

The Sinful Woman in the *Gospel of Peter*: Reconstructing the Other Side of P.Oxy. 4009

MATTI MYLLYKOSKI

Faculty of Theology, PL 33, 0014 University of Helsinki, Finland

In 1993, Dieter Lührmann published a reconstruction of the more intelligible side of P.Oxy. 4009. He demonstrated that this side, which he called the recto, consists of passages parallel to Matt 10.16 par., Luke 10.3 and 2 Clem. 5.2–4. He also argued that the passage stems from the *Gospel of Peter*. However, Lührmann considered it impossible ('ausgeschlossen') to reconstruct the other side of the fragment. The aim of the present article is to demonstrate that a full reconstruction of this less intelligible side of P.Oxy. 4009, lines 1–13, is possible and that it enriches our knowledge of the *Gospel of Peter* with a new pericope which is an interesting parallel of Luke 7.36–50. The reconstruction also demonstrates that the side reconstructed by Lührmann is actually the verso, and that both sides together point towards the well-known anti-Jewish redactional tendencies of the author of the *Gospel of Peter*.

Keywords: Manuscripts, Oxyrhynchus Papyri, *Gospel of Peter*, Gospel of Luke, Sin-repentance

In 1993, Dieter Lührmann and P. J. Parsons published P.Oxy. 4009, a double-sided Gospel fragment (2.9 × 9 cm).¹ The small and round letters and many ligatures of the fragment reveal an informal copyist. It has been difficult to date the document precisely, but on the basis of similar manuscripts, Lührmann and Parsons have allocated this small papyrus to the second century.² Paul Foster has criticized such an early date and instead dates P.Oxy. 4009 to the early third century.³

1 Dieter Lührmann and P. J. Parsons, '4009. Gospel of Peter?', *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri LX* (ed. R. A. Coles, M. W. Haslam and P. J. Parsons; London: The British Academy by the Egypt Exploration Society, 1994) 1–5, esp. 1. For a copy of P.Oxy 4009 see <http://www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk/P.Oxy>

2 Lührmann and Parsons, '4009. Gospel of Peter?', 1. Their conclusion is accepted by Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas, *Das Petrus-evangelium und die Petrusapokalypse: Die griechischen Fragmente mit deutscher und englischer Übersetzung* (Neutestamentliche Apokryphen I; GCS NF 11; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003) 59.

3 Paul Foster, 'Are there any Early Fragments of the So-Called Gospel of Peter?', *NTS* 52 (2006) 1–28, esp. 15–16. Foster draws attention to the round E with the extended horizontal line, the narrow A and the broad Θ, again with an extended horizontal line, as well as the broad Δ; they all indicate

1. The Side Reconstructed by Dieter Lührmann

In their publication, Lührmann and Parsons chose to call the side written on the horizontal fibers the recto—the side which was also easier to reconstruct. The side reconstructed by Lührmann includes 21 lines with a narrow margin of 0.5 cm on the right and 0.8 cm at the bottom. Lührmann’s reconstruction is based on Matt 10.16b, P.Oxy. ii.19–23 = *Gos. Thom.* 39b (lines 5–7), and 2 *Clem.* 5.2–4 (lines 7–19). The letters on the fragment are in bold:⁴

Matt 10.16b

Ἴδου ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ὡς πρόβατα ἐν μέσῳ λύκων· γίνεσθε οὖν φρόνιμοι ὡς οἱ ὄφεις καὶ ἀκέραιοι ὡς αἱ περιστεραί.

P.Oxy. 655 ii.19–23

ὑμεῖς]
δὲ γίν[εσθε φρόνι-]
μοι ὡ[ς ὄφεις καὶ ἀ-]
κέραι[οι ὡς αἱ περιστε-]
ρα[ί.

P.Oxy. 4009:

The Side Reconstructed by Lührmann

3

ει
κα

5

ὁ **θερισμός**.
γίνου δὲ ἀκέραιος ὡς αἱ πε-
ριστεραὶ καὶ φρόνιμος
ὡς οἱ ὄφεις. **ἔσεσθε** ὡς
ἀρνία ἀνὰ μέσον λύκων.

