

## Major f35 splits in Matthew

Wilbur N. Pickering

There are only five splits that might be called ‘major’ in Matthew. The reading listed first is the one that I have chosen as representing the family archetype, for reasons explained at the end of this article.

9:17 απολουνται [80%] || απολλυνται [20%]—the verb is the same and both are Indicative; the first is future middle and the second is present passive. In the immediately prior clauses, both εκχεται and ρηγνυνται are present passive and go together; so why the second reference to the wineskins? Any difference in meaning is almost too slight to translate.

19:29 οικιας [66%] || οικαν [30%]—plural or singular? As with the brothers, if you only have one, that is all that you can leave; and if you have none, you leave none.

25:32 συναχθουσινται [25%] || συναχθησεται [75%]—plural or singular; mass noun or not? The translation is the same.

26:29 γενηματος [30%] || γεννηματος [70%]—the nouns are different, the first referring to plant produce and the second to animal offspring; if the second is used of plants, it is a secondary meaning. The translation is the same.

27:35 βαλουντες [25%] || βαλλοντες [75%]—aorist or present? In the context any difference in meaning is so slight that the translation is the same.

As is typical of variation within the family, the difference is of one letter, except for the syllable, and Matthew is not a small book. I call this incredibly careful transmission—at no point will a reader be misled as to the intended meaning. The original wording of Matthew has been precisely preserved to our day. (The percentages within brackets are estimates, referring to the total of extant MSS for Matthew.)

I checked 114 representatives of Family 35, with reference to the five major splits, and the result is plotted on the chart below. I trust that any reasonable person will grant that the sample is adequate for my purpose (the extant Family 35 representatives for Matthew number at least 250). ++ stands for the first reading, — for the second.

MS	9:17	19:29	25:32	26:29	27:35	LOCATION	DATE	CONTENT
18	++	—	—	—	++	Constantinople	1364	eapr
35	—	illegible	—	++	—	Aegean	XI	eapr
55	—	—	—	++	++	Bodleian	XIV	e
83	++	++	++	++	++	Munich	XI	e
125	++	++	++	++	—	Wien	XI	e
128	—	—	—	++	—	Vatican	XIII	e
141	missing	—	—	—	—	Vatican	XIII	eapr
155	—	—	—	++	—	Vatican	XIII	e
189	—	—	++	—	—	Florence	XIII	eap

MS	9:17	19:29	25:32	26:29	27:35	LOCATION	DATE	CONTENT
201	++	—	—	—	++	Constantinople	1357	eapr
204	++	—	—	—	—	Bologna	XIII	eap
214	++	—	—	—	++	Venedig	XIV	e
246	++	++	++	—	++	Moscow	XIV	e
363	—	++	—	++	—	Florence	XIV	eap
386	++	—	—	—	++	Vatican	XIV	eapr
394	—	++	—	—	—	Rome	1330	eap
402	++	—	—	++	—	Neapel	XIV	e
415	missing	++	—	—	—	Venedig	1356	e
479	—	—	—	++	—	Birmingham	XIII	eap
480	++	—	—	—	++	Constantinople	1366	e
510	++	—	—	++	—	Oxford-cc	XII	e
516	++	++	++	++	—	Oxford-cc	XI	e
520	—	—	++	—	—	Oxford-cc	XII	e
536	—	—	—	++	—	Ann Arbor	XIII	ea
547	—	—	—	++	—	Karakallu	XI	eap
553	—	++	—	—	—	Jerusalem	XIII	e
586	++	—	—	++	—	Modena	XIV	e
645	—	—	++	++	—	Cyprus	1304	e
676	++	—	++	—	—	Munster	XIII	eap
685	—	—	++	—	++	Ann Arbor	XIII	e
689	missing	++	—	++	++	London	XIII	e
691	++	—	—	—	++	London	XIII	e
696	—	—	—	++	—	London	XIII	e
757	++	missing	++	++	++	Athens	XIII	eapr
758	++	—	—	—	—	Athens	XIV	e
763	++	++	++	++	++	Athens	XIV	e
781	—	—	—	++	—	Athens	XIV	e
789	++	++	++	++	++	Athens	XIV	e
824	++	++	++	++	++	Grottaferrata	XIV	eapr
867	—	—	—	++	—	Vatican	XIV	e
897	missing	—	—	++	—	Edinburgh	XIII	e
928	—	—	—	—	—	Dionysiu	1304	eap
938	—	++	—	++	—	Dionysiu	1318	e
959	++	++	++	++	++	Dionysiu	1331	eap
986	++	—	—	++	—	Esphigmenu	XIV	eapr
1023	—	++	—	++	—	Ivion	1338	e

