

Significant splits within Family 35 for the whole NT

Wilbur N. Pickering, ThM PhD

The purpose of this study is to present and discuss all the significant splits within the family that I have so far identified. I arbitrarily define as ‘significant’ any reading with at least 25% attestation; that is, 25% of the MSS that I have personally checked. For most books the numbers are based on complete collations that I have done for the book; but in some cases I have spot-checked further MSS, and I will inform the reader when that is the case. The splits will be treated in sequence.

Matthew has five significant splits: I have done complete collations of 51 MSS for this book; the rest were spot-checked, for a total of 114.¹

9:17—*απολουνται* —18, 83, 125, 201, 204, 214, 246, 386, 402, 480, 510, 516, 586, 676, 691, 757^s, 758, 763, 789, 824, 928^c, 959, 986, 1040, 1062, 1072, 1075, 1117, 1145, 1158, 1234, 1247, 1248, 1250, 1328, 1339, 1384, 1445, 1461, 1496, 1503, 1548, 1551, 1559, 1560, 1572^c, 1617, 1628, 1637, 1652, 1686, 1705, 1713, 2175, 2221, 2253, 2323, 2352, 2382, 2503, 2554, 2897, 2916, I.2110, L.65

απολλυνται —35, 55, 128, 155, 189, 363, 394, 479, 520, 536, 547, 553, 645, 685, 696, 781, 867, 928, 938, 1023, 1111, 1133, 1189, 1199, 1251, 1323, 1334, 1435, 1482, 1490, 1572, 1694, 1698, 1813, 2261, 2284, 2322, 2367, 2407, 2466, 2765

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? They would be ruined for future use; since a wineskin would be of more value than the wine it could contain, it was a loss to be avoided. Any difference in meaning is almost too slight to translate.

19:29—*οικιας* —83, 125, 246, 363, 394, 415, 516, 553, 586^{alt}, 689, 763, 789, 824, 928^{alt}, 938, 959, 1023, 1040, 1072, 1075, 1117, 1145, 1189^{alt}, 1247, 1328, 1334, 1339, 1461, 1496, 1503, 1548, 1551, 1559, 1560, 1572^{alt}, 1614, 1617, 1628, 1637, 1652, 1667, 1686, 1705, 1713, 1813, 2175, 2221, 2253, 2322, 2323, 2352, 2399, 2554, 2897, I.2110, L.65

οικιαν —18, 55, 128, 141, 155, 189, 201, 204, 214, 386, 402, 479, 480, 510, 520, 536, 547, 586, 645, 676, 685, 691, 696, 758, 781, 867, 897, 928, 986, 1062, 1111, 1133, 1147, 1158, 1189, 1199, 1234, 1248, 1250, 1251, 1323, 1384, 1435, 1445, 1482, 1490, 1572, 1694, 1698, 2122, 2261, 2284, 2367, 2382, 2407, 2466, 2503, 2559, 2765, 2916

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. Within the context, the choice makes no difference.

25:32—*συναχθησονται* —83, 125, 189, 246, 516, 520, 645, 676, 685, 757, 763, 789, 824, 959, 1040, 1072, 1075, 1111, 1117, 1133, 1145, 1199, 1234, 1250, 1323, 1328, 1339,

¹ In the lists of MSS below, the value of the superscript letters is as follows: ‘s’ = supplement, ‘c’ = corrector (presumably not the first hand), ‘alt’ = alternate (apparently by the first hand, who was aware of the alternate spelling and wrote it above the word).

1461, 1496, 1503, 1548, 1551, 1559, 1560, 1614, 1617, 1628, 1637, 1652, 1667, 1686, 1694, 1705, 1713, 1813, 2221, 2323, 2352, 2407, 2554, 2897, 2916, I.2110

συναχθησεται —18, 35, 55, 128, 141, 155, 201, 204, 214, 363, 386, 394, 402, 415, 479, 480, 510, 536, 547, 553, 586, 689, 691, 696, 758, 781, 867, 897, 928, 938, 986, 1023, 1062, 1147, 1158, 1189, 1247, 1248, 1251, 1334, 1384, 1435, 1445, 1482, 1490, 1572, 1698, 2122, 2175, 2253, 2261, 2284, 2322, 2367, 2382, 2399, 2466, 2503, 2559, 2765

Plural or singular; mass noun or not? The translation is the same. They are two ways of saying the same thing.

26:29—*γενηματος* —35, 55, 83, 125, 128, 155, 363, 402, 479, 510, 516, 536, 547, 586, 645, 685^c, 689, 696, 757, 763, 781, 789, 824, 867, 897, 938, 959, 986, 1023, 1040, 1062, 1072^c, 1075, 1111, 1117, 1158, 1199, 1250, 1251, 1328, 1339, 1384, 1435, 1461, 1490, 1496, 1503, 1559, 1560, 1614, 1617, 1637, 1652, 1667, 1686, 1698, 1713, 1813, 2122, 2253, 2352, 2367, 2382, 2399, 2554, 2765, I.2110, L.65

γεννηματος —18, 141, 189, 201, 204, 214, 246, 386, 394, 415, 480, 520, 553, 676, 685, 691, 758, 928, 1072, 1133, 1145, 1147, 1189, 1234, 1247, 1248, 1323, 1334, 1445, 1482, 1548, 1551, 1572, 1628, 1652^c, 1694, 1705, 2175, 2221, 2253^c, 2261, 2284, 2322, 2323, 2407, 2466, 2503, 2554^c, 2559, 2897, 2916

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 comes out the same in any case; but since wine is plant produce, the first noun is more appropriate.

27:35—*βαλοντες* —18, 55, 83, 201, 214, 246, 386, 480, 685, 689, 691, 757, 763, 789, 824, 959, 1040, 1062, 1072, 1075, 1111, 1117, 1145, 1234, 1247, 1248, 1250, 1328, 1339, 1461, 1496, 1503, 1548, 1551, 1559, 1560, 1614, 1617, 1628, 1637, 1652, 1686, 1713, 2221, 2253, 2323, 2352, 2399, 2503, 2554, 2897, I.2110

βαλλοντες —35, 125, 128, 141, 155, 189, 204, 363, 394, 402, 415, 479, 510, 516, 520, 536, 547, 553, 586, 645, 676, 696, 758, 781, 867, 897, 928, 938, 986, 1023, 1133, 1147, 1158, 1189, 1199, 1251, 1323, 1334, 1384, 1435, 1445, 1482, 1490, 1572, 1667, 1694, 1698, 1705, 1813, 2122, 2175, 2261, 2284, 2322, 2367, 2382, 2407, 2466, 2765

Aorist or present? In the context, the difference in meaning is slight, but the aorist is better, because the clothes were distributed after the lot was cast. However, a casual reader would not notice any difference.

As is typical of variation within the family, the difference in all five splits above is of one letter, except for one case of two letters, 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.

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. My choice was dictated by quality of MS and geographic distribution, in each case.

Attention, please! In the four Gospels Family 35 has over 250 representatives, of which I have checked only 114, for Matthew. Now then, what happens if some day all of the remaining representatives are checked, and the added information leads me to change my choice, in one or more of the splits above? What then? Then nothing! As already pointed out, the difference in meaning is so slight that a single translation can cover both readings, in every case. God has preserved His Text!²

Mark has three significant splits: I have done complete collations of 53 MSS for this book.

13:31—*παρελευσεται* —18, 35, 128, 141, 204, 510, 553, 586, 689, 928, 1072, 1111, 1117, 1133, 1145^c, 1147, 1199, 1251, 1384, 1435, 1572, 2122, 2253, 2261, 2382, 2466, 2503, 2554, 2875, 2876, l.2110, L.65

παρελευσονται —547, 645, 789, 824, 1023, 1040, 1075, 1145, 1339, 1461, 1496, 1503, 1628, 1637, 1652, 1667, 1705, 1713, 2221, 2323, 2352, 2765

Singular or plural; mass noun or not? The translation is the same. They are two ways of saying the same thing.