10

εἶπον πρὸς αὐτόν. **ἐὰν οὐ**(ν)
(ν) **σπαραχθῶμεν;**

ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς **λέγει μοι. οἱ**
λύκοι σπαραξάντες τὸ

2 *Clem.* 5.2–4

λέγει γὰρ ὁ κύριος·

Ἔσεσθε ὡς
ἀρνία ἐν μέσῳ λύκων.
(3) ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ

ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῷ λέγει· Ἐὰν οὖν
διασπαραξῶσιν οἱ λύκοι τὰ ἀρνία;

(4) εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ Πέτρῳ·
Μὴ φοβείσθωσαν τὰ ἀρνία τοὺς λύκους

third century style. He thinks that P.Oxy. 4009 may be best compared with Papyrus Bodmer 2 (P⁶⁶) and P.Oxy. 2334, both of which are dated to the 3rd century.

4 Dieter Lührmann, ‘POx 4009: Ein neues Fragment des Petrus-evangeliums?’, *NovT* 35 (1993) 390–410, esp. 395–8. In the presentation above, Lührmann’s text is modified by showing in bold only such letters which are unmistakably visible on the fragment itself; cf. also the remarks of Foster, ‘Early Fragments’, 17.

	ἀρνίον οὐκέτι αὐτῷ οὐ	μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτά·
	δὲν δύνανται ποιῆσαι. Δι	
15	ὃ ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν. μὴ φο	καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ φο-
	βεῖσθε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεν	βεῖσθε τοὺς ἀποκτέν-
	νόντων ὑμᾶς καὶ μετὰ τὸ	νοντας ὑμᾶς καὶ
	ἀποκτεῖναι μηκέτι ποι	μηδὲν ὑμῖν
	ῆσαι δυναμένων μηδέν.	δυναμένους ποιεῖν,
		ἀλλὰ φοβεῖσθε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν
		ὑμᾶς ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν ψυχῆς καὶ
		σώματος τοῦ βαλεῖν
		εἰς γέενναν πυρός.
20	ω	
	μει	

Translation of Lührmann's reconstruction:

...the harvest. Be innocent as doves and wise as serpents. You will be as sheep among the wolves.' I said to him: 'What if we will be torn?' He answered and said to me: 'When the wolves tear the lamb, they can no longer do anything to it. Therefore I say to you: "Do not fear those who kill you and after killing can do nothing anymore"'

Even though some lines of P.Oxy. 4009 may be reconstructed differently, Lührmann's reconstruction is convincing.⁵ Jesus answers the question proposed by a disciple with a saying introduced with the words λέγει μοι (line 11). On the basis of a strikingly similar dialogue quoted in 2 *Clem.* 5.2-4, Lührmann concludes that P.Oxy. 4009 has preserved a dialogue between Jesus and Peter. This, in turn, makes it possible to identify the fragment as part of the *Gospel of Peter*.⁶ This assumption is supported by the vocative form of the *nomen sacrum* $\overline{\kappa\epsilon}$ on the recto of the fragment (line 13), since this Christological title is characteristic of the Akhmîm fragment, which has been safely identified as a part of Peter's Gospel.⁷

5 Kraus and Nicklas, *Petrusevangelium*, 62: 'Die Rekonstruktion ist sehr wohl sinnvoll.' Three alternative readings may be proposed: (10) ν *σπαραχθῶμεν*; (15) α τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν. μὴ φο (20) $\chi\omega$. The reconstruction of line 11 seems to demand too much space, although it is very difficult to present a plausible alternative. Perhaps the copyist left a blank space at the beginning of the line—just like he did at the end of the preceding line—and wrote τότε ὁ κ(ύριος)ς κτλ.?

6 D. Lührmann, 'POx 4009' See also Lührmann's German translation on p. 398. See also his extensive study *Die apokryph gewordenen Evangelien: Studien zu neuen Texten und zu neuen Fragen* (NT.S 112; Leiden: Brill 2004).

7 U. Bouriant, 'Fragments du texte grec du livre d'Énoch et de quelques écrits attribués à saint Pierre', *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologique française au Caire* (t. IX, fasc. 1; Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1892) 94. The manuscript of the Akhmîm fragment has now also been published on the internet: <http://ipap.csad.ox.ac.uk/GP/GP.html>.

