## Early Uncial Support for f<sup>35</sup> in the General Epistles

I take it that Klaus Wachtel, in his *Der Byzantinische Text der Katholischen Briefe* [*The Byzantine Text of the Catholic Letters*], recognizes that the Byzantine <u>text</u> is early (though often deciding against it on internal grounds), thereby bidding adieu to the prevailing canard that the Byzantine text is late. I believe that the evidence presented below demonstrates the same for the **text** of **f**<sup>35</sup>.

I proceed to tabulate the performance of the early uncials ( $5^{th}$  century and earlier) as they appear in the apparatus of my Greek text of the seven General Epistles, but supplemented from the *Editio Critica Maior* series. I use  $f^{35}$  as the point of reference, but only tabulate variant sets where at least one of the extant early uncials (extant at that point) goes against  $f^{35}$  (this is necessary, since most words have unanimous attestation).

Thirteen early uncials appear in my apparatus:  $P^{20,23,72,78,81,100}$ , & ,A,B,C,048, 0173,0232. Only  $P^{72}$ , & ,A,B,C are not fragments (048 is a variety of pieces, here and there). Codex C is missing basically chapters 4 and 5 of James, 1 Peter and 1 John [curiously, the same two chapters for all three books], as well as all of 2 John. Of course,  $P^{72}$  has only 1 & 2 Peter and Jude. 0173 is the only one of them that never sides with  $f^{35}$ : Out of the total of 795 variant sets,  $f^{35}$  receives overt early attestation 77.9% of the time (619 ÷ 795).

Before drawing conclusions, I present the evidence (only combinations with at least one instance are tabulated). In passing, let me say that having neither secretary nor proof-reader, I do not guarantee complete accuracy, but a slip here or there will not alter the big picture, nor invalidate my conclusions.

	<u>                                     </u>	ame	s	1Pete	er   2	2Pete	er	1Joh	n   :	2&3Johr	<u>1</u>	Jude		<u>TOTAL</u>
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> alone	I	53	I	45	I	17	I	31		17	I	13	I	176
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72</sup> <b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>100</sup>		2	 	7		1	 		 			1		9 2
f <sup>35</sup> $\aleph$	İ	9	Ì	9		7	ļ	11	ĺ	3	İ	1	Ì	40
f <sup>35</sup> A f <sup>35</sup> B		10 2	 	8 3		2 1		6 7	 	3		1		27 16
f <sup>35</sup> C f <sup>35</sup> 048		5 1		8		3 1		4 1		1		1		22 3
	ı	1	ı		l	1	ı	1	ı		ı		ı	3
f <sup>35</sup> P <sup>20</sup> ₹		1			ļ		ļ				ļ			1
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72</sup> A <b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72</sup> B				3 3		1								3 4
f <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72</sup> C				3		T								3

	James	l 1Peter	l 2Peter	l 1John	2&3John	Jude	TOTAL
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72</sup> 048		1					1
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>100</sup> A	2	_			 		<u>-</u>   2
f <sup>35</sup> ℜA	12	3	l 6	10	' 	1	-
f <sup>35</sup> ℜB	10	5		22	2	<del>+</del> 	32
f <sup>35</sup> ⅓ C	1 10 1				2		•
		1	1 1	5		2	9
f³5 ₹ 048			1		1		2
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> AB	4	2	1	12	!	2	21
f <sup>35</sup> AC	7	4	4	2		1	18
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> A048			1 1	1	2	l	4
f <sup>35</sup> BC	3			3	l		6
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> B048	1			1	1		3
f <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72</sup> አ A		8			<b> </b>		8
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72</sup> ℵ B		4				1	5
<b>f</b> ³⁵ P <sup>72</sup> እ C		2	1	' ' 			3
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72</sup> AB	! !	12	3	! ! 	! 	3	18
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72</sup> AC		2	1 1	! ! [	! 	1 1	4
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72</sup> BC	 	1	13	l   	! 	<del> </del> 	14
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72</sup> C048	 	1	13   1	l   	 	] ]	1
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>81</sup> BC	 	1	1	<b>!</b>	 		1
f <sup>35</sup> P <sup>100</sup> ℜ A	   1	1			 	l 1	1
f <sup>35</sup> P <sup>100</sup> ₹ B	1				 	Ī	•
	1						1
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>100</sup> AB	2						2
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>100</sup> AC	1					_	1
f³⁵ ℵAB	13	13	1	10	1	3	41
f³⁵ ℵAC	8	4	1	11		2	26
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> ℜ A048			2	3	1		6
f³⁵ ℜBC	17	1	2	17	2	2	41
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> ℜ B048				2			2
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> ℜ B0232					1		1
f³⁵ ♂ C048	· 		1	İ			1
f <sup>35</sup> ABC	8	5	2	15	3	2	35
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> AB048	2			4	1		7
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> AB0232	, – , I i		i	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1	! 	1
f <sup>35</sup> AC048	! 		2		, <del>-</del> 	! 	2
f <sup>35</sup> BC048			1 1	' ' 	1		2
<b>635</b> D22 - D C						•	
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>23</sup> ABC	1						1
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72,78</sup> AB		_				1	1
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72</sup> ℜ AB		9	4			4	17
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72</sup> አ AC		4	1 1			1	6
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72</sup> ℜ BC		6	10			3	19
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72</sup> ABC		8	4			5	17
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72</sup> AB048			1				1
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72</sup> BC048	ĺ		1 1	ĺ			1
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>81</sup> ₹ AB	l i	1	l i	İ			1
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>81</sup> ℵ AC	· 	1	· 	· 	· 	· 	1
	. '		. '	'	2	•	•

