunae of ↓ 13 and 17) to mark the line divisions of the hymn found at 3:16. Elision is applied without being marked by apostrophe (↓ 5). *Nomina sacra* are present. On the basis of the space available in the lacunae I assume that the scribe used slightly different forms for the same *nomen sacrum*, i.e. 3-letter and 2-letter forms (↓ 2–3, → 13), a fact attested in other papyri (A. H. R. E. Paap, *Nomina Sacra in the Greek Papyri of the First Five Centuries A.D.* (1959) 8–9 no. 14, 50–51 no. 258).

5259 is the earliest witness of 1 Timothy to be published. Other witnesses are: P. Louvre inv. E 7332 (= \mathfrak{P}^{61} , a parchment codex of the fifth century, containing 3:15–16, 4:1–3, 6 *passim*; partial transcription in T. Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur*, iii: *Supplementum Clementinum* (1884) 277–8), partially overlapping with **5259**; St Petersburg, Russian National Library Gr. 6 II (= \mathfrak{P}^{88} (see K. Treu, *Die griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments in der UdSSR* (1966) 20–21), fifth/sixth century, primary text of a palimpsest, 1:1–13); P. Berol. inv. 3605 (= \mathfrak{P}^{259} (see K. Treu, *APF* 18 (1966) 36), a school exercise in a parchment notebook from the fifth/seventh century, 1:4–7); P. Berol. inv. 13977 (= \mathfrak{P}^{262} (see K. Treu, *APF* 18 (1966) 36–7), probably an amulet on parchment from

the seventh century, 1:15–16). In addition, it is worth mentioning a written exercise consisting of 1 Tim 1:9–10 in Coptic written on an ostrakon of the seventh century (O. Vind. Copt. 5 c). On Pauline literature in Oxyrhynchus, see **5258** introd.

The text has been collated against the 28th edition of Nestle–Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*. However, in certain instances, as documented in the notes, the 27th edition of Nestle–Aland and the Center for New Testament Textual Studies apparatus (CNTTS) have also been consulted. In one case **5259** agrees with two MSS against the majority of witnesses (see ↓ 2 n.; see also ↓ 27 n.). In another it presents an elision occurring in only two other MSS against the majority of witnesses (see ↓ 5). Additional variants can only be inferred from the size of the lacunae. Notably, **5259** contains a previously unattested form of a *nomen sacrum* (see ↓ 22 n.).

Fr. 1+2+3 ↓

	ται και [] . [c.2]ν πα[ρρησιαν	3.13
	εν πι]ιςτ[ει] την ε[ν] χρω	
	την τ]αυτ[α] ρι γρα[φω] ελπι	3.14
	ζων ε]λθ[ειν] εν τ[α]χει εαν	3.15
5	δε βρα]δυ[νω] ι] ειδ[ης] πως	
	δει εν ο]ι[κω] θυ] α[ναστρε	
	φεςθαι ητις] εστ[ιν] εκκλη	
	σια θυ] ζω]γτος [ετυλος	
	και εδρ]αιω[μα] της αλη	
10	[θειας κ]α[ι] ομολογουμε]	
	[νωσ μεγα εστιν το της]	
	ευσεβειας μ]υςτ[ηριον] ος	3.16
	εφανερ]ωθη ε]ν καρ[κι] vac. ε	
	δικαιωθη] εν π[ν]ι vac. ωφ[θη]	
15	αγγελου]ς vac. εκ[η]ρυχ[θη]	
	εν εθνει]ν vac. επι[ς]τευ[θη]	
	εν κοσμω vac.] ανελ[η]μφ[θη]	
	εν δοξη τ]ο δε π[ν]α ρη[τωσ]	4.1
	λεγει οτι ε]ν υστεροι]ς	
20	καιροις απ]οστησον[ται]	
	τινες της] πιστ[ε]ωσ[]	
	προσεχο]ντες π[ν]ε[] πλα	
	νοικαι δι]δακκαλια[ις]	

5 μ with 69 and 76 (CNTTS): *iva* other MSS.

