My Pilgrimage toward f³⁵ = K^r = M⁷ in the PA and M^c in Revelation Wilbur N. Pickering, ThM PhD

For my ThM I majored in Greek. The ruling paradigm in the area of NT textual criticism was eclecticism, itself an offshoot of the W-H critical theory. It became obvious to me that neither approach could offer certainty as to the original wording of the NT; indeed they are openly based on the premise that the original wording was 'lost' during the second century. So I did an exhaustive analysis of the W-H theory (see chapter 4 of my book, *The Identity of the NT Text*) and convinced myself that it was erroneous at <u>every</u> point. With it went the eclectic approach. I became a disciple of J.W. Burgon (in NT t.c.), having read all his works.

H.C. Hoskier's *Codex B and its Allies* demonstrates objectively that the early parchment Codices are of inferior quality. E.C. Colwell and others have demonstrated the same for the early papyri. It follows that the ascribing of special value or weight to them because of their age cannot be sustained. So we must turn our attention to the later MSS. Not having a copy of von Soden, I never paid much attention to his divisions of K, and basically subscribed to Burgon's 'Notes of Truth', wherein a **heavy** majority was usually convincing.

It was the H-F Majority Text's representation of the evidence for the Pericope Adulterae that caught my attention, being based on Soden's supposed collation of over 900 MSS. As stated in their apparatus, there were three main streams: \mathbf{M}^5 , \mathbf{M}^6 and \mathbf{M}^7 . 7 was always in the majority [except for one four-way split] because it was always accompanied by either 5 or 6 [5 + 6 never go against 7]. This looked to me like three independent streams, where seldom would more than one go astray at any given point. Being the common denominator, 7 was clearly the best of the three. (Appendix G of the version of *Identity* to be found on my website, www.esqm.org, demonstrates the superiority of 7, based on Soden's figures.)

Then I went to Revelation (in H-F) and noticed three main streams again: $\mathbf{M}^{\mathbf{a}-\mathbf{b}}$, $\mathbf{M}^{\mathbf{c}}$ and $\mathbf{M}^{\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}}$. The picture was analogous to that of the PA. Revelation represents a very much larger corpus than does the PA, but even so, there are only 8 cases where $\mathbf{a}-\mathbf{b}$ and $\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}$ join against \mathbf{c} (+ 6 others where one of the four is split), compared to over 100 each for $\mathbf{a}-\mathbf{b}$ and \mathbf{c} against $\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}$ and for \mathbf{c} and $\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}$ against $\mathbf{a}-\mathbf{b}$. Again, being the common denominator, \mathbf{c} was clearly the best of the three (see the apparatus of my Greek Text of the Apocalypse).

Now then, it so happens that \mathbf{M}^7 in the PA and \mathbf{M}^c in Revelation equal Soden's \mathbf{K}^r , so I began to smell a rat. Then the *Text und Textwert* series proved that \mathbf{K}^r is independent of \mathbf{K}^x throughout the NT. It follows that \mathbf{K}^r cannot be a revision of \mathbf{K}^x . Then there are hundreds of places where \mathbf{K}^r has overt early attestation, against \mathbf{K}^x , but there is no pattern to that early attestation. There being no pattern then \mathbf{K}^r must be early, as the picture in the PA and in Revelation has already implied. If \mathbf{K}^r is early and independent, then it must be rehabilitated in the practice of NT textual criticism. If it is the best line of transmission in the PA and Revelation, it just might be the best elsewhere as well.

But there is an ingrained disdain/antipathy toward the symbol K^r , so I am proposing a new name for the text-type. Let's substitute f^{35} for K^r —it is more objective and will get away from the prejudice that attaches to the latter. Cursive 35 contains the whole NT and reflects K^r throughout, and it is the MS with the smallest number that meets those qualifications (just as cursives 1 and 13 are the smallest number in their families; and like them, 35 is not the best representative—but it is 11^{th} century, so the text-type could not have been created in the 12^{th} , Q.E.D.).