However, Lührmann warns us against assuming that the author of 2 *Clem.* used the *Gospel of Peter* (cf. the Gospel mentioned in 2 *Clem.* 8.5) as his source.⁸

The proposal of Lührmann has not been received unopposed; Kraus and Nicklas as well as Foster conclude that P.Oxy. 4009 cannot be reliably considered to be part of the *Gospel of Peter*.⁹ However, the case for identification is stronger than they assume because the side reconstructed by Lührmann consists clearly of sayings material tied to the plot of the Gospels. The other side of the fragment also indicates the vocabulary of the Gospels.

In spite of the verbal differences, the harvest theme, and the dove-serpent-saying in P.Oxy. 4009, the train of thought is similar in both P.Oxy. 4009 and 2 *Clem.* 5.2–4. It reads like a developed form of the synoptic saying in Matt 10.16 par. Luke 10.3. In both texts, the saying about lambs and wolves is extended with (Peter's) concerned question about the physical threat against the disciples. Jesus' answer is based on another synoptic saying which we know from a different context.¹⁰ The clusters in both documents are dependent on the synoptic tradition.

The reorganized and edited synoptic material in P.Oxy 4009 and in 2 *Clem.* 5.2–4 is closely related to the themes of persecution and martyrdom. Even though the tradition of 2 *Clem.*, particularly in its formulation of the last sayings of the cluster, is closer to Luke than Matthew (μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν, ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν, βαλεῖν), it is reasonable to assume that the cluster rather follows the structure of the Matthean narrative. As with several other sayings in 2 *Clem.*, this passage also is a harmonized version of Matthean and Lukan texts.¹¹ However, the author has bypassed Jesus' speech on the eschatological mission of the disciples (Matt 10.17–27) and thus produced an immediate connection between the sending of the disciples and the saying about false and true fear (Matt 10.28 par. Luke 12.4–5).¹² With this arrangement of the text, the author has also discarded the immediate expectation of the end proclaimed by the Matthean Jesus (10.23). Thus the focus of the text shifts from the Matthean eschatological plan to the situation in which the apostles are

8 Lührmann, 'POx 4009', 400–401; cf. his even more cautious evaluation in 'Ein neues Fragment des Petrus-evangeliums', *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism* (ed. C. Focant; BETL 110; Leuven: Leuven University, 1993) 579–81, 581.

9 Kraus and Nicklas, *Petrusevangelium*, 63 point to the fact that the I-narrator Peter also appears in many other early Christian documents (1–2 Pet; *eth Apoc Pet 2*; *Acts of Peter and the Twelve* [1,30–31 (NHC V,1)]). Foster, 'Fragments', 17–19 has criticized Lührmann's identification of the fragment with the *Gospel of Peter* because the text reconstructed by Lührmann and the traditions preserved in Matt 10.16b and 2 *Clem.* 5.2–4 cannot be traced back to the same basic forms and because the verbal agreements between these texts are rather slim.

10 Matt 10.28 par. Luke 12.4–5; cf. Clement of Alexandria *Exc. ex Theod.* 14.3; 51.3; Irenaeus *Adv. Haer.* 3.18.5; Justin 1. *Apol.* 19.7; *Ps.-Clem. Hom.* 17.5.2.

11 H. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (Philadelphia: Trinity/London: SCM, 1990) 351.

12 H. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 353 thinks that Clement did not receive this tradition from a Gospel harmony but rather from a saying tradition clothed in the form of a dialogue.

expected to suffer bravely at the hands of their killers and fear God and the punishment of hell more than the brutal power of their oppressors.

In a similar vein, the text reconstructed by Lührmann refers to a situation that was more or less current in the days of the author and not somewhere in a distant eschatological future. However, here the cluster of sayings is even more closely connected with the sending out of the disciples (harvest, serpents and doves). In lines 5–8, P.Oxy. 4009 is in one way or another dependent on Matt 10.16, but has the two sayings (serpents and doves, wolves) in reverse order. Furthermore, while the saying of Matt 10.16b, both in the manuscript tradition and in quotations from the church fathers, is consistently presented in the order serpents–doves, in P. Oxy. 4009 we have the opposite order. In addition, this saying is addressed to all the disciples (γίνεσθε) elsewhere, while in P.Oxy. 4009 only one disciple is addressed (γίνου).¹³ However, according to both P.Oxy. 4009 and 2 *Clem.* 5.2, all the addressed disciples will be like sheep among the wolves. Thus, lines 5–8 offer a free reformulation of the Matthean text. The version of P.Oxy. 4009 is also more developed than its parallel in 2 *Clem.* 2.2–5. The saying especially addressed to Peter in lines 5–7 looks like a later addition to the similar oral tradition that both texts are quoting. It is not clear how the text of P.Oxy. 4009 continues; lines 20–21 do not allow a reconstruction of a saying about the true fear which follows at the end of 2 *Clem.* 5.4 (ἀλλὰ φοβεῖσθε κτλ.).¹⁴

