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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 miniscule 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?
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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.
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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?
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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 greece 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, ἔπεμψε πρὸς αἰδεσιμώτατον κύριον τῆς ἱσπανίας καρδηνάλιον). 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 ὁρμῇ ταύτῃ 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 Carbajosa 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-critico* (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 φαύλα ἡμασοὐδὲτυχόντα ἐπὶ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ἐντυπώσει ἐσχηκέναι ἀντίγραφα, ἀλλ᾽ ἀρχαιότατα καὶ καθόσον οἷόν τε ἐπηνορθωμένα, καὶ δὴ καὶ κατὰ τὴν παλαιότητα οὕτως ἀξιόπιστα, ὥστε μὴ πείθεσθαι αὐτοίς, πρὸς δυσκόλου εἶναι τὸ παράπαν καὶ βεβήλου. Ἅδη καὶ αὐτὰ ὁ ἁγιώτατος ἐν Χριστῷ Πατὴρ καὶ Κύριος ἡμῶν ὁ ὁμέγιστος ἀρχιερεὺς λέων δέκατος τῇ ὁρμῇ ταύτῃ συλλαμβάνειν προθυμούμενος, ἐκ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς βιβλιοθήκης ἐπεμψε πρὸς αἰδεσιμότατον κύριον τῆς ἰσπανίας καρδηνάλιον, οὗ 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 διεφθαρμένα, οὐ μεταφράσεις ὑποπται). 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 Ximeno Cisnerio (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 Greyerz 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 ὄρους9, ἡκολουθησαν αὐτῷ ὀχλοὶ πολλοί· καὶ ἵδον, λεπρός ἐλθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ10, λέγων, Κύριε, ἐὰν θέλης, δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι. Καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα, ἥψατο αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων 11, Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι. Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἄρα μηδενὶ εἴπης· ἀλλὰ λέγει αὐτῷ, ἐὰν θέλῃς, δύνασαί με καθαρίσαι. Καὶ καταβάντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους12 ἡ λέπρα. Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὃς ἐλθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ λέγων, Κύριε, ἐὰν θέλῃς, δύνασαί με καθαρίσαι. Καὶ ἔκαθαρίσθη ἡ λέπρα. Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Οὐκ εἴπας· ἀλλὰ πορεύθητι τῷ ἱερεῖ13, καὶ προσένεγκε τὸ δῶρον14, ὃ προσέταξε Μωϋσῆς15, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. Εἰσελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ16 εἰς Καπερναοῦμ, προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἑκατόνταρχος παρακαλῶν αὐτόν, καὶ λέγων17, Κύριε, ὁ παῖς μου βέβληται ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ παραλυτικός, δεινῶς βασανιζόμενος. Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐγὼ ἐλθὼν θεραπεύσω αὐτόν. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος ὁπαῖς μου ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσέλθῃς19· ἀλλὰ μόνον εἰπὲ λόγῳ20, καὶ ἱαθήσεται ὁ παῖς μου. Καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν22· καὶ λέγω τούτῳ, Πορεύθητι, καὶ πορεύεται· καὶ ἄλλῳ, Ἔρχου, καὶ ἔρχεται23· καὶ τῷ δούλῳ μου, Ποίησον τοῦτο, καὶ ποιεῖ. Ακούσας δὲ24 ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐθαύμασε, καὶ εἶπε τοῖς ἀκολουθοῦσιν, Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδὲ ἀκούσας τούτο, ἐθαύμασε τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς.
ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ τοσαύτην πίστιν εὗρον. Λέγω δὲ ύμίν, ὅτι πολλοὶ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν ἥξουσι, καὶ ἀνακληθήσονται μετὰ Αβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν ὀὐρανῶν· οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἐκβληθήσονται εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον. Καὶ ἔπεμν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸ ἐκατοντάρχη, "Ὑπαγε, καὶ ὡς ἐπίστευσας γενηθήτω σοι. Καὶ ἰάθη ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ. Καὶ εἰσελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Πέτρου, εἶδε τὴν πενθερὰν αὐτοῦ βεβλημένην καὶ πυρέσσουσαν, καὶ ἥψατο τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετός. Καὶ ἠγέρθη, καὶ διηκόνει αὐτῷ. Ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ δαιμονιζομένους πολλοὺς, καὶ ἐξέβαλε τὰ πνεύματα λόγῳ, καὶ πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἐθεράπευσεν· ὡς πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἠσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος, Αὐτὸς τὰς
ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν 39 ἀνέλαβε 40, καὶ τὰς νόσους ἐβάστασεν. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς πολλοὺς ὄχλους περὶ αὐτόν, ἐκέλευσεν ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν 41. Καὶ προσελθὼν εἷς γραμματεὺς ἔπειν αὐτῷ, Διδάσκαλε, ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἐὰν ἀπέρχῃ 42. Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσιν, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνώσει· ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ. Εἶπε δὲ ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ, Κύριε, ἐπίτρεψόν μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου 46. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ 47, Ἀκολούθει μοι, καὶ ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἐαυτῶν νεκροὺς. Καὶ ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον 48, ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἤγειραν αὐτόν, λέγοντες, Κύριε, σῶσον ἡμᾶς, ἀπολλύμεθα. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Τί δεῖλοί ἐστε, ὀλιγόπιστοι; Τότε ἐγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησε τοῖς ἀνέμοις καὶ τῇ θαλάσσῃ, καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη.