14:25—*γεννηματος* —35, 128, 510, 547, 586, 645, 689, 789, 824, 1023, 1072, 1075, 1111, 1117, 1145, 1147, 1199, 1251, 1339, 1384, 1435, 1461, 1496, 1503, 1628, 1637, 1652, 1667, 1713, 2122, 2253, 2352, 2382, 2554, 2765, 2875, 2876, l.2110, L.65

γεννηματος —18, 141, 204, 553, 928, 1133, 1147^{alt}, 1572, 1705, 2221, 2253^c, 2261, 2323, 2466, 2503, 2554^c

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 comes out the same in any case; but since wine is plant produce, the first noun is more appropriate.

15:46—*επι την θυραν* —18, 35^c, 128, 510, 547, 586, 645, 689, 789, 824, 1023, 1040, 1072, 1111^{alt}, 1075, 1117, 1145, 1199, 1251, 1339, 1384, 1435, 1461, 1496, 1503, 1628, 1637, 1652, 1667, 1705, 1713, 2122, 2221, 2323, 2352, 2382, 2503, 2765, 2875, L.65

επι τη θυρα —35, 141, 553, 928, 1111, 1133, 1147, 1572, 2253, 2261, 2554, 2876, l.2110

--- *τη θυρα* —204, 2466

² Consider further: there are eight MSS from St. Catherine's monastery included in the study, and to my surprise they present us with no fewer than seven different selections; only two of the eight share a selection. Now that monastery is located in the middle of a desert in the so-called Sinai peninsula. It may have been the most isolated of monasteries, just the sort of place where we could expect significant 'in-breeding', a disproportionate copying of a preferred exemplar. But no, evidently at least seven of the copies reflect distinct exemplars, which indicates a normal transmission.

Not only that: a few years ago I spent nine nights on the Mt. Athos peninsula, in Greece. I visited five of the twenty independent monasteries located there (and slept in three of them). When I tried to ask about lines of transmission to be found among the MSS, the librarian would just give me a blank look. The monks had never thought of such a thing. Their religious life is governed by tradition, not by the Text. In such a situation, there would be no disproportionate copying of a preferred exemplar, which indicates a normal transmission.

The preposition works with three cases. Around 98% of all known MSS have the accusative here, which emphasizes the arrival at the entrance; the best choice in the context. In any case, the translation will usually be the same.

As is typical of variation within the family, the difference in all three splits above is of one letter, except for one case of two letters. I call this incredibly careful transmission—at no point will a reader be misled as to the intended meaning. The original wording of Mark has been precisely preserved to our day. Although 53 is a much smaller representation of the Family than 114, a collation of all the remaining family representatives will not change the picture; the difference in meaning is so slight that a single translation can cover both readings, in every case. God has preserved His Text!

Luke has six significant splits, one being a repetition: I have done complete collations of 46 MSS for this book (so far).

2:40—*αυτω*—35^{alt}, 128, 204, 479, 553, 586^{alt}, 691, 757, 769, 781, 789^c, 867, 897, 928, 1072, 1117, 1147, 1384, 1435, 1461, 1493, 1496, 1503, 1621, 1637, 1652, 1667, 1713, 2122, 2253, 2352, 2466, 2554, I.2110

αυτο—18, 35, 201, 246, 510, 547, 586, 757^{alt}, 789, 1072^c, 1328, 1339, 1496^{alt}, 1503^{alt}, 2352^{alt}, 2367, 2382, 2503, 2765

The preposition works with three cases. In this context, the dative is correct: the grace was resting on Him all the time. In any case, the translation is the same.

3:18—*τω λαω*—35, 201, 204, 479, 510, 553, 586, 691, 757, 769, 789, 897, 928, 1072^{alt}, 1147, 1339, 1461, 1493, 1496, 1503, 1621, 1637, 1652, 1667, 1713, 2253, 2352, 2382, 2466, 2503

τον λαον—18, 35^{alt}, 128, 246, 479^{alt}, 547, 759^{alt}, 781, 789^{alt}, 824, 867, 1072, 1117, 1328, 1384, 1435, 1503^{alt}, 1637^{alt}, 1652^{alt}, 2122, 2367, 2466^{alt}, 2554, 2765, I.2110

The verb *ευαγγελιζω* normally takes the dative, although the accusative does occur—there seems to be no difference in meaning; the translation is the same.

9:27—*εστωτων*—18, 35, 128, 201, 204, 479, 510, 547, 553, 586, 769, 789, 867, 897, 928, 1117, 1147, 1384, 1435, 1493, 1621, 1667, 2122, 2253, 2367, 2382, 2466, 2503, 2554, 2765, I.2110

εστηκοτων—246, 691, 757, 781, 789^c, 824, 1072, 1328, 1339, 1461, 1496, 1503, 1637, 1652, 1713, 2352

Strange to relate, these appear to be alternate forms for the perfect active participle of *ιστημι*; so the meaning is the same and the translation is the same.

15:24—*απολωλας*—18, 35, 128, 201, 204, 479^c, 510, 553, 586, 757, 769, 781, 789, 824, 867, 897, 928, 1117, 1147, 1384, 1435, 1621, 1652, 1713, 2253, 2382, 2503, 2554, 2765, I.2110

απολωλος —246, 479, 547, 691, 1072, 1328, 1339, 1461, 1493, 1496, 1503, 1637, 1667, 2122, 2352, 2367, 2466

The nominative masculine form is clearly correct; the accusative neuter form is clearly wrong, so where did it come from? The participle is parallel to the adjective νεκρος, and copyists may have repeated the ending without thinking. This split is repeated in 15:32, except that the accusative loses four MSS to the nominative. The words would be pronounced the same way, and the translation is the same for both.

21:33—*παρελευσεται* —18, 35, 128, 201, 204, 479, 510, 553, 586, 691, 769, 781, 789, 824, 867, 897, 928, 1072, 1147, 1328, 1339, 1384, 1435, 1461, 1493, 1496, 1503, 1621, 1637, 2122, 2253, 2382, 2466, 2503

παρελευσονται —246, 547, 757, 1117, 1384^{alt}, 1652, 1667, 1713, 2352, 2367, 2554, 2765, I.2110

Singular or plural; mass noun or not? The translation is the same. They are two ways of saying the same thing.

As is typical of variation within the family, the difference in all five splits above is very slight, making no difference in a translation. I call this incredibly careful transmission—at no point will a reader be misled as to the intended meaning. The original wording of Luke has been precisely preserved to our day. Although I have only collated 46 MSS for Luke (so far), a collation of all the remaining family representatives will not change the picture; the difference in meaning is so slight that a single translation can cover both readings, in every case. God has preserved His Text!

John has only one significant split: I have done complete collations of 57 MSS for this book.

12:6—*εμελεν* —18, 141, 201, 204, 363^c, 402, 479, 480, 553^c, 685^c, 789^c, 928, 1072^c, 1075, 1111^c, 1334, 1339, 1384, 1461, 1496, 1503, 1572, 1667, 2253, 2322, 2382^c, 2503, 2554

εμελλεν —35, 83, 128, 363, 510, 547, 553, 586, 685, 696, 757, 789, 824, 867, 897, 1072, 1111, 1117, 1145, 1147, 1435, 1559, 1560, 1617, 1637, 1652, 1686, 1694, 1700, 1713, 2352, 2382, 2466, 2765, I.2110

Is the verb μελω or μελλω? μελει as an impersonal form is most common; however the verb is also used in a personal/active sense. μελλω ('to be about to') does not make sense here. μελλω is about ten times as frequent in the NT and some copyists may have put the more customary spelling without thinking. They had just written μελλων two lines above and may have repeated the form by attraction. However, since both forms have the same pronunciation, someone hearing the Text read aloud would understand it correctly, being guided by the context—the same would be true of someone pronouncing it to himself. Precisely for this reason, it may be that the semantic area of the longer form came to be regarded as including that of the shorter form; in which case we would have alternate spellings of the same verb. (It is not my custom to appeal to the early uncials, but all of them have the shorter form here, which would go along with my hypothesis above.)