	Jame	s	1Peter	: [ :	2Pete	r	1John	28	<u> </u>	J	ude	T(	<u>OTAL</u>
f <sup>35</sup> P <sup>100</sup> እ BC	2												2
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>100</sup> ABC	1												1
f³⁵ ℜ ABC	1		11		4				2		7		25
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> ℜ AC048									1				1
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> ℜ BC048			1						1				2
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> ABC048									2				2
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> AB048,0232	2								2				2
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72,78</sup> እ AB											1		1
<b>f<sup>35</sup></b> P <sup>72,81</sup> እ BC			1										1
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72</sup> ℜ ABC											1		1
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72</sup> ℜ AB048					3				6				9
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72</sup> ℜ AC048			2										2
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72</sup> ℜ BC048					1								1
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> P <sup>72</sup> ABC048			1		2								3
f³⁵ P <sup>78</sup> ℜ ABC											1		1
<b>f<sup>35</sup></b> P <sup>81</sup> እ ABC			3										3
<b>f</b> <sup>35</sup> ℜ ABC048			3		3								6
Total w/uncial	127		155		95		147		38		48		619

```
involving P^{20} -- 1 involving P^{23} -- 1 involving P^{72} -- 153 involving P^{78} -- 3 involving P^{81} -- 4 involving P^{100} -- 12 involving P^{100} -- 356 involving P^{100} -- 378
```

involving A -- **356** (this number is correct; it just happens to be the same as the other)

involving B -- 378 involving C -- 285 involving 048 -- 62 involving 0232-- 4

I will now list the singular readings for each of these uncials:

	James	1Peter	2Peter	1John	2&3John	Jude	TOTAL
P <sup>72</sup>	1	33	12			17	62
P <sup>78</sup>						2	2
×	11	25	13	18	5	4	76
Α	8		5	10	2	2	27
В	7	10	3	8	4	5	37
С	3	7	7	5	2		24
048	1		1	4	3		9

Each of these twelve uncials is plainly independent of all the others. The total lack of pattern in the attestation that these early uncials give to  $\mathbf{f}^{35}$  shows just as

plainly that  $f^{35}$  is independent of them all as well, quite apart from the 22.1% without them. But that 77.9% of the units receive early uncial support, without pattern or dependency, shows that the  $f^{35}$  text is early.

I invite special attention to the first block, where a single uncial sides with  $f^{35}$ ; each of the seven uncials is independent of the rest (and of  $f^{35}$ ) at this point, of necessity, yet together they attest 15% of the total (119 ÷ 795). Since there is no pattern or dependency for this 15%, how shall we account for these 119 early readings in  $f^{35}$ ? Will anyone argue that whoever 'concocted' the first  $f^{35}$  MS had all these uncials in front of him, arbitrarily taking 9 readings from  $P^{72}$ , 2 from  $P^{100}$ , 40 from R, etc., etc., etc.? Really now, how shall we account for these 119 early readings in  $f^{35}$ ? (Should anyone demure that the  $P^{35}$  century MSS included really are not all that early, I inquire: are they copies, or original creations? If they are copies their exemplars were obviously earlier—all of these 119 readings doubtless existed in the  $P^{35}$  century.)

Going on to the next block, we have another 148 readings where there is no pattern or dependency; 119 + 148 = 267 = 34%. Really now, how shall we account for these 267 early readings in  $f^{35}$ ? Going on to the next block, we have another 224 readings where there is no pattern or dependency; 267 + 224 = 491 = 61.8%. Really now, how shall we account for these 491 early readings in  $f^{35}$ ? Going on to the next block, we have another 100 readings where there is no pattern or dependency; 491 + 100 = 591 = 74.3%. The final block brings the total to 77.9%.

To allege a dependency in the face of this EVIDENCE I consider to be dishonest.  $\mathbf{f}^{35}$  is clearly independent of all these lines of transmission, themselves independent. If  $\mathbf{f}^{35}$  is independent then it is early, of necessity.  $\mathbf{f}^{35}$  has all those early readings for the sufficient reason that its <u>text</u> is early, dating to the  $3^{rd}$  century, at least. But if  $\mathbf{f}^{35}$  is independent of all other lines of transmission (it is demonstrably independent of  $\mathbf{K}^{x}$ , etc.) then it must hark back to the Autographs. What other reasonable explanation is there? Should anyone wish to claim that  $\mathbf{f}^{35}$  is a recension, I request (and insist) that he specify who did it, when and where, and furnish evidence in support of the claim. Without evidence, any such claim is frivolous and irresponsible.