Even though Lührmann has made a good case for P.Oxy. 4009 being a fragment of the *Gospel of Peter*, it is indeed impossible to be absolutely sure ‘whether the author is reworking oral, non-canonical or canonical gospel traditions (or even a combination of these)’.¹⁵ However, if the other side of the fragment reveals that P.Oxy. 4009 is part of an extended gospel narrative, it becomes difficult to avoid the conclusion that we have here an important late second- or early third-century witness to the *Gospel of Peter*.

2. Reconstruction of the Enigmatic Other Side

The recto of the fragment has been notoriously difficult to reconstruct. According to Lührmann, ‘a reconstruction of the verso is excluded’,¹⁶ and Foster thinks that ‘no secure identification is possible’.¹⁷ In their edition of the

13 Cf. Ignatius *Pol.* 2.2: Φρόνιμος γίνου ὡς ὄφις ἐν ὄψασιν καὶ ἀκέραιος εἰς αἰὶ ὡς ἡ περιστέρα. See also Barsanuphius et Joannes *Quaest. et resp.* 49: Καὶ γενοῦ «φρόνιμος ὡς ὄφις», ἵνα μὴ πλανήσωσί σε οἱ ἐχθροὶ σου. «Ἀκέραιος δὲ ὡς αἱ περιστεραί», ἵνα μὴ πολεμήσῃ σε ἡ ἀνταπόδοσις. For the standard edition, see F. Neyt and P. de Angelis-Noah, *Barsanuphe et Jean de Gaza, Correspondance, tome I-II* (SC 426/427; Paris: Cerf, 1997–98).

14 Thus correctly Lührmann, ‘POx 4009’, 397.

15 Foster, ‘Fragments’, 18–19.

16 Lührmann, ‘POx 4009’, 403: ‘Eine Rekonstruktion des Textes des Verso ist also ausgeschlossen.’

17 Foster, ‘Fragments’, 17.

fragments related to the *Gospel of Peter*, Kraus and Nicklas have given up all attempts to make sense of the other side.¹⁸

The longest visible lines of Lührmann's reconstruction include 8–10 letters. In each line, he has filled the lacuna with 9–10 letters—excepting line 11, where he has added 13 letters. Considering that the left margin of the unknown side is about 0.3 cm broader than the right margin of the side reconstructed by Lührmann, it is reasonable to assume that the missing parts of lines have basically included 11–12 letters. As line 10 on the unknown side reveals, the copyist may have started some lines one letter closer to the edge of the margin. On the other hand, the reconstructed side consists partly of quite dense writing, including 7 or even 8 letters in the same space in which the unknown side has only 6 letters (lines 4–7, 11–14). Therefore, it is not surprising that the lines to be reconstructed here are slightly shorter than the ones Lührmann has reconstructed.

The reconstructed side reveals an interesting feature of this manuscript: the copyist regularly seems to leave a blank space after an introduction to *oratio recta* (lines 9, 11 and 15). This detail has some significance for the reconstruction of the recto.

As mentioned above, the left margin of the unknown side (0.8 cm) is broader than the right margin of the other side. Correspondingly, even the broadest lines of the unknown side (5–13) include merely 6–7 letters. Unfortunately, there are no apparent catchwords that would create a common context for both sides. My transcription of the unknown side runs differently at some points from that of Lührmann¹⁹ and Kraus and Nicklas:²⁰

....
 ...].[
 ..]ψε . .[
 ..]υσ.[
 συδετ[
 5 παρεσχ[
 θοντιμ[
 κασδια.[
 οτιαφει.[
 λαιαμα[
 10 αυτωεκ [
 μενων[
 νοματ.[
 αφεισκει
 ..]ουθ[

18 Kraus and Nicklas, *Petrusevangelium*, 59: 'Eine sinnvolle Rekonstruktion des Verso gelang bislang allerdings nicht, wenngleich ein Zusammenhang zwischen Recto und Verso möglich erscheint.'

