

THE GREEK COLUMN OF THE COMPLUTENSIAN NEW TESTAMENT AND THE IMPLAUSIBILITY OF VATICAN MANUSCRIPTS

Thomas W. Hudgins
thomashudgins@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

Did Greek manuscripts belonging to the Vatican Library serve as the basis for the text of the Greek column of the Complutensian New Testament? The author of the Greek preface in *Novum testamentum grece et latine* indicated as much, saying they were “brought from the Apostolic Library, sent to the Most Revered Lord Cardinal of Spain.” But did manuscripts from the Vatican Library really serve as the basis for the Greek text of the Complutensian New Testament? In the study that follows, a comparison is made of the Complutensian Greek text of the Gospel of Matthew, the eighth chapter in particular, and the manuscripts housed in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. This study offers, in place of a definitive conclusion, a reassessment of the issue concerning the sources used for the Greek column of the Complutensian New Testament, in this case, thinking in terms of what is or is not plausible. To provide some contrast, a comparison of Erasmus’ *Novum instrumentum omne* and minuscules 1 (AN IV 2), 2 (AN IV 1), and 817 (A III 15) is also provided, showing how the Greek text of Erasmus can be constructed using those three copies with minuscule 2 serving as the primary base text. Does the Complutensian text share the same likeness to one or more of the Vatican manuscripts as that of Erasmus to those manuscripts housed at the Universitätsbibliothek Basel?

KEYWORDS: New Testament Textual Criticism, Complutensian Polyglot Bible, Cisneros, Erasmus, Greek New Testament, Gospel of Matthew.

LA COLUMNA GRIEGA DEL NUEVO TESTAMENTO DE LA BIBLIA POLÍGLOTA COMPLUTENSE Y LA IMPROBABILIDAD DE MANUSCRITOS ORIGINARIOS DEL VATICANO

RESUMEN

¿Sirvieron los manuscritos griegos pertenecientes a la Biblioteca del Vaticano como base para el texto de la columna griega del Nuevo Testamento Complutense? El autor del prefacio griego en *Novum testamentum grece et latine* lo indicó, diciendo que fueron “traídos de la Biblioteca Apostólica, enviados al Señor Venerable Cardenal de España”. ¿Pero los manuscritos de la Biblioteca del Vaticano realmente sirvieron de base para el texto griego del Nuevo Testamento Complutense? En el estudio que sigue, se compara el texto griego complutense del Evangelio de Mateo, el capítulo octavo en particular, y los manuscritos alojados en la Biblioteca Apostólica Vaticana. Este estudio ofrece, en lugar de una conclusión definitiva, una reevaluación de la cuestión relativa a las fuentes utilizadas para la columna griega del Nuevo Testamento Complutense, en este caso, pensando en términos de lo que es o no es plausible.

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.25145/j.fortunat.2020.31.02>

FORTVNATAE, Nº 31; 2020 (1), pp. 29-44; ISSN: 1131-6810 / e-2530-8343

Para proporcionar un poco de contraste, también se proporciona una comparación de la obra de Erasmo, *Novum instrumentum omne* y minúsculas 1 (AN IV 2), 2 (AN IV 1) y 817 (A III 15), que muestra cómo se puede construir el texto griego de Erasmo usando esas tres copias con minúscula 2 que sirve como texto base principal. ¿El texto complutense comparte la misma semejanza con uno o más manuscritos del Vaticano que el de Erasmo con los manuscritos alojados en la Universitätsbibliothek Basel?

PALABRAS CLAVE: Crítica textual del Nuevo Testamento, Biblia Políglota Complutense, Cisneros, Erasmo, griego neotestamentario, Evangelio según Mateo.

1. INTRODUCTION

Did Greek manuscripts belonging to the Vatican Library serve as the basis for the text of the Greek column of the Complutensian New Testament? The author of the Greek preface in *Novum testamentum grece et latine* indicated as much, saying they were “brought from the Apostolic Library, sent to the Most Revered Lord Cardinal of Spain” (ἐκ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς βιβλιοθήκης ἀγόμενα, ἐπεμψε πρὸς αἰδεσιμώτατον κύριον τῆς ἵσπανίας καρδινάλιον). Who does he say sent them? –None other than the “Most High Chief Priest Leo X” (ὁ μέγιστος ἀρχιερεὺς λέων δέκατος). He even states that the pope wanted to help the project along (τῇ ὄρμῃ ταύτη συλλαμβάνειν προθυμούμενος), or in other words, he had personal involvement and a vested interest. But did manuscripts from the Vatican Library really serve as the basis for the Greek text of the Complutensian New Testament?

María Victoria Spottorno says this: “Whether or not said copies arrived from the Vatican cannot be known for sure, because no document in the Vatican Library proves that a manuscript was sent to the Cardinal.”¹ And that is a critical point. Incomplete records of loan exist in the Vatican Library,² but none mentions a single New Testament manuscript sent to Spain. How can such a claim be tested? Over a century ago, M. Revilla Rico wrote that a “comparison of the text of the Complutense with extant Vatican mss. has not provided any clarification, despite hopes that it would.”³ What those analyses were, however, is not exactly clear. There exists a need for a comprehensive study of the Vatican manuscripts, a collation between the Greek text contained in the Complutensian New Testament and those extant Vatican manuscripts, with the evidence presented in a readable manner for other scholars to assess for themselves.

¹ María Victoria Spottorno, “El texto griego del Nuevo Testamento en la Políglota Complutense,” in *Una Biblia a Varias Voces: Estudio Textual de la Biblia Políglota Complutense*, ed. Ignacio Carabajosa and Andrés García Serrano (Madrid: Universidad San Dámaso: 2014), 197.

² Maria Bertola, *I due primi registri di prestito della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (codici Vaticani latini 3964, 3966)* (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1942).

³ M. Revilla Rico, *La Políglota de Alcalá. Estudio histórico-crítico* (Madrid: Helénica, 1917), 115-116.

In the study that follows, a comparison is made of the Complutensian Greek text of the Gospel of Matthew, the eighth chapter in particular, and the manuscripts housed in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. One chapter taken from one text of New Testament is a very small sample, a noticeable weakness of any text-critical study. Conclusions on the New Testament as a whole are avoided. Nothing is certain. This study offers, in place of a definitive conclusion, a reassessment of the issue concerning the sources used for the Greek column of the Complutensian New Testament, in this case, thinking in terms of what is or is not plausible. To provide some contrast, a comparison of Erasmus' *Novum instrumentum omne* and minuscules 1 (AN IV 2), 2 (AN IV 1), and 817 (A III 15) is also provided, showing how the Greek text of Erasmus can be constructed using those three copies with minuscule 2 serving as the primary base text. Does the Complutensian text share the same likeness to one or more of the Vatican manuscripts as that of Erasmus to those manuscripts housed at the Universitätsbibliothek Basel?