9 $\epsilon\delta\rho$]αιω[μα. The word $\epsilon\delta\rho\alpha\iota\omega\mu\alpha$ is expected here. The α is quite clear, then we can see the top of the iota, but the following traces are at first sight problematic. There is a horizontal stroke, 1.5 mm long, lying in the upper part of the writing space, and 0.5 mm farther, slightly below, another trace. One would be tempted to interpret them as the upper part of the left-hand lobe of the expected ω and remains of its central vertical element respectively. However, the above mentioned stroke looks too horizontal and long. Perhaps traces of interlinear corrections?

12 *oc* supplemented with \aleph^* A* C* F G 33. 365. 1175 Did Epiph: *o* D* lat: $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ \aleph^3 A^c C² D² K L P Ψ 81. 104. 630. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881 \aleph vg^{ms}.

13–14 Text reconstructed according to the *textus receptus*: the *paradosis* records a single variant in P. Louvre inv. E 7332, which transmits *και* before $\epsilon\delta\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\theta\eta$.

21 The reconstruction of this line based on the *textus receptus* results in a much shorter line than the rest of the fragment. No other variants exist to suggest an additional word after $\pi\iota\varsigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, but the extra space allows for the possibility of an addition here.

22 $\overline{\pi\nu\epsilon}$ [τ: $\pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\varsigma\omega$ MSS. **5259** clearly contains an hitherto unattested form of *nomen sacrum* in the dative plural where the meaning may be ‘spirit’ but the context is not sacred but profane (i.e. not indicating the Holy Spirit of the Trinity). Assuming that in this passage the papyrus follows most MSS (see also 22–3 n.), it appears that the scribe contracted the noun on the basis of the analogy with the other *nomina sacra*; on the occurrence of this noun in contracted forms with a profane meaning, see Paap, *Nomina Sacra* 102–3; P. Bodmer XIV, introd. p. 18; S. D. Charlesworth, ‘Consensus Standardization in the Systematic Approach to *Nomina Sacra* in Second- and Third-Century Gospel Manuscripts’, *Aegyptus* 86 (2006) 40–2, 45, 47–9, 55–6, 61, 63. Thus I supply the iota in lacuna since the contracted form should contain at least the last two letters of the word to make the dative plural clearly recognizable, as the standard cases of *nomina sacra* suggest (see e.g. Paap, *Nomina Sacra* 6, 50, 72: the genitive plural is contracted as $\overline{\pi\nu\alpha\tau\omega\nu}$; cf. 8 $\overline{\pi\nu\omega\nu}$); note that the horizontal above the *nomen sacrum* goes on after the *c* before the gap, suggesting that there was another letter as part of the contracted form; cf. the occurrence of the dative plural in the profane meaning in P. Bodmer XIV (\aleph^{75}), Lc 4:36, which is abbreviated as $\overline{\pi\nu}$ [α]τ[ι].

22–3 $\pi\lambda\alpha$]||*νοικ* supplemented with most MSS: $\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\eta\varsigma$ P Ψ 104. 614. 630. 945 lat.

25–6 $\kappa\epsilon\kappa$ [αυ]||[*κτηριαςμεν*]ων supplemented with \aleph A L *alii* Origen: *και* $\kappa\alpha\nu(\epsilon)\tau\eta\rho\iota\alpha\varsigma\mu\epsilon\nu\omega\nu$ F 0241^{vid} *alii* lat sy^p: $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\alpha\nu\tau\eta\rho\iota\alpha\varsigma\mu\epsilon\nu\omega\nu$ C D G I Ψ 33. 1739. 1881 \aleph Clem Did Epiph.

27 The iotacistic form $\kappa\nu\nu\iota\delta\eta\varsigma\omega$, transmitted by F010 G012 (CNTTS), fits the available space better than $\kappa\nu\nu\epsilon\iota\delta\eta\varsigma\omega$, the form transmitted by the other MSS. Note that **5259** agrees with F010 G012 also in ↓ 2.

27–8 κ]ωλυ[ο]ντω[ν γα]||[*μειν* απεχε]ζθαι with MSS: $\kappa\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu\tau\omega\nu$ απεχεθαι Toup.

