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PAPYRUS MAGDALEN GREEK 17 (GREGORY-ALAND \(\text{\textcopyright}^{64}\))
A REAPPRAISAL

It would be a very brave man who would deny that such a text, or any text, might be susceptible to further improvement.

H.C. Youtie

The oldest extant papyrus fragment of the Gospel according to Matthew consists of five small scraps, three of which are kept at Magdalen College, Oxford, the other two at the Fundación San Lucas Evangelista, Barcelona. It was dated, by Colin Roberts, to the later second century. Roberts himself was the first scholar to recognize the relationship between the three Magdalen scraps and the two remnants in Barcelona (P.Barc. inv. 1, \(\text{\textcopyright}^{67}\)) as parts of one and the same original codex. Further attempts to link this codex to fragments of Luke's gospel preserved at the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (Suppl. Gr. 1120 = Gregory-Aland \(\text{\textcopyright}^{4}\)), had to be abandoned: although the fragmentary codex at the Bibliothèque Nationale had, at one stage, contained Matthew – as seems to be obvious from a scrap with the title Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μωϋσεὶς –, the Paris codex is written on much darker, brownish papyrus and is considerably later (by up to one-hundred years). As yet, there is no candidate among extant papyri to supplement \(\text{\textcopyright}^{64}\) and \(\text{\textcopyright}^{67}\). However, after more than forty years since Roberts first published the Magdalen fragment, some additions and corrections appear to be called for.

1) THE CATALOGUE NUMBER

Whereas the earliest publications of and about the fragments do not give them a college library number, van Haelst's Catalogue, faithfully copied by all later publications including the latest, 27th edition of Nestle-Aland, Novum Testamentum Graece, calls them "Gr.18". There are, however, no such fragments at Magdalen College Oxford. The College handlist had indeed numbered the papyrus "Magdalen Greek 18", but this was an obvious mistake due to a tiny scrap

---

4 K. Aland's suggestion, based on an observation by P. Weigandt, in his 'Neue Neutestamentliche Papyri II', New Testament Studies 12 (1965/66), here 193-5; repeated, as probable ("probablement") by J. van Haelst, Catalogue des Papyri litteraires juifs et chrétiens, Paris 1976, 146 (no. 403), and by C.H. Roberts/T.C. Skeat, The Birth of the Codex, London 1983, 40-41.65-66, but discontinued by Aland himself in his and his wife's Der Text des Neuen Testaments, Stuttgart 2 1989, 105, where \(\text{\textcopyright}^{4}\) is categorized as "Normaltext", but \(\text{\textcopyright}^{64/67}\) as "fester Text", and 106/110, where the dates are given as "III" and "um 200" respectively.
of papyrus found in an envelope among the correspondence relating to the Matthean fragment, a mere 1.8 x 1.9 cm, with two fragmentary lines containing just two complete letters (Iota/Ny) and five incomplete ones on one side (the other side is blank), in a later, larger script unrelated to the three fragments of Matthew. The College Library now correctly numbers the three Matthean fragments "Gr.17", and this should henceforth be the number used in all lists and catalogues of NT papyri.

2) CONTENTS

There are some discrepancies between the editions of and references to Magdalen Gr.17:


Dated "9.6. 60", this new transcription offers several alterations: Col II, recto (a), line 1 (Mt 26,31) now recognizes the nomen sacrum for Jesus as IC rather than IH; in line 2, the visible part of the line is now extended to σκονδάλισθη... rather than σκονδά...; and in Col II, recto (b), he tentatively adds a new first line for verse 32, προσεξ[ω and changes, in line 2, γαλεγλαίαν to γαληγλαίαν. Furthermore, he now corrects the contents; Mt 26:7-8, 10, 14-15, 22-23, 31, 32-33. There is a very good reason for Roberts' insistence on the separation of v. 31 from vv. 32-33: v. 31 is on a separate scrap of papyrus. The three scraps of Magdalen Gr.17, all of them with text on recto and verso, offer six 'units', Mt 26: 7-8 (fr. 1, verso), 10 (fr. 2, verso), 14-15 (fr. 3, verso), 22-23 (fr. 3, recto), 31 (fr. 1, recto), 32-33 (fr. 2, recto). Thus, Roberts' system with a separate v. 31 is to be preferred for reasons of clarity and should be copied by Nestle-Aland et al.