2. THE MAIN EVIDENCE FOR MANUSCRIPTS FROM ROME

Apart from references in the front matter of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible, especially those references made in the Greek preface of the fifth volume, there would be no reason to suspect the use of the Vatican manuscripts by the editors in Alcalá de Henares for the Greek text of the New Testament. The discussion concerning the Greek sources begins fourteen lines up from the bottom of the first page containing the Greek preface. It reads as follows:

Καὶ ἵνα παύσωμεν προοιμιάζοντες, κακεῖνο τὸν φιλομαθῆ μὴ λανθανέτω, οὐ φαῦλα ἡμᾶς οὐδὲ τυχόντα ἐπὶ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ἐντυπώσει ἐσχηκέναι ἀντίγραφα, ἀλλ’ ἀρχαιότατα καὶ καθόσον οἶον τε ἦν ἐπιγνορθωμένα, καὶ δὴ καὶ κατὰ τὴν παλαιότητα οὕτως ἀξιόπιστα, ὅστε μὴ πείθεσθαι αὐτοῖς, πρὸς δυσκόλου εἶναι τὸ παράπον καὶ βεβήλον. Ἄ δὴ καὶ αὐτὰ ὁ ἀγιώτατος ἐν Χριστῷ Πατήρ καὶ Κύριος ἡμῶν ὁ μέγιστος ἀρχιερεὺς λέων δέκατος τῇ ὄρμῃ ταῦτη συλλαμβάνειν προθυμούμενος, ἐκ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς βιβλιοθήκης ἀγόμενα, ἔπειμις πρὸς αἰδεσιμώτατον κύριον τῆς ἴσπανίας καρδινάλιον, οὐ χορηγοῦντος καὶ κελεύσαντος τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον ἐτυπώσαμεν.

Translated: "And so we can draw our preface to a close, this should not escape the notice of the one who loves learning: We did not use inferior or just regular copies for our printing. We used the oldest and most accurate that were possible to secure. And with respect to their age, they are so trustworthy that to not do so would be a completely profane thing to do. They were copies brought from the Apostolic Library, which our Most Holy Father and Lord in Christ, the Most High Chief Priest Leo X, who being eager to assist the work, sent to the Most Revered Lord Cardinal of Spain, who through his provision and mandate we printed the present volume."

The author first identifies what the manuscripts were not: (1) "inferior" or (2) "just regular copies." Then he uses the descriptors "oldest" and "most accurate" to describe

what they are. The language suggests a long-held view, right or wrong, that better manuscripts are older manuscripts. And it is interesting to see that viewpoint expressed here by the author of the Greek preface, most likely written by the one who oversaw the formation of the Greek text (i.e., in terms used today, the project leader). Their trustworthy nature is derived from their age. The word used for their age is ἀρχαιότατα. It should be contrasted with the use of ἀντίγραφα, which occurs earlier in the preface with respect to old copies (τῶν ἀντιγράφων) of Greek texts that illustrate the lack of accentuation.⁴ The same word occurs once more at the end of the preface: “no more corrupted copies, no more dubious translations” (οὐκέτι ἀντίγραφα διερθαρμένα, οὐ μεταφράσεις ὑποπτα). The word ἀντίγραφα is neutral and says nothing about the date or quality of a manuscript, only that it is not an original. And the deviation from using it when referencing the manuscripts sent from the Apostolic Library is noteworthy. The author wants to highlight that they are not just copies, but the oldest they could acquire.

There are some problems with the assertions made in the preface. For example, how does one explain the mention of Leo X? His papacy had not even completed a full year before the New Testament volume was printed. Marvin R. Vincent dismisses any possibility that the Medici Pope was directly connected to the manuscripts utilized for the New Testament, writing, “But Leo could have sent no New Testament manuscripts, since he was elected a year before the New Testament was printed.”⁵ Scholars, for quite some time now, have attempted to offer another explanation that would account for the editors mentioning the recently elected pope in their preface. One proposal is that the manuscripts were actually sent by then Cardinal of Medici, who in 1513 would be elected pope and take the name Leo X.⁶ Another possibility is manuscripts were sent by Julius II.⁷ Of course, one would expect Cisneros to thank the pope, whoever that happened to be when the New Testament volume was printed. Perhaps no Greek manuscripts containing the New Testament were sent from the Apostolic Library. Perhaps the author of the preface takes the Vatican’s loan of Greek manuscripts containing the part of the Septuagint and allowed that loan to justify his claims in the preface. One could imagine him saying, “It’s not technically a lie. They did send Greek manuscripts. They just weren’t for the New Testament. And technically we didn’t say anything in the preface about what the manuscripts contained.” –even though the assumption would have been that they were for the New Testament since it was the preface to the New Testament.

⁴ See line 11 from the top in the preface.

⁵ Marvin R. Vincent, *A History of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1899), 49.

⁶ See, for example, Spottorno, “El texto griego del Nuevo Testamento,” 197.

⁷ For example, see Jack Finegan, *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts: A Working Introduction to Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1974), 56.

Or perhaps there was no justification at all. Perhaps the author of the preface just said what any faithful Catholic with high aspirations as a philologist, especially under the direction of someone as powerful as Cisneros, would have said to promote their work, honor the Cardinal, and bestow the greatest of honor on the pope, who happened to be Leo X.⁸

If the author of the preface says Greek manuscripts were sent from the Apostolic Library, then manuscripts belonging to that collection need to be assessed. Whether they had any involvement in the formation of the Greek text of the Complutensian New Testament, it would seem, begins with an analysis of their contents.

3. VATICAN MANUSCRIPTS AND THE GREEK TEXT OF THE COMPLUTENSIAN NEW TESTAMENT

The Vatican Library contains over sixty Greek manuscripts containing the Gospel of Matthew (excluding commentary manuscripts). They were compared to the Greek text of the Complutensian New Testament for this study. Below the Greek text of the Complutensian New Testament is presented as the base text, Matthew 8 provided in full, with diacritical marks and punctuation provided as one would expect to see them in a modern critical edition of the Greek New Testament. A superscript numeral, corresponding to a footnote, follows the Complutensian text where an issue of divergence is present with one or more Vatican manuscript. Chapter and verse are provided in the footnote followed by the Complutensian reading. Subsequent readings are given along with manuscript numbers corresponding to that reading. Variant readings are separated by the symbol // . Note that seven manuscripts (141 176 382 2589 2742 396 2740) are missing chapter eight in its entirety. Minuscule 875 is missing a significant portion of the chapter (hence why it contains only two issues of divergence).