39: ἡμῶν // ὑμῶν
40: ἀνέλαβε // ἔλαβε
41: Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς πολλοὺς ὄχλους περὶ αὐτόν, ἐκέλευσεν ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν // Ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς... εἰς τὸ πέραν
42: Διδάσκαλε, ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἐὰν ἀπέρχῃ // Διδάσκαλε, ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἐὰν ἀπέρχῃ, κύριε
43: Καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ
44: Καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. Τί δεῖλοί ἐστε, ὀλιγόπιστοι; Τότε ἐγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησε τοῖς ἀνέμοις καὶ τῇ θαλάσσῃ, καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη.
Οἱδὲ ἄνθρωποι ἐθαύμασαν, λέγοντες. Ποταπός ἐστιν οὗτος, ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ; Καὶ ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ πέραν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γεργεσηνῶν, ὑπήντησαν αὐτῷ δύο δαιμονιζόμενοι εἰς τὴν ὁδοῦ εὐθανάσιαν· καὶ ἤκουσαν αὐτῷ, ἔκραξαν λέγοντες. Καὶ ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γεργεσηνῶν, ὑπήντησαν αὐτῷ δύο δαιμονιζόμενοι εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων. Καὶ ἐπέστρεφε καὶ ἔφυγεν, καὶ ἀπελθόντες εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἀπήγγειλαν πάντα, καὶ τὰ τῶν δαιμονιζομένων. Καὶ ἐλθόντι τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γεργεσηνῶν, ἔφυγεν ἀγέλη τῶν χοίρων κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ ἀπέθανον ἐν τοῖς ὕδαις.
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 is just one Vatican manuscript. In 8:14, GA153 and the Complutian text both include the prefixed preposition on the participle (εἰσελθόν). The remaining Vatican manuscripts have ἐλθόν. In Matt. 8:17, the Complutian text as well as minuscules 140 158 389 and 873 have ἀνέλαβε instead of ἐλαβε, which is found in the remaining Vatican manuscripts. 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 acceptit corresponding to λαμβάνο, not assumpsit corresponding to ἀναλαμβάνο, 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 εἰσελθόν 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 Complutian text has κατελθεῖν (instead of ἐλθεῖν) and only one Vatican manuscript (140) shares that same reading.