3) A SCRIBAL ERROR AND THREE VARIANTS

The peculiar variants of Gr.17 were duly noted by Roberts; in three instances, however, he himself seemed uncertain and mistaken, and one further variant has so far remained unnoticed.

i) fr. 3, verso, line 2 (26:14): Roberts had seen that δόδεκα is written in the numerical symbol δβ – the lower half of the Beta is clearly visible. It is, however, equally obvious that there is no space for an Omicron between Beta and the Lambda of λεγόμενος. Thus, we have a rare example of λεγόμενος without the article, a construction paralleled by, e.g., Matthew 2:23 (εἰς πόλιν λεγομένην Ναζαρέτ), John 4:5 (εἰς πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας λεγομένην Σωράρ). In Magdalen Gr.17/Δ64, the omission may of course merely be a scribal error.

---

6 I owe this information to K.S. Speirs, Assistant Librarian, Magdalen College Oxford, in a letter dated 23rd February 1994.
7 Conversely, they all agree as to P.Barc.1 (Δ67), Mt 3:9.15; 5:20-22.25-28
8 See note 2, here 236.
9 See note 3, here 57-59.
ii) fr. 3, recto, line 1 (26:22): Roberts had stated, in his 1953 edition,\(^{11}\) that "the papyrus must have read \(\text{λέγειν}\) εἰς \(\text{ἐκκόστος}\) αὐτῷ, an order which is unique ...". However, this unique variant is far from evident. The three severely damaged letters in line 1 which Roberts had identified as \(\text{Tau/Omega/My}\) are in fact \(\text{Tau/Omega/Ny}\). The \(\text{Ny}\) is the final letter of \(\text{αὐτῶν}\), and thus our papyrus would have read ... \(\text{ἐκκόστος}\) \(\text{αὐτῶν}\) μήτι \(\text{ἐγώ}\) \(\text{ἐίμι}\) ..., the text of \(\text{Π}^{45}, \text{Π}^{37}, \text{Bezae Cantab.} (D), \text{et mult.}\). There is only one standard edition of the Greek NT which has this as the best reading;\(^{12}\) \(\text{Π}^{64}\) now confirms the papyrological evidence for it against the text preferred by other editions.\(^{13}\)

iii) fr. 1, recto, line 2 (Mt 26:31): For reasons of stichometry, the \(\text{ὑμεῖς}\) after \(\text{πάντες}\) should be omitted. With it, line 1 would have 2o rather than the average 16 letters. This omission, in the oldest ms of Matthew's gospel, confirms, once again, the tendency of all early papyri to keep the Greek simple, to pare it to the bones, free from rhetorical embellishments.\(^{14}\)

iv) fr. 2, recto, line 2 (26:32): One has to read \(\text{γαλιλαῖαν}\) \(\text{α...,}\) as Roberts had transcribed it in his 1953 edition, not \(\text{γαλιλεῖαν}\) \(\text{α...}\). as in the printing error of the second transcription dated 1960. This variation of the common \(\text{Γαλιλαίαν}\) for Galilee is of course odd, and Roberts adds a note to his 1960 edition which reads "v. 33, vel \(\text{γαλιλεῖαν}\).\(^{15}\) But apart from the fact that it is v. 32, not 33, the \(\text{Gamma}\) is as unmistakable as the \(\text{Epsilon}\) which precedes it. \(\text{Epsilon + Iota}\) for \(\text{Iota}\) is common enough to be unremarkable; as for \(\text{Gamma}\) instead of \(\text{Iota}\), this is nothing but a scribal error not quite inexplicable in view of the identity of the vertical strokes of \(\text{Iota}\) and \(\text{Gamma}\) in this papyrus. The scribe of Magdalen Gr.17 was not averse to original decisions; even this mistake is, in a way, original.