⁸ Álvar Gómez de Castro's *De rebus gestis Francisco Ximenio Cisnero* (Alcalá de Henares, 1569), the first biography of Cisneros, was published just a half-century after the death of Cisneros in Roa de Duero, Spain. Evidence even in the last few years calls into question Gómez's presentation of the facts surrounding the publication of the Complutensian Polyglot. See Ignacio García Pinilla, "Reconsidering the Relationship between the Complutensian Polyglot Bible and Erasmus' *Novum Testamentum*," in *Basel 1516. Erasmus' Edition of the New Testament*, ed. Kaspar von Geyrer et al. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 63-64, for a discussion regarding Zúñiga's involvement and the notes belonging to Juan de Vergara supposedly used by Gómez. For the purpose of this study, the historicity of details presented in this biography are not considered. Gómez's presentation reinforces what is found in the preface of the polyglot, but veracity of those details is beyond the scope of this study.

Καταβάντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὅρους⁹, ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὅχλοι πολλοί· καὶ ἴδού, λεπρὸς ἐλθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ¹⁰, λέγων, Κύριε, ἐὰν θέλῃς, δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι. Καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα, ἤψατο αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων¹¹, Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι. Καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ¹² ἡ λέπρα. Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ὁρα μηδενὶ εἴπῃς· ἀλλὰ ὑπαγε, σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἵερει¹³, καὶ προσένεγκε τὸ δῶρον¹⁴ ὃ προσέταξε Μωσῆς¹⁵, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. Εἰσελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ¹⁶ εἰς Καπερναούμ, προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἐκατόνταρχος παρακαλῶν αὐτόν, καὶ λέγων¹⁷, Κύριε, ὁ παῖς μου βέβληται ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ παραλυτικός, δεινῶς βασανιζόμενος. Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐγώ ἐλθὼν θεραπεύσω αὐτόν. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἐκατόνταρχος ἔφη¹⁸, Κύριε, οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς ἵνα μου ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσέλθῃς¹⁹. ἀλλὰ μόνον²⁰ εἰπὲ λόγῳ²¹, καὶ ἰαθήσεται ὁ παῖς μου. Καὶ γάρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἔξουσίαν²², ἔχων ὑπ’ ἐμαυτὸν στρατιώτας· καὶ λέγω τούτῳ, Πορεύθητι, καὶ πορεύεται· καὶ ἄλλῳ, Ἔρχου, καὶ ἔρχεται²³. καὶ τῷ δούλῳ μου, Ποίησον τοῦτο, καὶ ποιεῖ. Ἀκούσας δὲ²⁴ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐθαύμασε, καὶ εἶπε τοῖς ἀκολουθοῦσιν²⁵, Άμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδὲ

⁹ 8:1: Καταβάντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὅρους // Καταβάντι δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὅρους 163 2585 // Καταβάντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ ὅρους 164 // Καὶ καταβάντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὅρους 161 // Καταβάντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὅρους 372 2737.

¹⁰ 8:2: ἐλθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ // προσελθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ 157 144 159 860 1269 380 // προσελθὼν προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ 152 873 // προσελθὼν προσεκύνῃ αὐτῷ 163 // προσεκύνει αὐτῷ 1823.

¹¹ 8:3: ἤψατο αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων // ἤψατο αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, εἶπεν 140 // ἤψατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς αὐτοῦ, λέγων 130.

¹² 8:3: ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ // ἐκαθαρίσθη ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ 2585 873.

¹³ 8:4: ἵερει // ἄρχιερει 2585 142.

¹⁴ 8:4: τὸ δῶρον // τὸ δῶρόν σου 376.

¹⁵ 8:4: Μωσῆς // Μωϋσῆς 1823 872 133 2585 2586 371 158 2195 380. Minuscules 163 and 157 have the υ written above line.

¹⁶ 8:5: Εἰσελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ // Εἰσελθόντος δὲ αὐτῷ 2737 // Εἰσελθόντι δὲ τῷ Ἰησοῦ 163 1269 // Εἰσελθόντι δὲ 2195.

¹⁷ 8:5-6: παρακαλῶν αὐτόν, καὶ λέγων // παρακαλῶν αὐτῷ, καὶ λέγων 1269 // λέγων 163.

¹⁸ 8:8: ἔφη // λέγει 130 // φησί 144.

¹⁹ 8:8: ἵνα μου ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσέλθῃς // ἵνα ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην μου εἰσέλθῃς 131.

²⁰ 8:8: μόνον // omit 2195.

²¹ 8:8: λόγῳ // λόγον 1823 135 852 1269 880.

²² 8:9: ὑπὸ ἔξουσίαν // ὑπὸ ἔξουσίαν τασσόμενος 372 2737.

²³ 8:9: καὶ λέγω τούτῳ, Πορεύθητι, καὶ πορεύεται· καὶ ἄλλῳ, Ἔρχου, καὶ ἔρχεται // καὶ λέγει τούτῳ, Ἔρχου, καὶ ἔρχεται · καὶ ἄλλῳ, Πορεύθητι, καὶ πορεύεται 2591.

²⁴ 8:10: Ακούσας δὲ // Ακούσας δὲ ταῦτα 173 860.

²⁵ 8:10: καὶ εἶπε τοῖς ἀκολουθοῦσιν // καὶ στραφεὶς εἶπεν τοῖς ἀκολουθοῦσιν 173 // καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς ἀκολουθοῦσιν αὐτῷ 163 157. Minuscule 2591 appears to have a word between τοῖς and ἀκολουθοῦσιν, but it is difficult to read.

ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ τοσαύτην πίστιν εὗρον²⁶. Λέγω δὲ ύμῖν, ὅτι πολλοὶ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν ἥξουσι, καὶ ἀνακληθήσονται μετὰ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν· οἱ δὲ νιοὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἐκβληθήσονται²⁷ εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἔξωτερον· ἐκεῖ ἔσται κλαυθμὸς²⁸ καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων. Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ ἑκατοντάρχῳ²⁹, "Υπαγε, καὶ³⁰ ὡς ἐπίστευσας γενηθήτω σοι. Καὶ ιάθη ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ³¹. Καὶ εἰσελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς³² εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Πέτρου, εἶδε τὴν πενθερὰν αὐτοῦ βεβλημένην καὶ πυρέσσουσαν, καὶ ἤψατο τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετός³³. καὶ ἡγέρθη, καὶ διηκόνει αὐτῷ³⁴. Ὁψίας δὲ γενομένης προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ δαιμονιζομένους πολλοὺς³⁵. καὶ ἐξέβαλε τὰ πνεύματα λόγῳ³⁶, καὶ πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ἐθεράπευσεν· ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥῆθὲν διὰ³⁷ Ἡσαῖου τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος, Αὐτὸς³⁸ τὰς

²⁶ 8:10 οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ τοσαύτην πίστιν εὗρον // διτι οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ τοσαύτην πίστιν εὗρον 2592 // οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ τοσαύτην πιστήν εὗρον 163 173 2585 // παρ' οὐδενὶ τοσαύτην πίστιν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ εὗρον 2586.

²⁷ 8:12: ἐκβληθήσονται // ἐμβληθήσονται 173 380.

²⁸ 8:12: κλαυθμός // ὁ κλαυθμός 140 128 152 167 180 153 130 149 1823 866 132 134 135 160 163 173 872 133 148 150 164 174 175 2585 2586 157 142 144 371 158 375 376 389 873 2195 161 2592 156 159 162 387 860 877 147 155 165 131 386 852 864 867 1269 380 880 2591 372 2737. This is almost certainly an error on the part of the Complutensian editors.

²⁹ 8:13: ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἑκατοντάρχῳ // ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἑκατοντάρχῃ 140 153 130 149 1823 134 160 163 133 164 175 2585 144 375 376 389 2195 2592 156 159 162 860 877 131 864 1269 380 880 // ὁ κύριος ἑκατοντάρχῃ 2586. Minuscule 150 could read ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἑκατοντάρχῃ or ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἑκατοντάρχῳ (final letter is omitted).

³⁰ 8:13: καὶ // omit 2586 372.

³¹ 8:13: Καὶ ιάθη ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ // Καὶ ιάθη ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης 152 180 153 133 2195 159 // Καὶ ιάθη ὁ παῖς ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ 2586. In minuscule 877, αὐτοῦ is written above line. Minuscule 2591 is difficult to read here.

A few manuscripts have an interpolation after this sentence (cf. Luke 7:10): Καὶ ὑποστρέψας ὁ ἑκατοντάρχος εἰς τὸν οἴκον αὐτοῦ. Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ. Εὗρε τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ ὑγιαίνοντα 152 153 132 150 159 387 // Καὶ ὑποστρέψας ... Εὗρε τὸν παῖδα ὑγιαίνοντα 134 135 163 133 142 873 161 860 877 880 // Καὶ ὑποστρέψας ... τὸν παῖδα ὑγιαίνοντα 375 // Καὶ ὑποστρέψας ... Εὗρε τὸν ἀσθενοῦντα παῖδα ὑγιαίνοντα 173 // Καὶ ὑποστρέψας ὁ ἑκατοντάρχος εὗρε τὸν παῖδα ὑγιαίνοντα 180.

³² 8:14: Καὶ εἰσελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς // Ελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς 1269 // Καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς 140 128 167 180 130 149 1823 866 132 134 135 160 163 173 872 133 148 150 164 174 175 2585 2586 157 142 144 371 158 375 376 389 873 2195 161 2592 156 159 162 387 860 877 147 155 165 131 386 852 864 867 380 880 2591 372 2737 // Καὶ ἐλθὼν 152.

³³ 8:15: καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετός // καὶ εὐθέως ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετός 173 // καὶ παρὰ χρῆμα ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετός 157.

³⁴ 8:15: καὶ ἡγέρθη, καὶ διηκόνει αὐτῷ // καὶ ἡγέρθη, καὶ διηκόνει αὐτοῖς 180 149 132 148 164 2586 157 873 387 147 880 372 2737. In minuscule 2592, καὶ ἡγέρθη, καὶ διηκόνει αὐτῷ is written in the left margin.

³⁵ 8:16: πολλοὺς // omit 149.

³⁶ 8:16: λόγῳ // τῷ λόγῳ 159.

³⁷ 8:17: διά // ὑπό 1823.

³⁸ 8:17: Αὐτός // Οὐτός 1823.

ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν³⁹ ἀνέλαβε⁴⁰, καὶ τὰς νόσους ἐβάστασεν. Ἰδών δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς πολλοὺς ὄχλους περὶ αὐτὸν, ἐκέλευσεν ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν⁴¹. Καὶ προσελθὼν εἰς γραμματεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Διδάσκαλε, ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἔὰν ἀπέρχῃ⁴². Καὶ⁴³ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσι, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνώσεις· ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ. Ἔτερος δὲ⁴⁴ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ⁴⁵ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Κύριε, ἐπίτρεψόν μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου⁴⁶. Ο δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ⁴⁷, Ακολούθει μοι, καὶ ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἔαυτῶν νεκρούς. Καὶ ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον⁴⁸, ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ⁴⁹ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἴδού, σεισμὸς μέγας ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ⁵⁰, ὥστε τὸ πλοῖον καλύπτεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων.⁵¹ αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκάθευδεν⁵². Καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ⁵³ ἤγειραν αὐτόν, λέγοντες, Κύριε, σῶσον ἡμᾶς, ἀπολλύμεθα. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Τί δειλοί ἐστε, δλιγόπιστοι; Τότε ἐγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησε τοῖς ἀνέμοις καὶ τῇ θαλάσσῃ, καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη.

³⁹ 8:17: ἡμῶν // ὑμῶν 852 1269.

⁴⁰ 8:17: ἀνέλαβε // ἔλαβε 128 152 167 180 153 130 149 1823 866 132 134 135 160 163 173 872 133 148 150 164 174 175 2585 2586 157 142 144 371 375 376 2195 161 2592 156 159 162 387 860 877 147 155 165 131 386 852 864 867 1269 380 880 2591 372 2737. Also, the following sentence (cf. Matt. 8:23) is written in the right margin of minuscule 375: Καὶ ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

⁴¹ 8:18: Ἰδών δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς πολλοὺς ὄχλους περὶ αὐτὸν, ἐκέλευσεν ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν // Ἰδών ὁ Ἰησοῦς ... εἰς τὸ πέραν 1269 // Καὶ ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς πλοῖον ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ 162. Minuscule 162 and 1269 accidentally place 8:23 after 8:17. The following issue is present in 8:18: πολλοὺς ὄχλους περὶ αὐτὸν // πολὺς ὄχλος περὶ αὐτῶν 163 // πολὺν ὄχλον περὶ αὐτὸν 2586 880 // ὄχλους πολλοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν 132.