19 Lührmann, 'POx 4009', 402: line 4 συδε...[; line 8 οτι.φει[.]α; line 15 ..]..α[.

20 Kraus and Nicklas, *Petrusevangelium*, 60: line 4 συ δεγ[; line 8 οτι.φ'ε'[.]α[; line 15 ..]μμια[.

15 ..]αμαι[
 ..]προ.[
 ..]πιη.[
 ..]..ν..[
 ..]...αι[
 20 ..].....[

These lines are expected to include 17–19 letters. This means that the space for reconstruction of missing letters in lines 5–13 hardly covers more than 12 letters. Due to the vocative κ(ύρι)ε, the letters αφεισκ̄ε in line 13 must be read as an address; the verb form is the active indicative present 2nd person singular, i.e., ἄφεῖς, κ̄ε.²¹ In principle, it is possible that the Lord is addressed about something he allows or does not allow to be done.²² However, further considerations make it clear that the question at stake here is the forgiveness of sins.

In the light of line 13, we can return to line 8 where the copyist has had some difficulties with the same verb. The small hook in the first letter reveals that it is not ο but α.²³ The last letter of the line is unclear, but it has clearly been corrected to be ω, as the upward hook reveals. Having first written ΑΦΙΕ[ΝΤΑΙ, the form that is known from Jesus' declaration of forgiveness of sins to the lame man in Mark 2.5 and Matt 9.2, the copyist later wants to write ΑΦΕΩ[ΝΤΑΙ²⁴ instead and corrects his mistake. He adds Ε upon the line between Φ and Ι, draws the messy Ω on the still visible small Ε, but leaves the iota in his former writing untouched. The final result is the text as it stands.²⁵ Be as it may, the unknown side of P.Oxy. 4009 does not tell the story of the lame man healed in Mark 2:1–10 and parallels; line 9 points in a different direction.

The first six letters of line 9 reveal the whole story: λαιαμια is nothing other than a part of the expression πολλὰ ἁμαρτία. In the whole Gospel tradition, there is only one person with 'many sins'—the sinful woman of Luke 7.36–50. On the unknown side of P.Oxy. 4009, we have some sentences of a variant of this story.

Two words, διὰ and ὅτι, reveal in lines 7–8 a similar introduction to the answer of Jesus as in Luke 7.47a. On the basis of the data gathered thus far, it is possible to reconstruct *lines 7–9* of the fragment:

21 This form is rare, but so is the grammatically more correct ἄφίης. The form ἄφεῖς is attested once in the NT (Rev 2.20) and once in the LXX (Ex 32.32). In *Ps-Clem. Hom.* 19.6.3, the Codex Parisinus has ἄφεῖς instead of ἄφίης.

22 Cf. Lührmann, *Evangelien*, 84 who saw in lines 8 and 13 forms of ἀφίημι ('in welcher Bedeutung auch immer').

23 For a similar α, see line 16 of the other side.

24 This form is familiar from the Lukan version of the same story (Luke 5.23).

25 I thank Peter Arzt-Grabner for his useful remarks on my reconstruction.

Lines 7–9

διὰ [τοῦτο λέγω σοι
ὅτι ἀφ' ἐ' {I}ω[νται ἀντῆ πολ-
λαὶ ἅμα[ρτίαι.

Luke 7.47a

οὐ χάριν, λέγω σοι,
 ἀφέωνται αἱ ἁμαρτίαι
 ἀντῆς αἱ πολλαί,

It is possible to add αἱ before πολλαί in line 8, but the most likely length of the lines speaks for the shorter form. More importantly, before πολλαὶ ἁμαρτίαι, the space that must be conjectured for each line in the fragment does not allow -νται ἀντῆς αἱ πολ- (14 letters)²⁶ or even -νται ἀντῆ αἱ πολ- (13 letters) but compels the choice of -νται ἀντῆ πολ- (11 letters) instead. It must be noted that some manuscripts of the Western text have a wording notably closer to that of the most likely reconstruction. The Codex Bezae has ἀφέωνται ἀντῆ πολλὰ (thus also ff² and I). Most old Latin manuscripts read *remissa sunt illi peccata multa*, and the Sinaitic Syriac translation offers a corresponding text ('her many sins are forgiven her').²⁷ Different versions of the Diatessaron favor similar readings.²⁸ Thus, the dative ἀντῆ is well attested in the Western text.