4) THE DATE

The date commonly given to Magdalen Gr.17 (and P.Barc.1), ca. 200,\(^{16}\) may look like a safe "dumping ground", but this might be too late. One has to keep in mind, of course, that Roberts revolutionized the dating of the papyrus in his first edition of 1953, when he suggested "a date in the later second century":\(^{17}\) At that time, he was confronted with the estimate provided by the Rev. Charles B. Huleatt, a former \textit{demy} (foundation scholar) of Magdalen College, who had acquired the fragments at Luxor in 1901 and had given them to his old college in the same year.\(^{18}\) Huleatt had suggested a date in the third century, and a note in the display cabinet with Gr.17 in the Old Library of Magdalen College still reads: "2nd half of 3rd century (probable date)"). In the librarian's report of 1901, H.A. Wilson quoted an oral assessment from no less an authority than A.S. Hunt who even thought that "they may be assigned with more probability to the fourth century". As Roberts pointed out in his commentary,\(^{19}\) Hunt and his colleague B.P.

---

\(^{11}\) See note 2, here 236.

\(^{12}\) Bover-O'Callaghan, \textit{Nuevo Testamento Trilingüe}, Madrid 3\footnote{1994}, 152. \(\text{αὐτῶν}\) before \(\text{μὴ}\) is also favoured, albeit in brackets, by Merk, \textit{Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine}, Rome \footnote{111992}, 94.

\(^{13}\) E.g., Nestle-Aland 27\footnote{1993} 31993: \(\text{λέγειν}\) \(\text{αὐτῷ}\) εἰς \(\text{ἐκκόστος}\) μὴτι \(\text{ἐγώ}\) \(\text{ἐίμι}\) ....


\(^{15}\) See note 3, here 58.

\(^{16}\) Latest example: Nestle-Aland, \textit{Novum Testamentum Graece} 27\footnote{1993}, 687.

\(^{17}\) See note 2.

\(^{18}\) Letter to the college librarian, H.A. Wilson, dated Messina, Dec: 5: 1901

\(^{19}\) See note 2, here 234-5.
Grenfell had assumed, on principle, that manuscripts written in a codex could not be earlier than the third, preferably the fourth century. He quotes the amusing example of P.Oxy. I.35, a Latin codex fragment of an otherwise unknown History of the Macedonian Wars now at the British Library,\(^{20}\) which they analyzed as belonging to the second century, perhaps even before AD 79 – for palaeographical reasons – but which they nonetheless assigned to the late third or fourth century because it is a vellum codex.\(^{21}\) As mentioned above, Roberts then proceeded to argue, comparatively, for a late second century date of Magdalen Gr.17, backed in this by Bell, Skeat and Turner. One of the decisive arguments he adduced is the fact that "in the Magdalen fragments the minute omikron and the flat omega, common in third century hands, are absent".\(^{22}\)

Since the publication of Roberts' paper, new papyri have become available, and they appear to favour an even earlier date. This may not come as a surprise, since one tendency of the reevaluation of NT papyri at least since the 60s has been a redating with, occasionally, somewhat drastic and not undisputed consequences.\(^{23}\) It may be argued that the result of this continuing process is a mounting degree of uncertainty, rather than certainty, as to the reliability of palaeographical datings of literary hands; but even so, one should not eschew the challenge. For Magdalen Gr.17/P. Barc.1., one such unexpected example is a leather scroll discovered in the Nahal Hever, near the Dead Sea, the so called Greek Minor Prophets Scroll 8HevXIIgr.\(^{24}\) With minor variations, D. Barthélemy (who first published parts of the scroll in 1963), C.H. Roberts, W. Schubart, E. Würthwein and R. Hanhart all opt for c. AD 50/mid-first century AD.\(^{25}\) Tov, in his new and complete edition, leaves the task of dating the scroll to P.J. Parsons who does not rule out a mid- to late first century date by referring to P. Oxy. 2555, but prefers a date in the later first century BC "as possible, though not of course necessary".\(^{26}\)

Obviously then, there seems to be some scope for differing assessments, between the late first century BC and the middle, or, at the latest, the second half, of the first century AD, with a clear preference for the mid-first century AD. Without entering the debate about the date of Matthew's gospel,\(^{27}\) we may note that the historical terminus post quem for any of the gospels obviously is the year of the last events reported about the crucified and risen Jesus, AD 30, and we may also note that this would give us enough space to accommodate a comparison between the Nahal Hever Scroll and Magdalen Gr.17.