⁴² 8:19: Διδάσκαλε, ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἔὰν ἀπέρχῃ // Διδάσκαλε, ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἂν ἀπέρχῃ 872 389 1269 // Ακολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἔὰν ἀπέρχῃ, κύριε 2585 // Ακολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἔὰν ἀπέρχῃ 2586 2592. It is possible that minuscule 872 has an ε written above ἀν. Minuscule 161 is difficult to read throughout but is illegible beginning with σοι here until the end of 8:22.

⁴³ 8:20: Καὶ // omit 128 167 866 387 155 386 867. Minuscule 161 is illegible.

⁴⁴ 8:21: Ἔτερος δὲ // Καὶ ἔτερος 2195. Minuscule 161 is illegible.

⁴⁵ 8:21: αὐτοῦ // omit 128 167 866 2586 873 387 147 155 386 867. Minuscule 161 is illegible.

⁴⁶ 8:21: ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου // ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι τὸν πατέρα 1823 // ἀπελθόντι θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου 157. Minuscule 133 has απ written above ἐλθεῖν. Minuscule 161 is illegible.

⁴⁷ 8:22: Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ // Ὅ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ 1823 156 // Ὅ δὲ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτῷ 132 2586. Minuscule 161 is illegible.

⁴⁸ 8:23: ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον // ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς πλοῖον 152 180 2195 162 // ἐμβάντι τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον 135 175 371 // ἐμβάντι τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἰς πλοῖον 163.

⁴⁹ 8:23: αὐτῷ // αὐτόν 135.

⁵⁰ 8:24: σεισμὸς μέγας ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ // σεισμὸς ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ μέγας 162.

⁵¹ 8:24: ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων // ἀπὸ τῶν κυμάτων 372 2737 // ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων· ἦν γάρ ὁ ἄνεμος ἐναντίος αὐτοῖς 160 163 164 2586 873 159 (cf. Mark 6:48).

⁵² 8:24: αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκάθευδεν // omit 173.

⁵³ 8:25: οἱ μαθηταὶ // οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ 153 1823 163 164 2586 142 380 2591.

Οι δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἐθαύμασαν, λέγοντες, Ποταπός ἐστιν οὗτος⁵⁴, δτι καὶ οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ ἡ θάλασσα⁵⁵ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ⁵⁶; Καὶ ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ πέραν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γεργεσηνῶν⁵⁷, ὑπήντησαν αὐτῷ δύο δαιμονιζόμενοι ἐκ τῶν μνημείων ἔξερχόμενοι, χαλεποὶ λίαν, ὥστε μὴ ἴσχυειν τινὰ παρελθεῖν διὰ τῆς ὁδοῦ ἐκείνης· καὶ ίδού, ἔκραξαν λέγοντες⁵⁸, Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ⁵⁹ νιè τοῦ θεοῦ; Ἡλθες ὅδε πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς⁶⁰; Ἡν δὲ μακρὰν⁶¹ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀγέλη χοίρων πολλῶν⁶² βισκομένη. Οι δὲ⁶³ δαίμονες παρεκάλουν αὐτόν, λέγοντες, Εἰ ἐκβάλλεις ἡμᾶς, ἐπίτρεψον ἡμῖν ἀπελθεῖν⁶⁴ εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ὑπάγετε. Οι δὲ ἐξελθόντες ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων⁶⁵. καὶ ίδού, ὥρμησε πᾶσα ἡ ἀγέλη τῶν χοίρων⁶⁶ κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ ἀπέθανον⁶⁷ ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν. Οι δὲ βόσκοντες ἔφυγον, καὶ ἀπελθόντες⁶⁸ εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἀπήγγειλαν πάντα, καὶ τὰ τῶν δαιμονιζομένων. Καὶ ίδού, πᾶσα ἡ πόλις ἐξῆλθεν εἰς συνάντησιν⁶⁹ τῷ Ἰησοῦ⁷⁰. καὶ ίδοντες αὐτόν, παρεκάλεσαν ὅπως⁷¹ μεταβῇ ἀπὸ⁷² τῶν ὁρίων αὐτῶν.

⁵⁴ 8:27: Ποταπός ἐστιν οὗτος // Ποταπός ἐστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος 165 1269.

⁵⁵ 8:27: καὶ οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ ἡ θάλασσα // καὶ ἡ θάλασσα καὶ οἱ ἄνεμοι 142. Matthew 8:26-27 is illegible in minuscule 161.

⁵⁶ 8:27: αὐτῷ // αὐτόν 135 // αὐτοῦ 2195.

⁵⁷ 8:28: Καὶ ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ πέραν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γεργεσηνῶν // Ἐλθόντι τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὸ πέραν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γεργεσηνῶν 1269 // Καὶ ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ πέραν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γεργεσηνῶν // Καὶ ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γεργεσηνῶν 389 // Καὶ ἐλθόντι εἰς τὸ πέραν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γεργεσηνῶν 135 // Καὶ ἐλθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πέραν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γεργεσηνῶν 160 2586 // Καὶ ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ εἰς Καπερναούμ εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γεργεσηνῶν 149 // Καὶ ἐλθόντι τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γεργεσηνῶν 163.

Concerning the spelling of Γεργεσηνῶν: Γεργεσηνῶν // Γεργεσινῶν 1823 163 2585 375 376 161 860 852 1269 380 880 2591 // Γαδαρηνῶν 160 174 2586 389.

⁵⁸ 8:29: λέγοντες // omit 164 2586.

⁵⁹ 8:29: Ἰησοῦ // omit 152 135 2586 875 162 1269.

⁶⁰ 8:29: ὅδε πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς // ἡμᾶς ὅδε πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι 160.

⁶¹ 8:30: μακράν // οὐ μακράν 161.

⁶² 8:30: πολλῶν // omit 180.

⁶³ 8:31: δέ // omit 163.

⁶⁴ 8:31: ἐπίτρεψον ἡμῖν ἀπελθεῖν // ἐπίτρεψον ἡμᾶς ἀπελθεῖν 149 872 165 // ἀποστειλον ἡμᾶς 372 2737.

