

Freer MS 5

Fayum

late III

Washington, Smithsonian Institution, Freer Gallery of Art, MS V. \*H.A.Sanders and C.Schmidt, *The Minor Prophets in the Freer Collection and the Berlin Fragment of Genesis* (New York 1927) 228-29, pl.II; *Facsimiles of the Washington Manuscript of the Minor Prophets in the Freer Collection* (Ann Arbor 1927) 69-70. H.St.J. Thackeray, 'A papyrus scrap of Patristic writing', *JTS* 30 (1929) 179-90, pl. opp. 184. VH 636; KV 9; Pack, App. 10; *LDAB* 1998.563; Montevecchi, *La Papirologia*, 325; Turner, *Typology*, 506.

Codex of fine quality papyrus, probably originally 48 leaves, which contained the Minor Prophets (319) on the first 39 pages, and this text on the last 9. Original measurements 32 x 14 cm, according to Turner; Van Haelst (284) gives 35 x 15; Sanders (10) had posited a measurement for a double leaf of the codex as 34.4 x 30 cm. Forty fragments are glassed together, of which twenty join. The largest, broken on all sides, the text of which was given by Sanders (229) and Thackeray (180) measures 3.8 - 5.3 (B) x 8.4 (H) cm. Both editors omit to mention the traces of a line preceding l.1 and another after l.14. Some of the restorations of Thackeray are impossible palaeographically. We give the text here of 8 contiguous fragments (including that reproduced by S. and T.), c. 9 (B) x 8.4 (H) cm at its furthest extremes. Patristic text written in a well executed literary informal round hand, inclined to the right; different from that of the Minor Prophets, although it closely resembles the hand which adds marginal notations on the Minor Prophets in several places. Van Haelst gives a date of III for the Patristic text, late III for the Minor Prophets; Turner dated the Minor Prophets to IV (*Typology* 59); Roberts, *MSB* 16, n.(h), gives later III for the Minor Prophets; *LDAB* gives III-IV. Diaresis (r. 9, 14). *Nomina sacra*: κς, θς; ανθρωπο[, πατρος written in full.

Recto (→):

	]όντως οὖν ἐστίν[	... truly therefore it is ...
	] . ασ . τα . . ν μαρτυροῦ[σιν	... to those witnessing ...
	]μή τις ν[. ]αισιηι τήν πολ[	... lest someone...
	]σω καλουμένην σκει[	... called ...
5	]καὶ διὰ τ. των τεχνίτων[	... of the craftsmen ...
	]ελουν ην τέχνην το[	... (their) craft ...
	]τυρ . . ἔγερσιν ἀνθρωπο[	... awakening of man ...
	] . παν περὶ τήν ἐκκλησίαν λ[	... around the church ...
	] . ζα . αθ ἰδρυται ἀνηβοη[	... it is established (?)...
10	] . . . η τοῦ παθ . . λετε[	...
	] . τείχη σου ταυτη[	... your walls by this ...
	] . ι' Εἰζεκιηλ βοᾷ καὶ λέγει και[	... Ezekiel cries and says ...
	]κ . ημ . . φηδια καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ . . σοι καλο[	... and on it...
	]ω τοῦ καὶ α . ηπ . . αλοε ἐκεῖ καὶ ἰδού[	... there, and behold! ...
15	]υ τοῦ ωσου . . χαλκοῦς . . . [	... bronze(?)...
	]τῆι χειρὶ αὐτοῦ[. ]και[	... by his hand...
	] . . μρ και\η/ αλ[	...
	] . ου κα[	...

1 Ἰησου]ς T. 2 ο]ν T. 3 ησαι T. 4 . . θελην S. & T. σκ(ε)ι[αγραφια T. 9 υηι ανεβοη[σαν T. ἰδρυται pap. καθἰδρυται? 13 μαρτ[υρε]ς οι καλο[υμενοι δωδεκα T. 14 ταδε λεγει κς T. ἕδου pap.

Verso (↓):

	]σοφιστῶν κ...ρυ[	... of the sophists ...
	]ἐκκλησίας δὴ γείτοσι[ν	... of the church indeed to the neighbours...
	οἰκο]δόμου οὖν ἦο[.]καὶ ενυ.[	... therefore of the builder? ...
	]ιν τὴν νῦν ὑπὸ πολλῆ[	... the present one by much ...
5	]γ λόγων καὶ ἐχθροῖς[	... of words and to enemies...
	]λίθος ἀνθραξ ἐτοιμάζω[	... the garnet stone. I am preparing...
	]τὸ πυρῶδες γα[.]... αρ[	... its fiery nature ...
	εἶπ]εν ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐτοιμάζω φω[	... [he said], Behold, I am preparing...
	ύ]πὸ τοῦ πατρός. τοι... πρ.[	... by the Father ...
10	]τὸ ἐν ὕστερον[	... the one later ...
	]ἐν δόξῃ ἀποκαλ[υφθήσεται	... [shall be] revealed in glory ...
	]τῶν μὲν κριτῆς γενόμενος.]υν αε[	... of some having become the Judge ...
	]υλ.γ καὶ ἕτερος μάρτυς ἀξιόλογος...[	... and the other witness of note...
	]ητης οὐκ ἄρα ἦν τινα δρας.ν ποιουμεν[	...
15	]η κ(ύριος) ὁ θ(εός)ς μο[	... the Lord God...
	]καὶ η..... [	...
	]εθτ[	...