Even at first glance and using, as a point of reference, the plate in Schmidt/Thiel/Hanhart, the identity and near-identity of several letters is striking: Alpha, Epsilon (a letter fluctuating in both scripts), Iota, Omicron, Rho and Ny are particularly close. An equally obvious difference, on


\(^{21}\) The Oxyrhynchus Papyri Part I, London 1898, 59-60, here 59.

\(^{22}\) See note 2, here 237.

\(^{23}\) E.g., H. Hunger, 'Zur Datierung des Bodmer II', Anzeiger der phil.-hist. Klasse der Österr. Akad. der Wissenschaften, 4 (1960), 12-23, arguing for a date in the first quarter of the second century, against the traditional consensus which dates Bodmer II (\(96\)) to "c. 200"; or Y.K. Kim, 'Palaeographical Dating of \(\mathbb{9}\) to the Later First Century', Biblica 69 (1988), 248-57, taking away some one-hundred years from the usual dating of P. Chester Beatty II/University of Michigan Inv. 6238, "c. 200". See also note 32 below.


\(^{26}\) P.J. Parsons, 'The Scripts and Their Date', in E. Tov, as in note 15, 19-26, here 24 and 26.

the other hand, may be seen in the *Etas* and *Mys*; but the second scribe of the Nahal Hever scroll provides the comparable *Eta* and *My* more than once.\(^{28}\) The Nahal Hever scroll of the Minor Prophets may be at the extreme end of the spectrum, but is not the only first century analogy. Further material is provided by papyri in the script of Herculaneum, for which AD 79 is the natural focal point.\(^{29}\) Interestingly, there is a small, unidentified Greek fragment from Qumran Cave 7, 7Q6\(_1\), for which the archaeological *terminus ante quem* is AD 68, which has the characteristic *Eta* with the horizontal stroke above the median, evident in Magdalen Gr. 17.\(^{30}\) There also is a Greek papyrus from Qumran Cave 4 which shows several letters resembling Papyrus Magdalen Gr.17, such as the *Alpha*, the *Beta*, etc.: pap4QLXXLeviticusb. As Parsons points out, the script is far from uniform, but this papyrus from Cave 4 could be dated to the mid-first century AD.\(^{31}\)

Unwittingly, he then proceeds to offer an interesting case study: In his drawings of letters of the preceding fragment 4QLXXLev\(\alpha\) (parts of a leather scroll which he dates to the first century BC), the *Alpha*, *Beta*, *Delta*, *Epsilon*, *Eta*, *Iota*, *Kappa*, *Eta* etc are identical or near-identical to what we find in Magdalen Gr.17. In fact, the letters he draws could have been taken straight out of Gr.17. Looking at the fragments themselves, there would seem to be at least two differences, however: the Qumran Leviticus\(a\) is sloping slightly to the right, and the letters are very close to each other, occasionally even connected (*ligatures*). Even so, archaeology alone cannot have influenced Parsons’ very early dates – there is scope until AD 68, after all, when the caves were abandoned, and one might well prefer mid-first century dates AD for both 4QLXXLev\(\alpha\) and pap4QLXXLev\(\beta\). But, and this is the point, the prevailing tendency to date material of a nature comparable to Magdalen Gr.17 to a period even preceding the earliest possible date of Matthew’s gospel suggests, with all due caution, the possibility of redating the fragments from Oxford and Barcelona – which are, after all, definitely Matthean – to a period somewhat earlier than the late second century previously assigned to them. Certainty will remain elusive, of course.

To sum up, even though Herculaneum and Qumran (with its Greek fragments in two caves, 4 and 7) are still under survey, they both have their archaeological termini: all comparative material taken directly from their finds suggest dates prior to AD 79 and 68 respectively. It goes without saying that scribal characteristics found in those places may well have continued to be in use afterwards, towards the end of the first century, and occasionally even later. For our present purposes, we may proffer a tentative suggestion: the material from Nahal Hever, Herculaneum and Qumran could point towards a first century date for Magdalen Gr.17 / P.Barc.1.