⁶⁵ 8:32: Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ὑπάγετε. Οι δὲ ἐξελθόντες ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων // Καὶ ... ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὸν χοίρους 160 372 2737 // omit 157 2195 852.

⁶⁶ 8:32: πᾶσα ἡ ἀγέλη τῶν χοίρων // πᾶσα ἡ ἀγέλη 163 157 142 // ἡ ἀγέλη πᾶσα 160.

⁶⁷ 8:32: ἀπέθανον // ἀπέθανεν 180 148.

⁶⁸ 8:32: καὶ ἀπελθόντες // Ἀπελθόντες δέ 2195.

⁶⁹ 8:34: συνάντησιν // ὑπάντησιν 2586 // ἀντησιν 135.

⁷⁰ 8:34: τῷ Ἰησοῦ // αὐτοῦ 144.

⁷¹ 8:34: ὅπως // ἵνα 2586. In minuscule 852, the scribe accidentally recorded αὐτόν here.

⁷² 8:34: ἀπό // ἐκ 875 880.

The lack of the article with κλαυθμός in 8:12 is not found in any of the manuscripts at the Vatican Library. This is almost certainly an accident on the part of editors or that of Brocar, the printer. One reading is found in just one Vatican manuscript. In 8:14, GA153 and the Complutensian text both include the prefixed preposition on the participle (εἰσελθών). The remaining Vatican manuscripts have ἔλθών. In Matt. 8:17, the Complutensian text as well as minuscules 140 158 389 and 873 have ἀνέλαβε instead of ἔλαβε, which is found in the remaining Vatican manuscripts.⁷³ The prefixed preposition could have been supplied by the editors by choice or accident. In 8:14 the preposition is present in the participial clause, occurring nowhere else in Matthew with this combination. It is common in the Gospel of Mark however (e.g., 2:1; 3:27; 7:24). The presence of a prefixed preposition on a verb or participle where the preposition occurs in the same clause is not unusual in the New Testament. The editors could have incorrectly anticipated it, though this explanation seems unlikely in 8:14 and 8:17. Note that in 8:17 the Vulgate has *acepit* corresponding to λαμβάνω, not *assumpsit* corresponding to ἀναλαμβάνω,⁷⁴ further evidence that they were not attempting to change the Greek to match the Vulgate reading. It is more likely that the editors had one or more manuscripts containing εἰσελθών and ἀνέλαβε. And if they were exclusively using manuscripts from the Vatican, it would require having minuscule 153 and at least one of the following: 140, 158, 389, and 873.

Issues of Divergence	Minuscules
0	—
1	—
2	875 *lacuna
3	158
4	140 150 174
5	128 167 866 134 148 175 144 371 156 877 147 155 165 131 386 864 867
6	153 130 872 375 376 389 2592
7	132 133 161 387 852 2591
8	152 149 142 873 860
9	180 164 159 162 380
10	160 173 157 880 372 2737
11	135 2585
12	—
13	1823 2195

⁷³ Another issue related to the presence of a prefixed preposition is found later in Matt. 13:32. The Complutensian text has κατελθεῖν (instead of ἔλθεῖν) and only one Vatican manuscript (140) shares that same reading.

⁷⁴ See the Greek-Latin dictionary provided at the end of volume five.

14	-
15	1269
16	-
17	-
18	-
19	163
20	-
21	2586
22	-

Table 1: Divergence Between Vatican Manuscripts and Complutensian Text

It is possible, of course, that the Complutensian editors had a combination of Vatican manuscripts and manuscripts originating from somewhere else, which would not require dependence on a Vatican manuscript for the Complutensian reading. But the focus here is on dependence. Were manuscripts really sent from the Vatican? Well, there is significant reason to question that based on the historical evidence or lack thereof. Were Vatican manuscripts used for their edition of the New Testament text? So far, it seems the editors did not. The presence of the prefixed prepositions, if they came from the Vatican manuscripts, would require at least two with those readings. When any combination of those manuscripts is combined with the rest of the Gospel of Matthew, the number of divergent readings unaccounted for by that combination is still greater than seventy. And that includes all kinds of textual issues—from word order to lexical choice. None of the data points definitively to a particular manuscript or group of manuscripts. Instead, the editors were probably using some other manuscript or group of manuscripts not attributable to the Vatican collection. And that manuscript, or manuscripts if more than one, served as the base text for the Greek column in the Complutensian New Testament.

4. GREEK MANUSCRIPTS AND ERASMUS' *NOVUM INSTRUMENTUM OMNE*

Consider for a moment the manuscripts used by Erasmus in the first edition of his New Testament. How much divergence exists between those manuscripts and the Greek column of the *Novum instrumentum omne*? Does there exist divergence similar to that found with Greek text of the Complutensian New Testament and the Vatican manuscripts? To provide this contrast, a comparison of Erasmus' *Novum instrumentum omne* and minuscules 1 (AN iv 2), 2 (AN iv 1), and 817 (A iii 15)⁷⁵ was performed, showing how the Greek text of Erasmus follows minuscule 2.⁷⁶ Below is the text of Matthew 8 with textual issues identified in the footnotes.

⁷⁵ Minuscule 817, also housed at the University of Basel Library, is a commentary manuscript.

⁷⁶ Erasmus' personal notes have been very important for studies surrounding the formation of his editions of the Greek New Testament. Krans identifies the following as the "most accurate": ASD ix-2, p. 131 n.l. 433 and p. 191 n.l. 461; ASD vi-2, pp. 6-7; ASD vi-3, pp. 1-17; ASD vi-5, pp. 7-8; ASD vi-6, p. 4; ASD vi-8, pp. 46-47 n.l. 94 (335).

Καταβάντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὅρους⁷⁷, ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί· καὶ ίδού, λεπρὸς ἐλθὼν⁷⁸ προσεκύνει αὐτῷ, λέγων, Κύριε, ἐὰν θέλῃς, δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι. Καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα, ἤψατο αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων⁷⁹, Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι. Καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα. Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ὅρα μηδενὶ εἰπῆς· ἀλλὰ ὑπαγε, σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἵερεῖ, καὶ προσένεγκε τὸ δῶρον ὃ προσέταξε Μωσῆς, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. Εἰσελθόντι⁸⁰ δὲ τῷ Ἰησοῦ⁸¹ εἰς Καπερναούμ, προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἐκατόνταρχος παρακαλῶν αὐτόν, καὶ λέγων, Κύριε, ὁ παῖς μου βέβληται ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ παραλυτικός, δεινῶς βασανιζόμενος. Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐγὼ ἐλθὼν θεραπεύσω αὐτόν. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἐκατόνταρχος ἔφη, Κύριε, οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς ἵνα μου ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσέλθῃς· ἀλλὰ μόνον εἰπὲ λόγῳ⁸², καὶ ιαθήσεται ὁ παῖς μου⁸³. Καὶ γάρ ἐγὼ ἀνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἔξουσίαν, ἔχων ὑπ’ ἐμαυτὸν στρατιώτας· καὶ λέγω τούτῳ, Πορεύθητι, καὶ πορεύεται· καὶ ἄλλῳ, Ἐρχου, καὶ ἔρχεται· καὶ τῷ δούλῳ μου⁸⁴, Ποίησον τοῦτο, καὶ ποιεῖ. Ακούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐθαύμασε, καὶ εἶπε τοῖς ἀκολουθοῦσιν, Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ τοσαύτην πίστιν εὑρον⁸⁵. Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι⁸⁶ πολλοὶ ἀπὸ⁸⁷ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν ἦξουσι, καὶ ἀνακληθήσονται μετὰ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν· οἱ δὲ νιοὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἐκβληθήσονται εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἔξωτερον· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων. Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ ἐκατοντάρχῃ⁸⁸, Ὑπαγε, καὶ ὡς ἐπίστευσας γενηθήτω σοι. Καὶ ιάθη ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ⁸⁹ ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ⁹⁰. Καὶ εἰσελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς⁹¹ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Πέτρου, εἶδε τὴν πενθερὰν αὐτοῦ βεβλημένην καὶ πυρέσσουσαν, καὶ ἤψατο τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετός· καὶ ἤγέρθη, καὶ διηκόνει αὐτῷ⁹². Ὁψίας δὲ

γενομένης προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ δαιμονιζόμενους πολλούς· καὶ ἐξέβαλεν τὰ πνεύματα λόγῳ, καὶ πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ἐθεράπευσεν· ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ρῆθὲν διὰ Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος, Αὐτὸς τὰς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν ἔλαβε, καὶ τὰς νόσους ἐβάστασεν. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς πολλοὺς ὄχλους περὶ αὐτὸν, ἐκέλευσεν ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν. Καὶ προσελθὼν εἰς γραμματεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Διδάσκαλε, ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἔαν⁹³ ἀπέρχῃ. Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσι, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνώσεις· ὁ δὲ νίὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ. Ἐτερος δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Κύριε, ἐπίτρεψόν μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ⁹⁴, Ἀκολούθει μοι, καὶ ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἔαυτῶν νεκρούς. Καὶ ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον⁹⁵, ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἴδιον, σεισμὸς μέγας ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, ὥστε τὸ πλοῖον καλύπτεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων· αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκάθευδεν. Καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ⁹⁶ ἤγειραν αὐτόν, λέγοντες, Κύριε, σῶσον ἡμᾶς⁹⁷, ἀπολλύμεθα. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Τί δειλοὶ ἔστε, ὀλιγόπιστοι; Τότε ἐγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησεν τοῖς ἀνέμοις⁹⁸ καὶ τῇ θαλάσσῃ, καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη. Οἱ δὲ ἀνθρώποι ἐθαύμασαν, λέγοντες, Ποταπός ἐστιν οὗτος, ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἀνέμοι καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ⁹⁹; Καὶ ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ¹⁰⁰ εἰς τὸ πέραν εἰς χώραν¹⁰¹ τῶν Γεργεστηνῶν¹⁰², ὑπήντησαν αὐτῷ δύο δαιμονιζόμενοι ἐκ τῶν μνημείων ἐξερχόμενοι, χαλεποὶ λίαν, ὥστε μὴ ἰσχύειν τινὰ παρελθεῖν διὰ τῆς ὁδοῦ ἐκείνης· καὶ ἴδιον, ἔκραξαν λέγοντες, Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦν¹⁰³ νιὲ τοῦ θεοῦ; Ἡλθες ὅδε πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς; Ἡν δὲ μακρὰν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀγέλη χοίρων πολλῶν βοσκομένη. Οἱ δὲ δαίμονες παρεκάλουν αὐτόν, λέγοντες, Εἰ ἐκβάλλεις ἡμᾶς, ἐπίτρεψον ἡμῖν¹⁰⁴ ἀπελθεῖν¹⁰⁵ εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Υπάγετε. Οἱ δὲ ἐξελθόντες ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων¹⁰⁶.



⁹³ 8:19: ἔαν // ἄν 817.

⁹⁴ 8:22: Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ // Ὁ εἶπεν αὐτῷ 2 // Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτῷ 1.

⁹⁵ 8:23: ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον // ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς πλοῖον 1.

⁹⁶ 8:25: οἱ μαθηταὶ // οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ 1.

⁹⁷ 8:25: ἡμᾶς // omit 1.

⁹⁸ 8:26: τοῖς ἀνέμοις // τῷ ἀνέμῳ 1.

⁹⁹ 8:27: καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ // καὶ ἡ θάλασσα αὐτῷ ὑπακούουσιν 1.

¹⁰⁰ 8:28: Καὶ ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ // Καὶ ἐλθόντι αὐτοῦ 1. In minuscule 1, καὶ ἐλθόντι τῷ Ἰησοῦ is included in an alternative reading at the bottom of the page.

¹⁰¹ 8:28: εἰς χώραν // εἰς τὴν χώραν 1 2 817.

¹⁰² 8:28: Γεργεστηνῶν // Γεργεστινῶν 1 817. In minuscule 2, vowels and diphthongs are occasionally corrected in the margin or between lines. In this case, the η is present above the τ in Γεργεστινῶν. Jerry H. Bentley mentions these notations in his book *Humanists and Holy Writ*: “Most of these notes simply correct iotaisms or errors in spelling” (*Humanists and Holy Writ: New Testament Scholarship in the Renaissance* [Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983], 131).

¹⁰³ 8:29: Ἰησοῦ // omit 1.

¹⁰⁴ 8:31: ἐπίτρεψον ἡμῖν // ἀπόστελον ἡμᾶς 1.

¹⁰⁵ 8:31: ἀπελθεῖν // omit 1.

¹⁰⁶ 8:32: εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων // εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρους 1.