1 τρουτων α S. 3 μου συνπ S. οικο]δομου εργω T. 4 ὑπ[αρχουσαν T. 5 ...ιδου ειμι... S. χηδονιαν  
καλ[ουμενην] T. 8 εγω ειπ[ S. 11 ...βηνηκαλ S. 14 ου καρνιτων S. δις] η τρις T.

This text, which followed at the end of the codex containing the Minor Prophets (cf. **319**), was glassed in a fragmentary state after Sander's conservation of the codex, and has been unstudied since Thackeray's treatment. However, personal inspection confirms that half the forty fragments join to form the remains of a single page; as it seems likely that the remaining fragments also derive from this page, it may have been the only page of this work which survived. In anticipation of a full new edition of the text, we reproduce here the large fragment edited by Sanders and Thackeray, plus seven adjoining fragments.

Into the text have been introduced several new readings of the main fragment (based on autopsy). The 'tentative' readings of Sanders were often displaced by Thackeray in a highly speculative attempt to show that the text was by Clement. The chief clue to the identity of the fragment is in l.12 of the recto. The expression βοᾷ (or κέκραγεν) introducing a biblical passage or paraphrase is to be observed in Clement of Alexandria and Justin Martyr, but (prior to IV and its currency in John Chrysostom) the combination βοᾷ και λέγει is used by Clement only, e.g. *Prot.* 94.2, cf. *Paed.* 1.9.76, *Strom.* 7.9.53. The possibility that the fragment belongs to a lost work of Clement would be increased by the use of other words with significant parallels in his works (recto ll.4, 7, 11: verso ll.3, 6-8) if the restorations and arguments of Thackeray were followed, but they repeatedly defy the plain reading.

The text of the recto indicates the use of OT prophecy for messianic purposes, Ezekiel certainly (r. 12), and perhaps Isaiah, if τείχη σου in r.11 echoes Isa. 60:18 (so Thackeray, but his suggested reading of Isaiah's name at r.3 cannot stand). The metaphors relating to building (r.5) and walls (r.11) could be used to compare Zion of the Old Covenant with the Church and the heavenly Jerusalem of the New (e.g. Isa. 60:18, Eph. 2:21, Rev. 21:2). Such a context would be strengthened by references on the verso to the Church (v.2) and to building (v.3), which have good parallels in the *Stromateis* of Clement (7.5.28). Thackeray assumed that a quotation from Isaiah 54:11 commenced at v.8 (ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐτοιμάζω), but the adjoining fragment shows that φω[, rather than the expected σοι, follows these words). Yet the passage clearly reflects the OT text; the λίθος ἀνθραξ has already featured above (v.6). The references to the 'fiery garnet' and other gems (the λίθος ὑασπις is mentioned on another fragment, not reproduced here) might well have been interpreted along the lines of Clement's

comments on the heavenly city in Revelation (*Paed.* 2.12.119). Thackeray believed that v.9-12 echo the teaching of the Gospels on the last Judgement, especially Matt. 25:31ff.

It is possible that the title of this lost work survives in two words (written in a larger hand of the same date) which Sanders read under the main subscription to the Twelve Prophets as  $\pi\rho\omicron\phi$  'κηρυκξι[α]. This could be restored as  $\pi\rho\omicron\phi(\eta\tau\iota\kappa\eta)$  κηρυκεία, 'A Prophetic Proclamation', which Thackeray took for the title of the present work. Yet it seems strange that the title was at the foot of a page on which there was no text following it, and not (as might be expected) at the head of the new text.

New readings on the largest fragment cast doubt on Thackeray's identification of the text's author. Neither these nor the remaining fragments have permitted a positive alternative identification. On another fragment (not reproduced here) the writer refers to the 'New Testament' ( $\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\eta$  διαθήκη) and Revelation ( $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ ] κάλυψις). A context for such a discussion of Revelation and the New Testament, and one which fits well with the messianic tone of this text, might be found in the dispute between Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, and the adherents of the teachings of Nepos, a 'Bishop of Egypt', which took place in the middle of the third century (Eusebius, *HE* 7.24). Concentrated in the Fayum (where this codex was found), this group followed the teachings of Nepos, as set out in his *Refutation of the Allegorists*. Dionysius answered this in two books *On the Promises*, in which he felt compelled to question the canonical status of Revelation. Eusebius excerpts sections of Dionysius' work (*HE* 7.24-25) but the text as preserved here is not among them. As the text of Nepos' work is lost, there is no way of determining whether or not this papyrus preserves a fragment of a work which was influential in early Fayumic Christian communities.