In spite of the scanty data in lines 2–7, it is possible to reconstruct the beginning of the fragment with the help of the corresponding verses in Luke 7.45–46. The sentences are quite differently constructed, but the words σὺ δέ in line 4 make it clear that Jesus addresses his host, most likely a Pharisee as in Luke, about his actions in lines 4–7, while in the preceding lines, he has described the actions of the sinful woman. The affinities between the Lukan text and the version of the fragment are marked in bold:

...].[
 . .] **ψε** . .[
 .]. **υσπ**[
συδετ[
 5 **παρεσχ**[
 θοντιμ[
κασδια

26 Some witnesses for Luke 7.47a (N A K W Ψ *et alii*) read ἀντῆς αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αἱ πολλαί. Cf. also the quotation of John Chrysostom in *Ad Theodorum lapsus* 17: ἀφίενται ἀντῆς αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αἱ πολλαί.

27 E. Jan Wilson, *The Old Syriac Gospels: Studies and Comparative Translations*. vol. 2. *Luke and John* (Eastern Christian Studies 2; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2002) 442.

28 See, e. g., *Saint Ephrem's Commentary on Tatian's Diatessaron* (trans. Carmel McCarthy; JSSSup 2; Oxford: Oxford University, 1993) 10.9: 'her many sins are forgiven her'. Thus also the Venetian (135: *li fia remetù assai peccadi*) and the Tuscanian (139: *molti peccati le sono perdonati*) versions which are printed in *Il Diatessaron in volgare italiano: Testi inediti dei secoli XIII–XIV* (ed. V. Todesco, A. Vaccari and M. Vattasso; Studi e testi 81; Roma: Bibliotheca apostolica Vaticana, 1938). Codex Fuldensis (Eduard Sievers, *Tatian: Lateinisch und altdeutsch mit ausführlichem Glossar* [2nd ed.; Paderborn, 1892]; online: http://users.belgacom.net/chardic/html/tatien_intro.html) offers a slightly different reading: *remittentur ei peccata multa*.

φίλημά μοι οὐκ ἔδωκα· αὕτη δὲ ἀφ' ἧς εἰσηλθὼν οὐ διέλιπεν καταφιλοῦσά μου τοὺς πόδας, ἐλαίῳ τὴν κεφαλὴν μου οὐκ ἤλειψας· αὕτη δὲ μύρω ἤλειψεν τοὺς πόδας μου.

These affinities indicate that the washing of feet described by Luke in 7.44b does not come up in the first lines of the fragment. A reconstruction of lines 2–4 is possible because the actions of the sinful woman are known to us from Luke (vv. 45b and 46b). The anointing performed by the sinful woman is described in lines 1–2. The letters ψε (and some obscure remains of ν) in line 3 point to the word ἤλειψεν of the Lukan story. The horizontal line of σ indicates that a τ or π follows; therefore it is possible, following the text of Luke, to add π here. The following reconstruction of *lines 1–3* recommends itself:

μύρω ἤ-
λει]ψε[ν καὶ οὐ διέλ(ε)ιπεν
το]ύς[πόδας μου φιλοῦσά.

Some notes are necessary.

Line 1–2: In the Codex Bezae and W 079 sy, the Lukan v. 46b is preserved in a shorter form αὕτη δὲ μύρω ἤλειψεν, omitting τοὺς πόδας μου. It is impossible to say whether P.Oxy. 4009 supports the short (Western) form of the text, even though the formulation of the sentence in lines 1–3 hints at the possibility that the woman anointed *Jesus* and kissed his *feet*. Some scholars have indeed argued that the shorter text is original.²⁹ Be that as it may, the logic of the anointing has caused problems for the copyists of the Lukan story. Some later Latin manuscripts have—for symmetry's sake—made *Jesus* say that the *host* did not anoint his feet.³⁰

Line 2: It is possible to read either διέλειπεν or διέλιπεν.³¹ The former reading fits better the assumed length of the lines.