MS	9:17	19:29	25:32	26:29	27:35	LOCATION	DATE	CONTENT
1040	++	++	++	++	++	Karakallu	XIV	eap
1062	++	—	—	++	++	Kutlumusiu	XIV	e
1072	++	++	++	—	++	M Lavras	XIII	eapr
1075	++	++	++	++	++	M Lavras	XIV	eapr
1111	—	—	++	++	++	Stavronikita	XIV	e
1117	++	++	++	++	++	Philotheu	XIV	e
1133	—	—	++	—	—	Philotheu	XIV	e
1145	++	++	++	—	++	Constantinople	XII	e
1147	missing	—	—	—	—	Constantinople	1370	e
1158	++	—	—	++	—	Lesbos	XIV	e
1189	—	—	—	—	—	Sinai	1346	e
1199	—	—	++	++	—	Sinai	XII	e
1234	++	—	++	—	++	Sinai	XIV	e
1247	++	++	—	—	++	Sinai	XV	eap
1248	++	—	—	—	++	Sinai	XIV	eapr
1250	++	—	++	++	++	Sinai	XV	eap
1251	—	—	—	++	—	Sinai	XIII	eap
1323	—	—	++	—	—	Jerusalem	XII	e
1328	++	++	++	++	++	Jerusalem	XIV	er
1334	—	++	—	—	—	Jerusalem	XIII	e
1339	++	++	++	++	++	Jerusalem	XIII	e
1384	++	—	—	++	—	Andros	XI	eapr
1435	—	—	—	++	—	Vatopediu	XI	e
1445	++	—	—	—	—	M Lavras	1323	e
1461	++	++	++	++	++	M Lavras	XIII	e
1482	—	—	—	—	—	M Lavras	1304	eap
1490	—	—	—	++	—	M Lavras	XII	eap
1496	++	++	++	++	++	M Lavras	XIII	e
1503	++	++	++	++	++	M Lavras	1317	eapr
1548	++	++	++	—	++	Vatopediu	1359	eap
1551	++	++	++	—	++	Vatopediu	XIII	er
1559	++	++	++	++	++	Vatopediu	XIV	e
1560	++	++	++	++	++	Vatopediu	XIV	e
1572	—	—	—	—	—	Vatopediu	1304	e
1614	missing	++	++	++	++	M Lavras	1324	e
1617	++	++	++	++	++	M Lavras	XIV	eapr
1628	++	++	++	—	++	M Lavras	1400	eap

MS	9:17	19:29	25:32	26:29	27:35	LOCATION	DATE	CONTENT
1637	++	++	++	++	++	M Lavras	1328	eapr
1652	++	++	++	++	++	M Lavras	XVI	eapr
1667	missing	++	++	++	—	Panteleimonos	1309	e
1686	++	++	++	++	++	Athens	1418	e
1694	—	—	++	—	—	Athens	XIII	e
1698	—	—	—	++	—	Athens	XIV	e
1705	++	++	++	—	—	Tirana	XIV	e
1713	++	++	++	++	++	Lesbos	XV	e
1813	—	++	++	++	—	Duke	XII	e
2122	illegible	—	—	++	—	Athens	XII	e
2175	++	++	—	—	—	St Petersburg	XIV	eap
2221	++	++	++	—	++	Sparta	1432	eap
2253	++	++	—	++	++	Tirana	XI	e
2261	—	—	—	—	—	Kalavryta	XIV	eap
2284	—	—	—	—	—	Manchester	XIII	e
2322	—	++	—	—	—	Prinkipos Is	XII	e
2323	++	++	++	—	++	Benaki (Athens)	XIII	er
2352	++	++	++	++	++	Meteora	XIV	eapr
2367	—	—	—	++	—	Princeton	XII	e
2382	++	—	—	++	—	Constantinople	XII	e
2399	missing	++	—	++	++	Chicago	XIV	e
2407	—	—	++	—	—	Chicago	1332	e
2466	—	—	—	—	—	Patmos	1329	eap
2503	++	—	—	—	++	Sinai	XIV	e
2554	++	++	++	++	++	Bucharest	1434	eapr
2559	missing	—	—	—	missing	Benaki (Athens)	XII	e
2765	—	—	—	++	—	Corinth? (Oxford)	XIV	e
2897	++	++	++	—	++	Orlando	XIII	e
2916	++	—	++	—	missing	Athens	XIII	e
I.2110	++	++	++	++	++	Ivion	1322	e
L.65	++	++	missing	++	missing	Leukosia	XIV	e

I will now plot the patterns for the five variant sets. I noticed eight ‘corrections’ and nine ‘alternates’, scattered here and there; I ignored them for the purpose of this exercise (although 12 of the 17 change a ‘—’ to a ‘++’). That purpose is to evaluate whether the patterns indicate independent lines of transmission within Family 35. Here are the patterns. The numbers stand for the first reading (++), — for the second.