At this stage, we must turn to the *Nomina Sacra* and their influence on the date: Magdalen Gr.17 has two, probably three abbreviations of holy names and words: ις for 'Ἰησοῦς (fr. 2, *verso*, l. 1, probable because of the stichometry of the line; fr. 1, *recto*, l. 2, definitely) and κε for  

\(^{28}\) For a single plate, see E. Würthwein, as in note 16, 195; for the two scribes, see P.J. Parsons, as in note 17, here 20.


\(^{31}\) P.J. Parsons, The Palaeography and Date of the Greek Manuscripts, in P.W. Skehan/E. Ulrich/J.E. Sanderson, eds., *Qumran Cave 4, IV*, DJD IX, Oxford 1992, 7-13, here 8. Such references to Greek ms from Qumran are all the more legitimate as they did not originate at Qumran and could represent a wide variety of Jewish diaspora hands. Cf. E. Tov, ‘Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism’, Journal of Jewish Studies 39/1 (1988), 5-37, here 19; *et al*.
κόριτε (fr. 3, recto, l.2). For historical reasons, Roberts had suggested that the use of these and other nomina sacra had become established practice among Christians in Jerusalem even before the year AD 70.32 He did lack the palaeographical evidence, though, and even for John Rylands Gr. 457 (𝔓52), which he himself had edited,33 he did not suggest nomina sacra in the reconstructed, missing parts of the extant lines, although this would have been possible within the given stichometry.34 Magdalen Gr.17 might offer the missing link: a Christian codex fragment of the first century, perhaps (though not necessarily) predating AD 70, with the nomina sacra postulated by Roberts.35

Some time ago, such a date would have been ruled out for the simple reason that a copy of a codex of Matthew – and there is no dispute whatsoever about the identification of the Oxford and Barcelona papyri – cannot have reached Egypt at such an early stage of the gospel’s germination and transmission. But we have learned from the methodological error of Grenfell and Hunt, described above; and we possess that famous fragment of a codex of John's gospel kept at the John Rylands University Library Manchester,𝔓52 (J. Rylands Libr. Gr.P. 457). Within the range of dated and datable papyri Colin Roberts compared to𝔓52 for his first edition in 1935, he finally decided in favour of what is arguably the latest possible date, c. AD 125. He could, however, have been less cautious by preferring the other end of the spectrum, documented by P. Fayyum 110 of AD 94 or P. Lond. 2078, a private letter from the time of Domitian, AD 81-96. There also is a good resemblance to𝔓52 in P.Gr. Berol. 19c, part of a scroll with Iliad X, from the end of the 1st century.36

In their monograph, The Birth of the Codex, C.H. Roberts and T.C. Skeat argue that the Christians had chosen the codex form for copies of Old Testament texts and their own writings before AD 100.37 Near the end of the first century, the Roman poet Martial praises his and his publisher friend Secundus’ unheard-of marketing enterprise, the introduction of a library of classical works in the codex format; the Latin codex fragment of a History of the Macedonian

32 C.H. Roberts, Nomina sacra: Origins and Significance, in id., Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt, London 1969, 26-48, here 46. Cf also J. O’Callaghan, “Nomina sacra” in papyris graecis saeculi III neotestamentarisis, Rom 1970, for an analysis of nomina sacra in 𝔃46 which may, according to Kim, be late first century. B.M. Metzger, The Text of the New Testament. Its Transmission, Corruption and Restoration, 3rd, enlarged ed., Oxford 1992, 265-6, thinks that it is precisely the occurrence of nomina sacra in 𝔃46 which counts against Kim's advocacy of such an early date. But whatever the quality of Kim's arguments as such, this could well be a circular argument on Metzger's side. If, for other palaeographical reasons, certain papyri with nomina sacra turn out to be first century, then this would favour Roberts' theory of the early origins of nomina sacra rather than Metzger's preference for later dates.


35 It seems to me that the “watershed” is the Christian change from scroll to codex, most likely some time after the destruction of the temple in the year AD 70 which contributed to the end of Jewish-Christian missionary activities among their fellow Jews and terminated the strategical reasons for using the scroll format and for resisting the temptation to put Jesus on a par with God (Jahwe) palaeographically by means of nomina sacra which had, until then, been the privilege of Jewish scribes using the tetragrammaton for the name of God.