Line 3: In Luke 7.45b, the old Latin manuscript e offers a striking parallel to the wording in the fragment: *non intermisit pedes meos osculando*.

Lines 4–7 form the next unit. In line 5, the verb form παρέσχεζ (active indicative aorist 2nd person singular) indicates that, in line 4, *Jesus* mentions something that his *host* did not offer him or provide for him. The context makes it clear that *Jesus*

29 Thus particularly Konrad Weiss, 'Der westliche Text von Lc 7:46 und sein Wert', *ZNW* 46 (1955) 242–5. He thinks that the anointing of *Jesus'* feet was invented by John (12.3) and later interpolated in Luke 7.46. In Luke 7.38, the elliptical expression does not mean that the woman anointed *Jesus'* feet but that she anointed him. Weiss also states that anointing the feet is an all too extraordinary feature here: 'Die ehrende Salbung der Füße an einem Gaste ist an und für sich ein für die Antike ungewöhnlicher, ja unerhörter Vorgang'. If the longer reading is regarded as original, it is strange that the Pharisee does not take offence at this particular action.

30 Thus, a ff² l (*oleo non unxisti pedes meos*) and e (*oleo pedes meos non unxisti*).

31 In Luke 7.45b, ⳨ A K L W Δ Ξ and others read διέλειπεν, while B D P Γ Θ Ψ and others prefer διέλιπεν.

speaks about oil. It is interesting to see that the author of this text is not satisfied with the Lukan formulation of Jesus' words. The host is not expected to have anointed Jesus' head, but he should have provided oil for him that he could do it himself. The letters θοντιμ in line 6 make it clear that lines 5–6 included the words οὐδὲ εἰσελ[θόντι μ[οι, using the verb εἰσέρχομαι that is used in Luke 7.44–45. In the beginning of line 7 the letters κας indicate the verb form—again in active indicative aorist 2nd person singular—ἐδώκας. The Lukan parallel and the spacing of the fragmentary lines reveal that these words are about the kiss (φίλημα) that Jesus did not receive from his host. These considerations lead to the following reconstruction of *lines 4–7*:

σὺ δὲ τὸ[ἔλαιόν ἐμοὶ οὐ
 παρέσχ[εις οὐδὲ εἰσελ-
 θόντι μ[οι φίλημα ἐδώ-
 κας.

Lines 9–11 can also be read in the light of the Lukan parallel, which introduces here the reaction of 'those who were at the table' (οἱ συνανακείμενοι). The letters μενων in line 11 indicate the expression ἐκ τῶν συνανακείμενων which fits perfectly both the length of line 10 and the characterization of the guests in Luke 7.49a. The word αὐτῶ in the beginning of line 10 indicates that line 9 ended with an expression like εἶπον δὲ, introducing the reaction of the συνανακείμενοι which begins in line 11 and ends with the words ἀφεῖς, κ̅ε in line 13:

Lines 9–11

εἶπον δὲ
 αὐτῶ ἐκ [τῶν συνανακει-
 μενων· [

Luke 7.49a

καὶ ἤρξαντο
 οἱ συνανακει-
 μενοι λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς·

This reconstruction is not secure, but it has very few alternatives. An expression like εἶπον δὲ αὐτῶ ἐκ τῶν συνανακείμενων is rare, but attested in the Christian corpus of texts.³² The introduction to the reaction heard from among the guests can hardly be more extensive because such an assumption would make it all too difficult to reconstruct lines 11–13.

The vocative κ(ύρι)ε implies that lines 11–13 include *a question* the guests pose to the Lord. The letters νοματ in line 12 indicate the words ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου since the expression ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί τοῦ θε(ο)ῦ would be too long and would make less sense here. Furthermore, the only reasonable object for ἀφεῖς is ἁμαρτία. Since the presence of precisely these three elements—question

32 There is a similar sentence in a homily of John Chrysostom on John (*Hom. in. Joh.* 59.1; paraphrasing John 8.40): Λέγουσιν αὐτῶ ἐκ τῶν ἀκολουθούντων αὐτῶ· Μὴ καὶ ἡμεῖς τυφλοὶ ἐσμεν; see also *Catena in Joannem* 364.21: διὸ καὶ εἶπον ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ.