There we have the fourteen ‘significant’ splits within Family 35 to be found in the four Gospels. As is typical of variation within the family, the difference in all of them is very slight, making no difference in a translation (with the possible exception of the last one). I call this incredibly careful transmission—at no point will a reader be misled as to the intended meaning. The original wording of the four Gospels has been precisely preserved to our day. Although I have collated less than a fourth of the family representatives (so far), a collation of all the remaining family representatives will not change the picture; the difference in meaning is so slight that a single translation can cover both readings, in every case. God has preserved His Text!

I now move on to **Acts**. Whereas we know of around 2,000 continuous-text MSS containing the Gospels (this includes a considerable number of fragments—for any given verse there will be around 1,700), those containing Acts are around 700. Of these, the MSS that represent Family 35 are probably around 100, but this has yet to be verified. Acts has thirteen significant splits: I have done complete collations of 35 MSS for this book (so far), that number being over a third of the total.

1:11—*ουτος* —201, 394, 824, 928, 986, 1072, 1075, 1249, 1482, 1503, 1548, 1617, 1652, 1761, 1855, 1856, 1864, 1865, 2261, 2352, 2587, 2723

ουτος ο —18, 35, 141, 204, 386, 444, 1100, 1732, 1876, 1897, 2466, 2554

Copyists would expect the article, and so many supplied it, but it is not necessary. The translation is the same, in any case.

3:1—*εννατην* —18, 35^c, 141^c, 201, 386, 444, 824, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1482, 1503, 1548, 1617, 1652, 1732, 1761, 1864, 1865, 1897, 2352, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2723

εννατην —35, 141, 204, 394, 928, 1249, 1855, 1856, 1876, 2080, 2261

This is a mere matter of an alternate spelling that does not affect the meaning.

9:7—*εννοι* —18, 35^c, 141, 201, 204, 444, 824, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1503, 1617, 1652, 1732, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1897, 2080, 2261, 2352, 2466^c, 2554, 2723

εννοι —35, 141^c, 386, 394, 928, 986, 1249, 1482, 1548, 1761, 1855, 1856, 2466, 2587

This is a mere matter of an alternate spelling that does not affect the meaning.

11:26—*συναχθηναι* —18, 35^c, 201, 386, 824, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1503, 1548, 1617, 1652, 1864, 1865, 2352, 2466, 2723

συναχθηναι εν —35, 141, 204, 394, 444, 928, 986, 1249, 1482, 1732, 1761, 1855, 1856, 1876, 1897, 2080, 2261, 2554, 2587

Making the preposition overt does not affect the meaning; the translation is the same.

12:25—because of the very peculiar nature of this variant set, I will handle it at the very end of this article (after Revelation).

14:10—*ηλλατο* —18, 35^c, 141, 201, 204, 824, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1503, 1617, 1652, 1732, 1761, 1855, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1897, 2080, 2261, 2352, 2466, 2554, 2723

ηλατω —35, 386, 394, 444, 928, 986, 1249, 1482, 1548, 1855^c, 1856, 2587

These are presumably alternate spellings of the aorist that would be pronounced the same way; the difference would not affect the meaning.

14:17—*ομιν* —18, 35, 141, 201, 204, 444, 824, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1503, 1548, 1617, 1761, 1864, 1865, 1876, 2261, 2352, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2723

ημιν —386, 394, 928, 986, 1249, 1482, 1652, 1732, 1855, 1856, 1897, 2080

Since the verse ends with this pronoun in the 1st plural, perhaps 15% of the known MSS changed the pronoun here to agree, but almost all the rest have the 3rd plural. Since both are true, in the context, the difference has almost no effect on the total meaning.

16:26—*ανεθη* —18, 35, 141, 201, 204, 386, 444, 824, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1503, 1548, 1617, 1652, 1732, 1761, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1897, 2080, 2261, 2466, 2554, 2723

ανειθη —394, 928, 986, 1249, 1482, 1855, 1856, 2352, 2587

These are alternate spellings of the aorist passive that do not affect the meaning.

18:17—*εμελλεν* —35, 141, 204, 824, 986, 1075, 1249, 1617, 1652^c, 1732, 1856, 1865, 1876, 1897, 2080, 2261, 2466, 2554, 2723

εμελεν —18, 141^c, 201, 386, 394, 444, 928, 1072, 1075^c, 1100, 1249^c, 1482, 1503, 1548, 1652, 1761, 1855, 1864, 2352, 2554^c, 2587

Is the verb *μελλω* or *μελω*? If the former, the meaning is not common and could easily give rise to the latter. Render: 'None of this was a delay to Gallio'; Gallio is in the dative. Gallio presumably considered himself to be a busy man and did not appreciate the interruption; he was not about to allow himself to be further delayed. In 22:16 the same verb has the sense of 'delay'. Although 85% of the total of all MSS have the longer form, both the TR and the 'critical text' have the shorter form, as in most versions. That Gallio 'cared for none of these things' also makes good sense, even an easier sense. Although the two verbs have different meanings, the point of the episode is not affected by the choice between them.

19:34—*επιγοντες* —18, 35^c, 141, 201, 204, 386, 444, 824, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1249^c, 1503, 1548, 1617, 1652, 1732, 1761, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1897, 2261, 2352, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2723

επιγοντων —35, 394, 928, 986, 1249, 1482, 1855, 1856, 2080

Both forms are an aorist active participle of the same verb, the first being nominative plural and the second genitive plural. In the context, the nominative would appear to be clearly the better choice, but the translation will be the same for both.

23:24—*φιλικα* —18, 35^c, 141, 201, 204, 386, 444, 824, 1075, 1100, 1652^c, 1732, 1855, 1856, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1897, 2080, 2261, 2466, 2554, 2723

φιληκα —35, 394, 928, (986), 1072, 1249, 1482, 1503, 1548, 1617, 1652, 1761, 1855^c, 2352, 2587

This proper noun occurs at least eight times, and the distribution of the evidence will be similar throughout. We have alternate spellings for the same proper noun, so there is no difference in meaning.

27:2—*ατραμυτινω*—18, 35, 141, 201, 204, 386, 444, 824, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1503, 1617, 1652, 1732, 1761, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1897, 2080, 2261, 2352, 2466, 2554, 2723

ατραμμυτινω—394, 928, 986, 1249, 1482, 1548, 1855, 1856, 2587

We have alternate spellings for the same proper name, so there is no difference in meaning.

There we have twelve of the thirteen ‘significant’ splits within Family 35 to be found in Acts (the remaining one will be treated at the end). As is typical of variation within the family, the difference in almost all of them is very slight, making no difference in a translation (with the possible exception of two of them). I call this incredibly careful transmission—at no point will a reader be misled as to the intended meaning. The original wording of the Acts has been precisely preserved to our day. Although I have collated little more than a third of the family representatives (so far), a collation of all the remaining family representatives will not change the picture. God has preserved His Text!

I now move on to **Romans**. The manuscripts containing the Pauline Corpus, that includes Hebrews, number around 800. Of these, the MSS that represent Family 35 are probably at least 100, but this has yet to be verified. Romans has seven significant splits: I have done complete collations of 37 MSS for this book (so far), that number being around a third of the total.