36 See W. Schubart, as in note 29, 117-8.

Wars mentioned above may be the only surviving example of this possibly short-lived venture. Under the influence of Roberts' cautious dating of ∏52 and five years before Kim's paper, Roberts and Skeat do not name any first century Christian codex to corroborate their theory with some practical evidence. The present state of affairs, however, suggests that the Oxford fragments Magdalen Gr.17, with their Spanish counterparts, would be among the prime examples of the birth of the Christian codex prior to the turn of the century.

5) CONCLUSION

The fragments of Matthew's gospel in the Old Library of Magdalen College Oxford, henceforth to be listed as Magdalen Greek 17 rather than 18, remain the oldest extant papyrus of that gospel; but it may be argued that it could be redated from the late second to the late first century, some time after the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem. It appears to be the oldest known codex with nomina sacra. Lists of New Testament papyri should reflect the fact that the three fragments of Magdalen Gr.17 = ∏64 preserve text on all six sides, not just on five, as is the impression conveyed at present.

∏64 is a 'new', additional witness to a construction of Mt 26:22 preferred by the papyri ∏37 and ∏45 and several later ms, but ruled out by the most widely used editions of the Greek New Testament, Nestle-Aland27(1993) and The Greek New Testament UBS4(1993). The accumulated evidence now clearly suggests ... ἐκαστος ὁδὸν μῆτι ... as the better text, and this should be acknowledged by future editions of the Greek NT, in concurrence with Bover-O’Callaghan 31994. This improved reading and two further variants, λεγόμενος without the article in 26:14 and, in particular, the likely omission of ύμεις after πάντες in 26:31, appear to confirm the impression that the very earliest papyri tend to preserve a simple but clear and effective Greek untouched by the literary ambitions of later scribes.

P.MAGDALEN GREEK 17, TRANSCRIPTION

Fr. 1, verso (Mt 26:7-8) cf. Tafel IX

| κατεξεθενεπτ | της | κε | 16 |
| σαλης | αυτουςακει | 16 |
| μενουι | δοντεδεοι | 16 |
| μεθηται | γιανακτ | 15 |

Fr. 2, verso (Mt 26:10)

| οικεθεθεναυ | οι | επτ | 16 |
| κοσουκαρφεθετ | ηθο | 16 |
| γυναικειργονγα | ουθ | 15 |

I. 1: Nomen sacrum τις for ΄Ησοδος stichometrically plausible, cf fr. 1 1, recto, l. 1.

39 See note 23.
Fr. 3, verso (Mt 26:14-15)

[το]τεπορε[θειεις] 16
[των]βλέχοι[νοςιον] 17
[δασι][καριω][τηςπορς] 17
[τουκαριω][[ειειευν]] 18
[τιθε][λετεμο][ιδουναι] 17

l. 2: Numerical symbol ἵβ for δώδεκα. The article ὁ before λέγομενος is omitted; cf Matthew 2:23; John 4:5.

Fr. 3, recto (Mt 26:22-23)

[το]κοβ[τον][μιτεγω] 15
[εμικ]κεοδ[εποκρι] 15
[θεεκ]επενοε[μβαφας] 17
[με]τεμο[ηνχειρα] 15
[εντ]οτρυ[βλωουτος] 16

l. 1: Text as in ∏45, ∏37(vid), D, et al.: ἐκαστος σώτων.
l. 2: Nomen sacrum κε for κύριε.

Fr. 1, recto (Mt 26:31)

αυτοιςιεπαντ[ες] 15
εκανθάλη[εκθε] 17
ενεμοεντ[ηνυκτ] 15
ταυτηγη[βασταγαρ] 17

l. 1: The initial α of αυτοις is projected into the left margin; as in ∏67, 5:21 (τι) and 5:27 (εστε), this signifies the first complete line of a new section which began in the preceding line. – Nomen sacrum τε for Ἰησοῦς. – ἢμεῖς is omitted at the end of the line (stichometry !).

Fr. 2, recto (Mt 26:32-33)

προαε[αυμαεεις] 16
γαλεγλιαναο[ποκρι] 16
θειςδεοπετροε[ι] 15

l. 2: γαλεγλιαν: scribal error for γαλειλιαν.
P. Magdalen Greek 17, recto and verso
By permission of the President and Fellows of Magdalen College, Oxford