74 See the Greek-Latin dictionary provided at the end of volume five.
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 reset 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) was performed, showing how the Greek text of Erasmus follows minuscule 2. 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).
Matthew 8

Καταβάντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους, ἦκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοὶ καὶ ιδοὺ, λεπρὸς ἐλθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ, λέγων, Κύριε, ἐὰν θέλῃς, δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι. Καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα, ἥψατο αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων, Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι. Καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτὸς ἡ λέπρα. Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ὅρα μηδενὶ εἴπῃς· ἀλλὰ ἀπελθὼν τῷ ἱερεῖ, καὶ προσένεγκε τὸ δῶρον ὃ προσέταξε Μωσῆς, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. Εἰσελθόντι δὲ τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἰς Καπερναούμ, προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἑκατόναρχος παρακαλῶν αὐτόν, καὶ λέγων, ὁπαῖς μου βέβληται ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, δεινῶς βασανιζόμενος. Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐγὼ ἐλθὼν θεραπεύσω αὐτόν. Καὶ ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι, ἔχων ὑπὲρ ἐμαυτὸν στρατιώτας· καὶ λέγω τούτῳ, Πορεύθητι, καὶ πορεύεται· καὶ ἄλλῳ, Ἐρχου, καὶ ἐρχεται· καὶ τῷ δούλῳ μου, Ποίησον τοῦτο, καὶ ποιεῖ. Ὁ ἑκατόναρχος δὲ ἐθαύμασε, καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς ἀκολουθοῦσιν, Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ τοσαύτην πίστιν εὗρον. Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι πολλοὶ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν ἥξουσι, καὶ ἀνακληθήσονται μετὰ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν· οἱ δὲ οἱ παῖς τῆς βασιλείας ἐκβληθήσονται εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον· ἐκεῖ ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων. Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ ἑκατοντάρχῃ, Ὕπαγε, καὶ ὡς ἐπίστευσας γενηθήτω σοι. Καὶ ἐγέρθη ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ. Καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Πέτρου, εἶδε τὴν πενθερὰν αὐτοῦ βεβλημένην καὶ πυρέσσουσαν, καὶ ἥψατο τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετός· καὶ ἀφῆκεν τὸν παῖς αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ. Ὅψιας δὲ 77 8:1: Καταβάντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους // Καταβάντι δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους 1 // Καταβάντι δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους 817. 78 8:2: ἐλθὼν // προσελθών 1. 79 8:3: ἦματο αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων // ἦματο αὐτοῦ, λέγων 1 2. In minuscule 817, αὐτοῦ is included before and following ἦματο, but ὁ Ἰησοῦς is not present. 80 8:5: Εἰσελθόντι // Εἰσελθόντος 1. 81 8:5: τῷ Ἰησοῦ // αὐτοῦ 1 // αὐτῷ 817. 82 8:9: λόγῳ // λόγον 817. 83 8:9: ὁ παῖς μου // omit 1. 84 8:9: μου // omit 817. 85 8:10: οὖδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραηλ ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ ἡ συναγωγῇ // παρ᾽ οὖν ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ ἐκαθάρισεν πίστιν εἴρων 1. 86 8:11: ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ // omit 1. 87 8:11: ἀπὸ // omit 1. 88 8:13: ἐκαθάρισεν // ἐκαθάρισεν 817. 89 8:13: αὐτοῦ // αὐτοῖς 1 2.
γενομένης προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ δαιμονιζομένους πολλοὺς· καὶ ἐξέβαλεν τὰ πνεύματα λόγῳ, καὶ πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ἔθεράπευσεν· ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥήθην διὰ Ἰησοῦν τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος, Ἀλλά τας ἁθενεῖας ἡμᾶς ἔλαβε, καὶ τὰς νόσους ἐβάστασεν. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς πολλοὺς ὁχλοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν, ἐκέλευσεν ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν. Καὶ προσελθὼν εἰς γραμματεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Διδάσκαλε, ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἐὰν ἀπέρχῃ. Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσιν, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνώσεις· ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ. Ἕτερος δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Κύριε, ἐπίτρεψόν μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου. Οἱ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ἀκολούθει μοι, καὶ ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νεκροὺς. Καὶ ἐμβάντες αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἰδοὺ, σεισμὸς μέγας ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, ὥστε τὸ πλοῖον καλύπτεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων· αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκάθευδεν. Καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ ἤγειραν αὐτὸν, λέγοντες, Κύριε, σῶσον ἡμᾶς, ἀπολλύμεθα. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Τί δει λοί ἐστε, ὀλιγόπιστοι; Τότε ἐγερθεὶς επετίμησεν τοῖς ἀνέμοις καὶ τῇ θαλάσσῃ, καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη. Οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἐθαύμασαν, λέγοντες, Ποταπός ἐστιν οὗτος, ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ; Καὶ ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ πέραν εἰς χώραν τῶν Γεργεσηνῶν, ὑπήντησαν αὐτῷ δύο δαιμονιζόμενοι ἐκ τῶν μνημείων ἐξερχόμενοι, χαλεποί λίαν, ὥστε μὴ ἰσχύειν τινὰ παρελθεῖν διὰ τῆς ὁδοῦ ἐκείνης· καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἔκραξαν λέγοντες, Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ; Ἦλθες ὤδε πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς; Ἦν δὲ μακρὰν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀγέλη χοίρων πολλῶν βοσκομένη. Οἱ δὲ δαίμονες παρεκάλουν αὐτόν, λέγοντες, Εἰ ἐκβάλλεις ἡμᾶς, ἐπίτρεψον ἡμῖν ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ὑπάγετε. Οἱ δὲ ἐξελθόντες ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων.
καὶ ἰδοὺ, ὥρμησεν πᾶσα ἡ ἁγέλη τῶν χοίρων
καὶ ἀπέθανον ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν. Οἱ δὲ βόσκοντες ἔφυγον,
καὶ ἀπελθόντες εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἀπήγγειλαν πάντα,
καὶ ἰδοὺ, πᾶσα ἡ πόλις ἐξῆλθεν εἰς συνάντησιν
τῷ Ἰησοῦ· καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτόν,