Fr. 1+2+3 →

1–2 It seems that there is not enough space to accommodate the *textus receptus* -ματων α ο $\overline{\theta\epsilon}$ $\epsilon\kappa\tau\iota\varsigma\epsilon\nu$ εις μεταλημψιν μετα ευχαριστιας. It is worth noticing the occurrence of homoioarchon in the textual segment *μεταλημψιν μετα ευχαριστιας*, which may have caused an accidental omission of the word *μεταλημψιν*. If so, the text can be accommodated in the available space as follows:

ματων α] ο $\overline{\theta\epsilon}$ $\epsilon\kappa\tau\iota\varsigma\epsilon\nu$
εις μετα] ευχαρ[ιςτι]α[ς

The visible traces in 1 suggest two round letters; note that the second group of traces suggests a curved central stroke of the expected θ .

3–4 $\epsilon\pi$ [ε]||[*γνωκοσι*. On grounds of space I have restored with the text of NA 27. Final mobile ν is found in the text of NA 28, yet neither edition’s critical apparatus report witnesses. According to

the CNTTS, *επεγνωκοσι* **№**01 C04 Ψ044 1. 3. 33. 69. 76. 131. 209. 218. 424. 489. 927. 945. 999. 1243. 1244. 1245. 1249. 1505. 1548. 1573. 1628. 1724. 1739. 1768. 1876. 1880. 1881. 1962. 2085. 2086. 2374. 2400. 2495. 2501 TR: *επεγνωκοσι* A02 Δ06 1646. 1720. 1735. 1900 MT.

16 η supplemented with most MSS: ηc A 365.

17 πα]ρηκολου[θηκας supplemented with most MSS: παρηκολουθησας C F G.

25 η δ [ευσεβεια. I reconstruct the text by eliding the particle on the basis of the occurrence of elision in ↓ 5; the *textus receptus* has *scriptio plena* at this point.

J. SHAO

5260. HYMN OF THE CROSS: AMULET?

68 6B.24/K(1-2) a

24.2 × 18.5 cm

Fifth/sixth century
Plate III

A fragment from a papyrus sheet, written along the fibres, containing a Christian hymn in praise of the cross; the hymn appears in several patristic writings. Rotated 90° before reuse, the back contains a very cursive script that is clearly contemporary. **5260** measures 24.2 × 18.5 cm, but on the basis of parallel texts (see below) must have originally measured about 28 × 26 cm.

The hand is an inelegant capital, lacking consistent bilinearity. Letters are generally written separately, although there are occasional ligatures (*cτ* in col. ii 2; *av* in col. i 7, col. ii 4 and 8; *ai* in col. ii 1). Its most distinctive features are: **α** with an unclosed top with a loop; **ε** with the middle bar extending beyond the rest of the letter; **η** with a high crossbar and a small hook to the right at the bottom, but in col. i 8 there is an occurrence of the minuscule form in the sequence *μετανηα*; very tall **ι**, going well above and below the line, sometimes with a rightwards small hook at its lower extremity; enlarged **κ**; **ς** with a top stroke that extends quite far and sometimes slightly slants downward; **γ** with a small loop at the bottom.

This hand can be compared to scripts from the fifth and sixth centuries: Cavallo–Maehler, *GBEBP* 14a, Deed of loan of AD 423 (although much more cursive, it shows similarities in letter shapes, particularly **α**, **ε**, **ρ**, and **γ**); 14b, prayers from the middle of the fifth century (although **ο** and **ς** tend to be smaller in size and **γ** is different, **κ** and **ζ** are particularly similar); LXX **4799**, a receipt of a cogwheel from AD 586; *GBEBP* 36a, a loan of money upon mortgage of AD 591/2 (which also shows both forms of **η**, majuscule—with a rather high horizontal stroke—and minuscule). We would be inclined to assign this hand to the fifth/sixth century.

The text contains common phonetic spellings (see comm. *passim*) and two mistakes apparently corrected by the same scribe *currente calamo* (col. i 11, col. ii 13).

The text is written in two columns, with 12 extant lines (only 11 legible) on the left (col. i) and 13 on the right (col. ii), each line constituting one stanza of the hymn.