1:32—*πρασουσιν*—18, 35, 141, 204, 386, 394, 928, 1100, 1249, 1482, 1548, 1704, 1725, 1732, 1761, 1855, 1856, 1858, 1865, 1876, 1897, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2723

πραττουσιν—201, 757, 824, 986, 1040, 1072, 1075, 1503, 1637, 1652, 1864, 1892

We have alternate spellings for the same word, so there is no difference in meaning.

2:5—*του*—18, 35, 141, 204, 386, 394, 928, 1040, 1100, 1249, 1482, 1704, 1725, 1732, 1761, 1855, 1856, 1858, 1865, 1876, 1897, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2723

--- —201, 757, 824, 986, 1072, 1075, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1652, 1864, 1892

Why some copyists omitted the article, we do not know, but there is no difference in meaning; the translation will be the same.

4:7—*αφεθησαν*—18, 35, 141, 204, 386, 757, 824, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1503, 1637, 1652, 1704, 1725, 1732, 1761, 1858, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 1897, 2466, 2554, 2723

αφειθησαν—201, 394, 928, 986, 1040, 1249, 1482, 1548, 1704^c, 1855, 1856, 2587

These are alternate spellings of the aorist passive that do not affect the meaning.

6:8—*πιστευομεν*—18, 35, 141^c, 201, 386, 757, 824, 928, 986, 1040, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1249, 1482, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1652, 1704, 1725, 1732, 1761^c, 1855, 1856, 1864, 1865, 1892, 2466, 2554, 2723

πιστευωμεν —35^c, 141, 204, 394, 928^{alt}, 1482^{alt}, 1732^{alt}, 1761, 1855^{alt}, 1856^{alt}, 1858, 1865^{alt}, 1876, 1897, 2587, 2723^{alt}

In the context, the indicative is clearly better, although the subjunctive is possible; the difference in meaning is slight. The two forms would be pronounced the same way, so someone hearing the text would have to choose.

7:13—*αλλα* —18, 35, 141, 201, 386, 757, 824, 928, 986, 1040, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1652, 1864, 1865, 1892, 2466, 2723

αλλ —204, 394, 1249, 1482, 1725, 1732, 1761, 1855, 1856, 1858, 1876, 1897, 2554, 2587

These are alternate spellings of the same word that do not affect the meaning. When this word is followed by a vowel, its final vowel is usually elided, but in this case it was probably retained for emphasis.

9:3—*ευχομην* —18, 35, 141, 204, 386, 394, 928, 1100, 1249, 1482, 1548, (1704), 1725, 1732, 1761, 1855, 1856, 1858, 1865, 1876, 1897, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2723

ηυχομην —201, 757, 824, 986, 1040, 1072, 1075, 1503, 1637, 1652, 1864, 1892

These are alternate spellings of the imperfect middle/passive that do not affect the meaning.

16:24—*ημων* —35, 141, 201, 204, 394, 928, 1249, 1482, 1548, 1704, 1725, 1732, 1761, 1855, 1858, 1865, 1876, 1897, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2723

υμων —18, 386, 757, 824, 986, 1040, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1503, 1637, 1652, 1856, 1864, 1892, 2554^c

If verse 24 was not dictated by Paul but was written by Tertius as coming from himself, then the first person is especially appropriate. However, since this was the standard sign-off that Paul used, it was entirely predictable that copyists would put the second person without even thinking. In the context, the change makes little difference.

There we have seven ‘significant’ splits within Family 35 to be found in Romans. As is typical of variation within the family, the difference in almost all of them is very slight, making no difference in a translation (with the possible exception of the last one, the difference being of a single letter). I call this incredibly careful transmission—at no point will a reader be misled as to the intended meaning. The original wording of Romans has been precisely preserved to our day. Although I have collated little more than a third of the family representatives (so far), a collation of all the remaining family representatives will not change the picture. God has preserved His Text!

I now move on to **1 Corinthians**. 1 Corinthians has six significant splits: I have done complete collations of 34 MSS for this book (so far), that number being around a third of the total.

1:13—*υμων* —18, 35, 201, 204, 386, 394, 444, 604, 928, 986, 1075, 1100, 1249, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1761, 1855, 1865^{alt}, 1897, 2352, 2554, 2587, 2817

ημων —141, 757, 824, 1072, 1637^{alt}, 1864, 1865, 1892, 2080, 2431, 2466, 2723

The second person is clearly better, but the first person is possible. In the context the change makes little difference.

3:2—*ηδυνασθε* —18, 35, 141, 204, 386, 394, 444, 928, 1100, 1249, 1548, 1761, 1855, 1865, 1897, 2080, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2723

εδυνασθε —201, 604, 757, 824, 986, 1072, 1075, 1503, 1637, 1864, 1892, 2352, 2431, 2817

These are alternate spellings of the imperfect middle/passive that do not affect the meaning.

4:6—*μη* —18, 35, 141, 201, 204, 386, 394, 444, 757, 824, 928, 1072, 1100, 1249, 1503, 1761, 1864, 1865, 1897, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2723, 2817

--- —604, 986, 1075, 1548, 1637, 1855, 1892, 2080, 2352, 2431

The negative particle is repeated for emphasis; omitting the repetition does not change the basic meaning, nor the translation.

6:5—*διακριναι* —141, 386, 394, 444, 604, 757, 824, 928, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1761, 1855, 1864, 1865, 1897, 2080, 2352, 2431, 2554, 2817

ανακριναι —18, 35, 201, 204, 1249, 1892, 2466, 2587, 2723

Although the verbs are different, in the context they function as virtual synonyms, resulting in the same translation.

7:13—*ητις* —18, 35, 141, 204, 386, 394, 444, 604, 928, 986, 1075, 1100, 1249, 1548, 1637, 1761, 1855, 1865, 1897, 2080, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2723, 2817

ει τις —201, 757, 824, 1072, 1503, 1637^c, 1864, 1892, 2352, 2431

The variant is a repetition of the wording with the man: ‘if any brother has’ → ‘if any woman has’; rather than “a woman who has”. They are two ways of saying the same thing.

16:2—*ευοδουται* —18, 35, 141, 201, 204, 386, 444, 604, 757, 824, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1503, 1637, 1761, 1864, 1892, 1897, 2352, 2431, 2466, 2554

ευοδωται —394, 928, 1249, 1548, 1855, 1865, 2080, 2587, 2723, 2817

Is the verb indicative or subjunctive? Is it “as he is being prospered” or ‘as he may be prospered’? In the context the indicative is better, but the subjunctive is possible; the difference in meaning is slight.

There we have six ‘significant’ splits within Family 35 to be found in 1 Corinthians. As is typical of variation within the family, the difference in all of them is very slight, making scarcely any difference in a translation. I call this incredibly careful transmission—at no point will a reader be misled as to the intended meaning. The original wording of 1 Corinthians has been precisely preserved to our day. Although I have only collated around a third of the family representatives (so far), a collation of all the remaining family representatives will not change the picture. God has preserved His Text!

I now move on to **2 Corinthians**. 2 Corinthians has six significant splits: I have done complete collations of 27 MSS for this book (so far), and spot-checked another ten, that sum being over a third of the total.

1:20—*τω* —18, 35, 201, 386, 604, 757, 824, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1503, 1637^c, 1732, 1740, 1761, 1864^c, 1865, 1892, 2352, 2466, 2554, 2723^c

τω —35^c, 204, 328, 394, 928, 1249, 1548, 1637, 1725, 1855, 1864, 1876, 1897, 2080, 2466^c, 2587, 2723

--- —141, 444

The grammar calls for the nominative, rather than the dative, but the translation will be the same.

7:12—there is some confusion with the first two plural pronouns, whether they are first or second person, and although only one of them reaches my threshold, they are interrelated, so I will list them both.