| Erasmus | GA 1 | GA 2 | 817 |
|---------|------|------|-----|
| 8:1     | Καταβάντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους | X    |     |
| 8:2     | ἐλθὼν | X    |     |
| 8:3     | ἦγατο αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων | X    | X   |
| 8:5     | Εἰσελθόντι | X    |     |
| 8:6     | τῷ Ἰησοῦ | X    | X   |
| 8:9     | λόγο | X    |     |
| 8:10    | ὁ παῖς μου | X    |     |
| 8:11    | ὁ παῖς μου | X    |     |
| 8:12    | οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ τοσαύτην πίστιν εὗρον | X    |     |
| 8:13    | ὁ παῖς μου | X    |     |
| 8:14    | ὁ παῖς μου | X    |     |
| 8:15    | ὁ παῖς μου | X    |     |
| 8:16    | ἐλθὼν | X    |     |
| 8:17    | εἰς χώραν | X    | X   |
| 8:18    | Ιερουσαλήμ | X    |     |
| 8:19    | ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ | X    |     |
| 8:20    | ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ | X    |     |
| 8:21    | ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ | X    |     |
| 8:22    | ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ | X    |     |
| 8:23    | ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ | X    |     |
| 8:24    | ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ | X    |     |
| 8:25    | ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ | X    |     |
| 8:26    | ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ | X    |     |
| 8:27    | ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ | X    |     |
| 8:28    | ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ | X    |     |
| 8:29    | ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ | X    |     |
| 8:30    | ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ | X    |     |
| 8:31    | ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ | X    |     |
| 8:32    | ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ | X    |     |

107 8:32: τῶν χοίρων // omit 1.
108 8:34: συνάντησιν // ὑπάντησιν 1.
109 8:34: ὁ παῖς // omit 1.
110 8:34: μεταβῇ // μεταβήναι 1.
Table 2: Divergence Between Minuscules 1, 2, and 817 and the Text of Erasmus

| 8:34 | συνάντησιν | X |
| 8:34 | ὅπως | X |
| 8:34 | μεταβῇ | X |

Minuscules 1, 2, and 817 account for all of Matthew 8, assuming Erasmus left off τήν in 8:28 by accident or choice. 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. 12r, one on fol. 31r, 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 Polígloita de Alcalá. Estudio histórico-critico*. “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.” 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. 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.
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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](http://webs.ucm.es/BUCM/foa/55913.php).