# PATTERNS

1 2 3 4 5 — 23\*\* [+2]

1 2 3 4 — — 2

1 2 3 — 5 — 9\*

1 2 — 4 5 — 1

1 — 3 4 5 — 1

— 2 3 4 5 — 0

miss 2 3 4 5 — 1 [the exemplar presumably had all five]

1 miss 3 4 5 — 1 [the exemplar presumably had all five]

1 2 miss 4 miss — 1

miss 2 — 4 5 — 2

miss 2 3 4 — — 1

1 2 3 — — — 1

1 2 — — 5 — 1

1 — — 4 5 — 1

— — 3 4 5 — 1

— 2 3 4 — — 1

1 — 3 — 5 — 1

1 — 3 — miss — 1

1 — — — 5 — 8\*

— — — 4 5 — 1

—	2	—	4	—	—	3
1	—	—	4	—	—	7*
—	—	3	4	—	—	2
1	—	3	—	—	—	1
—	—	3	—	5	—	1
1	2	—	—	—	—	1
miss	2	—	—	—	—	1
miss	—	—	4	—	—	1
Illeg	—	—	4	—	—	1
—	Illeg	—	4	—	—	1

1	—	—	—	—	—	3
—	2	—	—	—	—	4
—	—	3	—	—	—	6*
—	—	—	4	—	—	14*
—	—	—	—	5	—	0
—	—	—	—	—	—	7*
miss	—	—	—	—	—	2
miss	—	—	—	miss	—	1

[+3]

[the exemplars probably had none]

[the exemplar probably had none]

Setting aside the 14 incomplete MSS, another 12 have a private pattern (so far). Two patterns show 2 MSS, another two show 3 MSS, while one shows 4 MSS. I will disregard all of these. I invite attention to the following seven patterns:

- 1) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 = 23 [+2] MSS
- 2) —, —, —, 4, — = 14 MSS
- 3) —, —, —, —, — = 7 [+3] MSS

- 4) 1, 2, 3, —, 5 = 9 MSS
- 5) 1, —, —, —, 5 = 8 MSS
- 6) 1, —, —, 4, — = 7 MSS
- 7) —, —, 3, —, — = 6 MSS

I consider that pattern 1) represents the family archetype; it is by far the strongest pattern and of necessity represents a line of transmission. But what of pattern 2); did 14 copyists just happen to make the same set of choices independently? Is it not far more likely that they represent an independent line of transmission? Indeed, I have collated many dozens of  $\text{f}^{35}$  MSS, and with few exceptions the copyists were faithful to their exemplar. For example, consider the following evidence for six of the patterns listed above:

Pattern 1)—GA 2554 (Bucharest, 1434, eap) is a precisely perfect copy of the line of transmission that has Pattern 1). There are several others that are all but perfect.

Pattern 2)—GA 867 (Vatican, XIV, e) is missing the first five chapters of Matthew, but otherwise is a precisely perfect copy of the line of transmission that has Pattern 2). GA 128 (Vatican, XIII, e) is almost perfect.

Pattern 3)—GA 1189 (Sinai, 1346, e) is a virtually perfect copy of the line of transmission that has Pattern 3). GA 928 (Dionysiu, 1304, eap), GA 1572 (Vatopediu, 1304, e) and GA 2466 (Patmos, 1329, eap) are all good.

Pattern 4)—GA 1072 (M Lavras, XIII, eap) is an all but perfect copy of the line of transmission that has Pattern 4). GA 246 (Moscow, XIV, e) is almost perfect.

Pattern 5)—GA 18 (Constantinople, 1364, eap) and GA 2503 (Sinai, XIV, e) are almost perfect copies of the line of transmission that has Pattern 5).

Pattern 6)—GA 586 (Modena, XIV, e) is a perfect copy of the line of transmission that has Pattern 6). GA 2382 (Constantinople, XII, e) is almost perfect, and GA 510 (Oxford-cc, XII, e) is virtually so.

Clearly the copyists were faithfully reproducing their exemplars, that represented distinct lines of transmission. Three of the patterns have overt XI century attestation, and another has overt XII, and all have scattered geographic distribution. The evidence before us simply requires the conclusion that the Family 35 archetype had to exist in the uncial period, and probably well back in that period. I have argued elsewhere that the evidence in hand indicates that it already existed in the III century, if not earlier still. **All preconceived notions concerning von Soden's K $\epsilon$  need to be discarded.**

Should anyone bother to count the MSS, pro and con, he will discover that the form I have chosen as archetypal has a numerical majority in only two of the five cases. Counting only the MSS included in the seven leading patterns, my choice is ahead in four of the five. Aside from the dominant nature of pattern 1), my choice was dictated by quality of MS and geographic distribution, in each case. But as pointed out at the beginning, the difference in meaning is so slight that a single translation can cover both readings, in every case. God has preserved His Text!