καὶ ἴδού, ὥρμησεν πᾶσα ἡ ἀγέλη τῶν χοίρων¹⁰⁷ κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ ἀπέθανον ἐν τοῖς ὕδαισιν. Οἱ δὲ βόσκοντες ἔφυγον, καὶ ἀπελθόντες εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἀπήγγειλαν πάντα, καὶ τὰ τῶν δαιμονιζομένων. Καὶ ἴδού, πᾶσα ἡ πόλις ἐξῆλθεν εἰς συνάντησιν¹⁰⁸ τῷ Ἰησοῦ· καὶ ἴδοντες αὐτὸν, παρεκάλεσαν ὅπως¹⁰⁹ μεταβῇ¹¹⁰ ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων αὐτῶν.

	Erasmus	GA 1	GA 2	817
8:1	Καταβάντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὅρους	X		X
8:2	ἐλθὼν	X		
8:3	ἥψατο αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων	X		X
8:5	Εἰσελθόντι	X		
8:5	τῷ Ἰησοῦ	X		X
8:9	λόγῳ			X
8:9	ὁ παῖς μου	X		
8:9	μου			X
8:10	οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ τοσαύτην πίστιν εὗρον	X		
8:11	ὅτι	X		
8:11	ἀπό	X		
8:13	έκατοντάρχῃ			X
8:13	αὐτοῦ	X		
8:13	ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ	X		
8:14	εἰσελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς		X	X
8:15	αὐτῷ	X	X	
8:19	ἐάν			X
8:22	Ο δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ	X	X	
8:23	ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον	X		
8:25	οἱ μαθηταί	X		
8:25	ἵματις	X		
8:26	τοῖς ἀνέμοις	X		
8:27	καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ	X		
8:28	Καὶ ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ	X		
8:28	εἰς χώραν	X	X	X
8:28	Γεργεσηγῶν	X		X
8:29	Ἰησοῦ	X		
8:31	ἐπίτρεψον ἡμῖν	X		
8:31	ἀπελθεῖν	X		
8:32	εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων	X		
8:32	τῶν χοίρων	X		

¹⁰⁷ 8:32: τῶν χοίρων // omit 1.

¹⁰⁸ 8:34: συνάντησιν // ὑπάντησιν 1.

¹⁰⁹ 8:34: ὅπως // omit 1.

¹¹⁰ 8:34: μεταβῇ // μεταβῆναι 1.

8:34	συνάντησιν	X		
8:34	ὅπως	X		
8:34	μεταβῆ	X		

Table 2: Divergence Between Minuscules 1, 2, and 817 and the Text of Erasmus

Minuscules 1, 2, and 817 account for all of Matthew 8, assuming Erasmus left off τήν in 8:28 by accident or choice.¹¹¹ Erasmus was able to establish his text for chapter eight using just these three manuscripts. It is quite evident that minuscule 2 was the primary source text, with some correction from that of 817. For example, Erasmus preferred the reading found in 817 for Matt. 8:15: Instead of saying that Peter's mother-in-law waited on the guests (plural) of the house after Jesus healed her, Erasmus opted for καὶ διηκόνει αὐτῷ ("and waited on *him*").

5. CONCLUSION

Continuous-text Greek manuscripts held today in the Vatican Library cannot account for the Complutensian Greek text of Matthew. While this does not necessarily rule out manuscripts were sent, it does call into question the likelihood that manuscripts from the Vatican Library were used by Cisneros' team. The amount of divergence that exists between the Complutensian text and the texts of the Vatican copies is too great, so far in the analysis of these manuscripts, to view their use by the Spanish editors as plausible. Were Greek manuscripts containing the New Testament sent to Spain? –Maybe, but the easier explanation is that the author of the preface wanted to thank their religious leader and present him as "over all, through all, and in all" things related to the formation of the first printed Greek edition of the New Testament. Were it not for Vat. lat. 3966 and the two records on fol. 12^r, one on fol. 31^r, more philologists would probably question the assertion that manuscripts from the Vatican were sent. Natalio Fernández Marcos expresses his own doubt that manuscripts were ever sent, citing Revilla's very brief comments in *La Políglota de Alcalá. Estudio histórico-crítico*: "As for the manuscripts used for the New Testament, Cisneros thanks Pope Leo X in the Preface for the Greek manuscripts sent by the Vatican Library *tum Veteris tum Novi Testamenti*. If the manuscripts of the New Testament were ever sent, then these have been lost, since no textual affinity between the New Testament of Alcalá and the manuscripts preserved in the Vatican Library

¹¹¹ Jan Krans discusses other issues surrounding the presence or absence of the Greek article; see pp. 63, 113, 147, 199, 220 in *Beyond What Is Written: Erasmus and Beza as Conjectural Critics of the New Testament*, ed. Bruce M. Metzger and Bard D. Ehrman (New Testament Tools and Studies 35; Leiden: Brill, 2006). Note also that these manuscripts account for the content of Matthew 22, also checked for this study, assuming Erasmus left off εἰς in Matt. 22:16 because it followed the verb βλέπεις.

can be appreciated.”¹¹² Unfortunately, an exhaustive comparison of the Vatican manuscripts with the Complutensian text remains incomplete. There lies the most conclusive data. This analysis of Matthew 8 is just a sample of what could be in studies of the Complutensian New Testament. Unfortunately, the Biblioteca Histórica de la Universidad Complutense de Madrid is not home to Greek manuscripts in the same way that the Basel library houses the main copies used by Erasmus for *Novum instrumentum omne* and subsequent editions.¹¹³ Until further evidence is presented showing either manuscripts were sent or affinities with the Complutensian text, similar to those we find when comparing the Erasmus text with those manuscripts in Basel, the matter is uncertain and, in this author’s opinion, suspect. So, in summary, is it possible that Greek manuscripts were sent from Rome to help with some or all of the New Testament? Possible, yes. Is it plausible, based on this evidence, that one or more were used for establishing the Greek text of the Gospel of Matthew? No.

RECIBIDO: octubre 2019; ACEPTADO: enero 2020.

¹¹² Natalio Fernández Marcos, “The First Polyglot Bible,” in *The Text of the Hebrew Bible and Its Editions: Studies in Celebration of the Fifth Centennial of the Complutensian Polyglot*, ed. Andrés Otero and Pablo A. Torijano Morales (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 14. For this final statement, Fernández cites M. Revilla Rico, *La Políglota de Alcalá. Estudio histórico-crítico* (Madrid: Helénica, 1917), 115-116.

¹¹³ To see the manuscripts available at the Complutense library, see <http://webs.ucm.es/BUCM/foa/55913.php>.