υμων —18, 35, 141, 201, 204, 386, 394, 444, 757, 824, 928, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1249, 1637, 1732, 1740, 1855, 1864, 1865, 1892, 1897, 2080^{alt}, 2352, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2723

ημων —328, 394^{alt}, 604, 1503, 1548, 1725, 1732^{alt}, 1761, 1855^c, 1876, 2080, 2466^c

ημων —18, 35, 141, 201, 386, 394, 444, 757, 824, 928, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1249, 1503, 1637, 1732, 1740, 1855, 1864, 1865, 1892, 2080^{alt}, 2352, 2554, 2587, 2723

υμων —204, 328, 394^{alt}, 604, 928^c, 1548, 1725, 1732^{alt}, 1761, 1855^c, 1876, 1897, 2080, 2466, 2587^c

Is it “your real commitment to us might be made clear to you”, or ‘our real commitment to you might be made clear to you’? The alternate seems the more probable or expected, presumably sufficient reason for the change, but the majority reading fits the context better. That said, we have two different meanings, but in the larger context the difference is not serious.

8:9—*ημας* —18, 35, 141, 204, 386, 394, 444, 928, 986, 1249, 1732, 1855, 1865, 1876, 2080, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2723

υμας —35^c, 201, 328, 394^{alt}, 444^c, 604, 757, 824, 928^c, 1072, 1075, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1725, 1732^{alt}, 1740, 1761, 1855^c, 1864, 1892, 1897, 2352, 2587^c

Looking only at the first hand, the first person is ahead by two, but it also has the better MSS. ‘For your sakes’ agrees with the complement; “for our sakes” is more inclusive; both are true. The difference is slight.

8:20—*ημας* —18, 35, 204, 328, 386, 394, 444, 604, 928, 986, 1100, 1249, 1548, 1725, 1732, 1740, 1761, 1855, 1865, 1876, 1892, 1897, 2080, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2723

υμας —141, 201, 757, 824, 1072, 1075, 1503, 1637, 1864, 2352

The first person is clearly better, but the second person is possible; in the context the difference is slight.

9:10— *γεννηματα* —18, 35, 141, 201, 204, 757, 824, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1503, 1637, 1740, 1761, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 1897, 2080, 2352, 2466, 2554, 2723

γεννηματα —328, 386, 394, 444, 604, 928, 1249, 1548, 1725, 1732, 1855, 2554^c, 2587

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 first is also used of the result of effort or value, as here. The translation comes out the same in any case; but since righteousness is value in action, the first noun is more appropriate.

11:7— *εαυτον* —18, 35, 201, 204, 757, 824, 928, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1740, 1761, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 1897, 2080, 2352, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2723

εμαυτον —141, 328, 386, 394, 444, 604, 1249, 1725, 1732, 1855, 2554^c

Is it “humbling self”, or ‘humbling myself’? The second is more direct, but they are two ways of saying the same thing.

There we have six ‘significant’ splits within Family 35 to be found in 2 Corinthians. As is typical of variation within the family, the difference in all of them is of only one letter, making scarcely any difference in a translation. I call this incredibly careful transmission. The original wording of 2 Corinthians has been precisely preserved to our day (since it is one variant or the other, the Text has not been lost). Although I have only collated around a third of the family representatives (so far), a collation of all the remaining family representatives will not change the picture. God has preserved His Text!

I now move on to **Galatians**. Galatians has one significant split: I have done complete collations of 37 MSS for this book (so far), that number being over a third of the total.

1:8— *ευαγγελιζεται* —18, 35, 201, 204, 328, 386, 394, 444, 604, 928, 1075, 1100, 1248, 1249, 1548, 1637, 1725, 1732, 1761, 1865, 1892, 2080, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2723, 2817

ευαγγελιζεται —757, 824, 986, 1072, 1503, 1617, 1855, 1864, 2352, 2431

Is the verb subjunctive, or indicative? The particle *εαν* normally works with the subjunctive, although the indicative is possible. Any difference in a translation will be very slight.

There being no significant splits in **Ephesians** or **Philippians**, I now move on to **Colossians**. Colossians has one significant split: I have done complete collations of 37 MSS for this book (so far), that number being over a third of the total. There are also no significant splits in **1 & 2 Thessalonians**.

1:8— *κολοσσαις* —18, 35, 204, 386, 444, 824, 928, 1072, 1100, 1248, 1503, 1637, 1725, 1732, 1761, 1768, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 1897, 2080, 2466, 2554, 2723

κολασσαις —201, 328, 394, 604, 757, 986, 1075, 1249, 1548, 1855, 1864^c, 2352, 2587

This is a mere matter of an alternate spelling that does not affect the meaning.

There we have two ‘significant’ splits within Family 35 to be found in Galatians through 2 Thessalonians. As is typical of variation within the family, the difference in all of them is of only

one letter, making scarcely any difference in a translation. I call this incredibly careful transmission. The original wording of these six books has been precisely preserved to our day. Although I have collated just over a third of the family representatives (so far), a collation of all the remaining family representatives will not change the picture. God has preserved His Text!

I now move on to **1 Timothy**. 1 Timothy has four significant splits: I have done complete collations of 37 MSS for this book (so far), and spot-checked another eight, that sum being well over a third of the total. The first two splits go together, and have almost identical distributions.

1:9— *πατραλοιας* —18, 35, 204, 328, 386, 394, (432), 444, 547, 604, 928, 959, 1100, 1247, 1249, 1548, 1725, 1732, 1761, 1768, 1841, 1855, 1897, 2466, 2554, 2587

πατρολωαις —201, 757, 824, 986, 1072, 1075, 1503, 1617, 1637, 1652, 1740, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 2080, 2352, 2431, 2723

1:9— *μητραλοιας* —18, (35),³ 204, 328, 386, 394, (432), 444, 547, 604, 928, 959, 1100, 1247, 1249, 1548, 1725, 1732, 1761, 1768, 1841, 1855, 1897, 2466, 2554, 2587

μητρολωαις —201, 757, 824, 986, 1072, 1075, 1503, 1617, 1637, 1652, 1740, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 2080, 2352, 2431, 2723

Liddell & Scott give *πατραλοιας* and *μητραλοιας* as the basic forms, but consider the variants to be alternate spellings of the same word. They further consider that the semantic area includes both a ‘striker’ and a ‘killer’; in the context ‘striker’ makes better sense, since the very next crime listed is ‘murder’. Why cite ‘murder’ three times? A normal list does not repeat items. In any case, we evidently have alternate spellings.

4:1— *πλανοις* —18, 35, 204, 386, 432, 444, 757, 824, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1503, 1548, 1617, 1637, 1652, 1725, 1732, 1740, 1761, 1768, 1841, 1864, 1865, 1876^c, 1892, 1897, 2352, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2723

πλανης —201, 328, 394, 547, 604, 928, 959, 1247, 1249, 1855, 1876, 2080, 2431

An adjective, or a noun? Is it “deceiving spirits”, or ‘spirits of deception’? They are two ways of saying the same thing.

5:21— *προσκλισιν* —18, 35^{alt}, 201, 328, 386, 394, 432, 547, 757^{alt}, 824, 928, 959, 1072, 1075, 1503^{alt}, 1617, 1652, 1725, 1740, 1761, 1855^c, 1876, 1892^{alt}, 1897, 2080^{alt}, 2352, 2431, 2466^{alt}, 2554, 2587

προσκλησιν —35, 204, 386^{alt}, 444, 604, 757, 986, 1100, 1247, 1249, 1503, 1548, 1617^{alt}, 1637, 1732, 1768, 1841, 1855, 1865, 1892, 2080, 2466, 2723

We have different nouns, but in this context they apparently were regarded as synonyms meaning ‘partiality’, the first being the basic form (the two vowels are pronounced the same way).

³ I use parentheses to indicate a slight variation from the basic form.

I now move on to **2 Timothy**. 2 Timothy has two significant splits: I have done complete collations of 36 MSS for this book (so far), and spot-checked another eight, that sum being well over a third of the total.

3:6— *ενδυνοντες* —18, 35, 201, 204, 386, 444, 757, 824, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1503, 1548, 1617, 1628, 1637, 1652, 1725, 1732, 1761, 1855, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 2080, 2352, 2431, 2466, 2554, 2723

ενδονοντες —328, 394, 432, 547, 604, 928, 959, 1247, 1249, 1768, 1841, 1892^c, 2587

ενδυνω or *ενδυω*? The basic meaning of *ενδυω* is ‘to enter’, which over time was obscured by the statistically predominant use with reference to entering clothes (in English we speak of ‘putting on’ clothes), except that for this use the verb is normally in the middle voice, not the active, as here. But in the context the description of such persons, given in verses 2-5, does not agree with ‘sneaking’ or ‘worming’—they enter openly, exuding confidence and competence. *ενδυω* is presumably correct. That said, however, there is a difference in the meaning, albeit not great; a choice between the two verbs does not change the message of the paragraph.

3:14— *επιστωθης* —18, 35, 201, 328, 386, 394, 547, 604, 757, 824, 928, 959, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1247, 1249, 1503, 1617, 1628, 1637, 1652, 1841, 1864, 1865, 1892, 2352, 2431, 2466, 2723

επιστευθης —204, 432, 444, 1548, 1725, 1732, 1761, 1768, 1855, 1876, 2080, 2554, 2587

Again we have two very similar verbs, both aorist passive. Is it “about which you have been assured”, or ‘to which you have been committed’? Both make sense, and make little difference to the message of the paragraph.

I now move on to **Titus**. Titus has one significant split: I have done complete collations of 36 MSS for this book (so far), and spot-checked another eleven, that sum being well over a third of the total.

2:7— *αδιαφοριαν* —18, 35, 328, 394, 547, 604, 928, 959, 1072, 1100, 1247, 1248, 1249, 1251, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1652, 1761, 1841, 1855, 1864, 1892, 2080, 2431, 2587, 2723

αδιαφοριαν —35^c, 201, 204, 386, 432, 444, 757, 824, 986, 1075, 1250, 1503^c, 1617, 1628, 1637^c, 1725, 1732, 1768, 1864^c, 1865, 1876, 2352, 2466, 2554, 2723^c

αδιαφορια, ‘indifference/carelessness’, was a common word in classical Greek, while *αδιαφθορια*, ‘integrity’, apparently did not exist in classical Greek, and some scribes may have written the more common word without thinking. Also, $\phi\theta \rightarrow \phi$ would presumably be an easier alteration than the reverse, being a predictable phonetic simplification. 91.9% of all extant Greek manuscripts have the double consonant, although 8.3% do so in a shorter form of the word. In any case, it is scarcely credible that Paul would tell Titus to teach with indifference or carelessness, so those who read the shorter form would presumably give it a derived meaning of impartiality. Both “integrity” and ‘impartiality’ make sense, and make little difference to the message of the paragraph.

I now move on to **Hebrews**. Hebrews has two significant splits: I have done complete collations of 34 MSS for this book (so far), and spot-checked another thirteen, that sum being well over a third of the total.

9:1— *πρωτη* —18, 35^c, 201, 204, 328, 386, 394, 444, 547, 604, 928, 959, 986, 1072, 1100, 1247, 1248, 1503^c, 1637^c, 1725, 1732, 1841, 1855, 1864^c, 2080, 2554, 2723^c

πρωτη σκηνη —35, 757, 824, 1075, 1249, 1250, 1251, 1503, 1548, 1617, 1628, 1637, 1652, 1761, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 2352, 2431, 2466, 2587, 2723

πρωτη διαθηκη —432, 1768

All of chapter 8 is about a new and better covenant and the last verse (13) has “the first”. This is repeated at the beginning of 9:1, and ‘covenant’ is to be understood in both places; two MSS actually supply the word. However, since verse 2 refers to the ‘Holy Place’ as the first tabernacle, somewhere along the line someone misunderstood verse 1 and officiously added ‘tabernacle’ (not to be found in any early MS). However, since both the variants make sense, the choice makes little difference to the message of the paragraph.

9:12— *ευρομενος* —18, 35, 328, 386, 394, 444, 757, 824, 928, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1249, 1503, 1548, 1617, 1628, 1637, 1652, 1725, 1841, 1864, 1865, 2080, 2352, 2431, 2466, 2554, 2723

ευραμενος —201, 204, 432, 547, 604, 959, 1247, 1248, 1250, 1251, 1732, 1761, 1768, 1855, 1876, 1892, 2587

Is it 2nd aorist, or 1st aorist? There is apparently no difference in meaning.

There we have nine ‘significant’ splits within Family 35 to be found in 1 Timothy through Hebrews. As is typical of variation within the family, the difference in all of them is slight, albeit some of them do make a bit of difference in a translation. However, the choice makes little difference in the larger context. I call this incredibly careful transmission. The original wording of these five books has been precisely preserved to our day (since it is one variant or the other, the Text has not been lost). Although I have collated and spot-checked less than half of the family representatives (so far), a collation of all the remaining family representatives will not change the picture. God has preserved His Text!

I now move on to **James**. James has two significant splits: I have done complete collations of 43 MSS for this book (so far), and spot-checked another 34, for a total of 77 out of 84 known family members (so far); the remaining seven will presumably not change our conclusions.

2:13— *ελεον* —18, 35, 141, {149,201} 204, 386, 432^{alt}, 757, 801, 824, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1101, 1248, 1250, 1503, 1508, 1617, 1618, 1619, 1628, 1637, 1656, 1704, 1726, 1732, 1733, 1737, 1740, 1745, 1748, 1754, 1761, 1763, 1766^c, 1855, 1858, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 2218, 2255, 2261, 2303, 2352, 2378, 2431, 2466, 2501, 2554, 2626, 2723, 2777

ελεος —328, 394 {432,604} 634, 664, 928, 986, 1247, 1249, 1482, 1548, 1619^c, 1636, 1725, 1732^{alt}, 1749, 1752, 1766, 1897, 2080, 2221, 2289, 2587, 2704

Accusative, or nominative? Is mercy the subject of the verb, or its direct object? The subject, ‘the law of liberty’, must be supplied from the prior verse; render, ‘*that law exalts mercy over judgment*’. In either event, the difference in meaning is not great.

2:14— *εχει* —18, 35, {149,201} 204, 432, 757, 824, 1072, 1100, 1101, 1248, 1503, 1617, 1618, 1619, 1628, 1636, 1637, 1725, 1726, 1732, 1733, 1740, 1754, 1761, 1763, 1858, 1864, 1865, 1892, 2080, 2255, 2261, 2352, 2378, 2466, 2554, 2723, 2777

εχη —141, 328, 386, 394, 604, 634, 664, 801, 928, 986, 1075, 1247, 1249, 1250, 1482, 1508, 1548, 1656, 1704, 1737, 1745, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1766, 1855, 1876, 1897, 2218, 2221, 2289, 2431, 2501, 2587, 2626, 2704

Indicative, or subjunctive? In the context, the indicative is better, but any difference in meaning is so slight that a single translation covers both.

I now move on to **1 Peter**. 1 Peter has five significant splits: I have done complete collations of 42 MSS for this book (so far), and spot-checked another 34, for a total of 76 out of 83 known family members (so far); the remaining seven will presumably not change our conclusions.

1:23— *αλλ* —18, 35, 141, 204, 328, 386, 394, 634, 664, 801, 928, 986, 1100, 1101, 1247, 1249, 1482, 1508, 1704, 1725, 1726, 1732, 1733, 1737, 1749, 1752, 1761, 1766, 1855, 1858, 1865, 1876, 1897, 2080, 2218, 2221, 2255, 2261, 2289, 2378, 2466, 2501, 2554, 2587, 2626, 2704, 2723

αλλα —{149,201} {432,604} 757, 824, 1072, 1075, 1248, 1250, 1503, 1548, 1617, 1618, 1619, 1628, 1636, 1637, 1656, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1748, 1754, 1763, 1768, 1864, 1892, 2352, 2431, 2777

These are simply alternate spellings of the same word.

4:2— *του* —18, 35, 141, 204, 328, 386, 394, 634, 664, 801, 928, 986, 1100, 1247, 1249, 1250, 1482, 1508, 1704, 1725, 1726, 1732, 1733, 1749, 1752, 1763, 1855, 1858, 1865, 1876, 1897, 2080, 2221, 2255, 2261^c, 2289, 2378, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2626, 2704, 2723

--- —{149,201} {432,604} 757, 824, 1072, 1075, 1101, 1248, 1503, 1508^c, 1548, 1617, 1618, 1619, 1628, 1636, 1637, 1656, 1737, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1748, 1754, 1761, 1766, 1768, 1864, 1892, 2218, 2261, 2352, 2431, 2501, 2777

The omission of the article does not change the meaning.

4:11— *ως* —18, 35, 141, 204, 328, 386, 394, 634, 664, 801, 928, 986, 1100, 1101, 1247, 1249, 1250, 1482, 1704, 1725, 1726, 1732, 1733, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1761, 1763, 1766, 1768, 1855, 1858, 1865, 1876, 1897, 2080, 2221, 2255, 2261, 2289, 2378, 2466, 2501, 2554, 2587, 2626, 2704, 2723

ης —141^c {432,604} 757, 824, 1072, 1075, 1248, 1503, 1508, 1617, 1618, 1619, 1628, 1636, 1637, 1656, 1737, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1754, 1864, 1892, 2218, 2352, 2431, 2777

Is it “strength as God supplies”, or ‘strength which God supplies’? They are virtually two ways of saying the same thing.

5:7— *μελει* —18, 35, {149,201} 204, 328, 386, 394, 634, 664, 757, 824^c, 928, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1101, 1482, 1503, 1618, 1619, 1628, 1636, 1637, 1656, 1704, 1725, 1726^c, 1732, 1733, 1737, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1749, 1761, 1766, 1855, 1858, 1865, 1897, 2080, 2221, 2255, 2289, 2378, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2704, 2723, 2777

μελλει —141 {432,604} 801, 824, 986, 1247, 1248, 1249, 1250, 1508, 1617, 1726, 1748, 1752, 1763, 1768, 1876, 1892, 1899, 2261, 2352, 2431, 2501, 2626

Is the verb *μελω* or *μελλω*? *μελει* as an impersonal form is most common; however the verb is also used in a personal/active sense. *μελλω* ('to be about to') does not make sense here. *μελλω* is about ten times as frequent in the NT and some copyists may have put the more customary spelling without thinking. However, since both forms have the same pronunciation, someone hearing the Text read aloud would understand it correctly, being guided by the context—the same would be true of someone pronouncing it to himself. Precisely for this reason, it may be that the semantic area of the longer form came to be regarded as including that of the shorter form; in which case we would have alternate spellings of the same verb. (It is not my custom to appeal to the early uncials, but all of them have the shorter form here, which would go along with my hypothesis above.)

5:8— *καταπιειν* —18, 35, 141, {149,201} 204, 386, 394^{alt}, 432, 634, 757, 801, 824, 1072, 1100, 1101, 1248, 1250, 1503, 1548, 1617, 1618, 1619, 1628, 1636, 1637, 1656, 1704, 1725, 1726, 1732, 1733, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1754, 1858, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 1897, 2080, 2221, 2378, 2466, 2501, 2554, 2587, 2723, 2777

καταπιη —328, 394, 604, 664, 928, 986, 1075, 1247, 1249, 1482^v, 1508, 1737, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1761, 1763, 1766, 1855, 1892^c, 1899, 2218, 2221^c, 2255^v, 2289, 2431, 2587^c, 2704

Is it “seeking someone to devour”, or ‘seeking someone he may devour’? They are two ways of saying the same thing.

I now move on to **1 John**, there being none in **2 Peter**. 1 John has one significant split: I have done complete collations of 42 MSS for this book (so far), and spot-checked another 34, for a total of 76 out of 83 known family members (so far); the remaining seven will presumably not change our conclusions.

1:6— *περιπατουμεν* —18, 35, 141, 204, 386, 801, 824, 1100, 1101, 1250, 1636, 1704, 1725, 1726, 1732, 1733, 1754, 1761, 1858, 1865, 1876, 1897, 2080, 2221, 2261 [2378] 2466, 2554, 2626, 2723

περιπατωμεν —{149,201} 328, 394 {432,604} 634 (664) 757, 928, 986, 1072, 1075, 1247, 1248, 1249, 1482, 1503, 1508, 1548, 1617, 1618, 1619, 1628, 1637, 1656, 1737, 1740, 1745, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1763, 1766, 1768, 1855, 1864, 1892, 2218, 2255, 2289, 2352, 2431, 2501, 2587, 2704, 2777

Indicative, or subjunctive? Only if we are in fact walking in darkness is it a lie to claim to be in fellowship, so the indicative is clearly correct. The verse begins with “If we say”, subjunctive, so I suppose that ‘walk’ became subjunctive as well, by attraction. The translation comes out the same, in any case.

There we have eight ‘significant’ splits within Family 35 to be found in James through Jude. As is typical of variation within the family, the difference in all of them is slight, making little difference in a translation. The original wording of these seven books has been precisely preserved to our day. God has preserved His Text!

I now move on to **Revelation**, there being none in **2 & 3 John** and **Jude**. Revelation has nineteen significant splits: I have done complete collations of 20 MSS for this book (so far), and spot-checked the rest of the 43 known family members (so far). Any further discoveries can scarcely change any of our conclusions.

3:9— *ηξουσιν*—432, 757, 824, 986, 1072, 1075, 1248, 1328, 1503, 1637, 1732, 1733, 1740, 1745, 1771, 1774, 1864, 1865^c, 2035, 2352, 2431, 2434, 2554, 2669, 2821

ηξωσιν—35, 1064, 1384, 1551, 1617, 1732^c, 1746, 1865, 1894, 1903, 1957, 2023, 2041, 2061, 2196, 2201, 2323, 2656, 2723

One’s first impression is that the three verbs controlled by *ινα* are parallel and should be in the same mode, namely subjunctive—*γνωσιν* is home free, *προσκυνησωσιν* has a heavy majority [including **f³⁵**] but with some dissent; with *ηξωσιν* the dissent becomes stronger, including 3/5 of Family 35 [a preponderance of the better representatives read the indicative]. The generalized splitting suggests that the ‘norm’ of subjunctive with *ινα* was at work in the minds of the copyists, the more so since the other two verbs are in that mode; but the indicative is not all that infrequent, and in this case presumably emphasizes certainty—they **will** come. There is little or no difference in the translation.

4:6— *κρυσταλω*—757, 824, 986, 1072, 1328, 1503, 1551, 1637, 1733, 1774, 1864^c, 1894, 1957, 2035, 2061, 2323, 2352, 2434, 2554, 2669

κρυσταλλω—35, 432, 1064, 1075, 1248, 1384, 1617, 1732, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1771, 1864, 1865, 1903, 2023, 2041, 2196, 2201, 2431, 2656, 2723, 2821

These are simply alternate spellings of the same word.

4:8— *λεγοντα*—35, 432, 757^c, 824, 986, 1064, 1075, 1503, 1551, 1617, 1637, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1771, 1864, 1865, 2023^c, 2041, 2061, 2201, 2323^c, 2352, 2431, 2434, 2554, 2656, 2669, 2723, 2821

λεγοντες—757, 986^{alt}, 1072, 1248, 1328, 1503^{alt}, 1617^c, 1637^c, 1732, 1733, 1740^{alt}, 1745^{alt}, 1746^{alt}, 1771^{alt}, 1774, 1864^{alt}, 1865^{mar}, 1894, 1957, 2023, 2035, 2196, 2323, 2352^{alt}

The Subject of the participle is *τα ζωα*, neuter, so the neuter form is correct. It seems clear from verse 9 that it is only the four living beings who are repeating ‘holy’, but if copyists thought the elders were in chorus with the living beings, they would naturally change the gender to masculine. In spite of the split in **f³⁵**, most of the better representatives of the family attest the first variant. In English the translation is the same, “saying”.

6:4— *πυρρος* —35, 757, 824, 986, 1072, 1248, 1503, 1551, 1637, 1732, 1733, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1771, 1774, 1864, 1865, 1957, 2023^c, 2035^c, 2041, 2061, 2352, 2431, 2434, 2554, 2656, 2669, 2723

πυρος —432, 1064, 1075, 1328, 1617, 1894, 1903, 2023, 2035, 2196, 2201, 2323, 2821

πυρρος is the reading of all the more faithful members of **f**³⁵. As an unintentional error, $\rho\rho \rightarrow \rho$ would be much easier than $\rho \rightarrow \rho\rho$. Is it “fiery red”, or ‘of fire’? Since the word refers to the color of the horse, the translation comes out the same.

7:5— *ρουβιμ* —35, 432, 757, 824, 986, 1328, 1551, 1732, 1733, 1774, 1864, 1865, 1894, 1903, 1957, 2023^c, 2035^c, 2061, 2196, (2201), 2323, 2352, 2431, 2434, 2554, 2669, 2723

ρουβειμ —1072, 1075, (1248), 1503, 1617, 1637, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1771, 2023, 2035, 2041, 2431, 2821

These are simply alternate spellings of the same word, a proper noun.

7:10— *τω θρονω* —35, 432, 757, 824, 986, 1072, 1075, 1328, 1503, 1551, 1617, 1637, 1745, 1746, 1771, 1864, 1865, 1903, 1957, 2023, 2041, 2061, 2323, 2352, 2431, 2434, 2669, 2723, 2821

του θρονου —1064, 1248, 1732, 1733, 1740, 1774, 1894, 2035, 2061, 2196, 2201, 2554, 2656

Since the Father is firmly seated, the dative is correct. However, since the preposition takes three cases, the translation comes out the same.

7:17— *ποιμινει* —432, 757^{alt}, 824^{alt}, 986^{alt}, 1072, 1075^{alt}, 1328^{alt}, 1503^{alt}, 1551, 1617, 1637^{alt}, 1740^{alt}, 1745^{alt}, 1771^{alt}, 1774, 1864^{alt}, 1865, 1957, 2023, 2041^{alt}, 2061, 2323, 2352^{alt}, 2431^{alt}, 2434, 2554^{alt}, 2669, 2723

ποιμανει —35, 757, 824, 986, 1064, 1075, 1248, 1328, 1503, 1637, 1732, 1733, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1771, 1864, 1894, 1903, 2023^{alt}, 2035, 2041, 2196, 2201, 2352, 2431, 2554, 2656, 2821

This set and the next go together; I will treat them together below.

7:17— *οδηγει* —432, 757^c, 824^{alt}, 986^{alt}, 1072, 1503^{alt}, 1771^{alt}, 1774, 1864^{alt}, 1865, 1903, 1957, 2023, 2041^{alt}, 2323, 2352^{alt}, 2434, 2554^{alt}, 2669, 2723

οδηγησει —35, 757, 824, 986, 1064, 1075, 1248, 1328, 1503 (1551) 1617, 1637, 1732, 1733, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1771, 1864, 1894, 2035, 2041, 2196, 2201, 2352, 2431, 2554, 2656, 2821

Present tense, or future? Verse 17 gives the reason for the blessings described in verse 16, where the verbs are future, as is the last verb in verse 17; so where did the present tense come from? It is because the Lamb shepherds and leads them that they will have the blessings. However, the future tense also makes sense; so much so that if the Text had always been future, the present would not have been used. Notice that there are many more ‘alternates’ with the first set than with the second; I suppose the explanation to be that with the first set it

was easy, just add a vowel above the line; with the second it was more complicated. In any case, the choice between the tenses makes scarcely any difference in a translation.

9:5— *πληξη* —432, 757^{alt}, 824^{alt}, 986, 1064, 1072, 1075^c, 1328, 1503^{alt}, 1551, 1637^{alt}, 1732, 1740^c, 1745^{alt}, 1771^{alt}, 1774, 1864^{alt}, 1865, 1894, 1903, 2023, 2035, 2041^{alt}, 2061, 2196, 2323, 2352^{alt}, 2431^{alt}, 2434, 2554^{alt}, 2656, 2669, 2723, 2821

παιση —35, 757, 824, 1075, 1248, 1503, 1637, 1733, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1771, 1864, 1957, 2041, 2201, 2352, 2431, 2554

It is difficult to imagine medieval monks changing *παιση* to *πληξη*; on what basis would they do so? On the other hand, the unfamiliar *πληξη* could be changed to *παιση* (and even *πεση*), early on [*πλησσω* having been used with the 2nd aorist in 8:12 above, the 1st aorist would be unexpected]. *πλησσω* is used for sudden, violent strikes, like from lightning or God's wrath; it is used expressly of a scorpion's sting in the 1st century AD [Sammelb.1267.6]. In this context *πληξη* is precisely appropriate, although the difference in meaning is slight; a single translation covers both.

9:11— *αββαδων* —757, 824, 986, 1072, 1328, 1637, 1733, 1774, 1864, 1903, 2035, 2041, 2352, 2434, 2554, 2669, 2723

αββαδων —35, 432, 1075, 1248, 1503, 1551, 1732, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1865, 1894, 2023, 2061, 2201, 2323, 2431, 2821

αβαδδων —1064, 1771, 1957, 2196, 2656

These are simply alternate spellings of the same word, a proper noun.

14:14— *καθημενος ομοιος* —432, 757^{alt}, 824^{alt}, 986, 1072, 1075, 1248, 1328^{alt}, 1503, 1551, 1617^{alt}, 1637^{alt}, 1732, 1733, 1740^{alt}, 1745^{alt}, 1746, 1771^{alt}, 1774, 1864^{alt}, 1865, 1894, 1903, 1957, 2023, 2035, 2041^{alt} (2061) 2201, 2352^{alt}, 2431^{alt}, 2554^{alt}, 2656, 2723, 2821

καθημενον ομοιον —35, 757, 824, 1328, 1617, 1637, 1732^{alt}, 1740, 1745, 1771, 1864, 2041, 2196, 2352, 2431, 2434, 2554, 2669

I take it that the grammar calls for the nominative, but the translation is the same.

16:19— *επεσον* —432, 757^{alt}, 824^{alt}, 986, 1072, 1075^{alt}, 1248, 1328, 1384, 1503^{alt}, 1551, 1617^{alt}, 1637^{alt}, 1732, 1733, 1740^{alt}, 1745^{alt}, 1746, 1771^{alt}, 1774, 1864^{alt}, 1865, 1894, 1903, 1957, 2035, 2041, 2061, 2323, 2352, 2431^{alt}, 2434, 2554, 2656, 2669, 2723, 2821^{alt}

επεσαν —35, 757, 824, 1075, 1503, 1617, 1637, 1740, 1745, 1771, 1864, 2023, 2041^{alt}, 2196, 2201, 2431, 2821

These are evidently alternate spellings of the same form. There is an almost identical set in 17:10. Curiously, in 19:4 these two forms are inverted.

17:16— *ηρημωμενην* —432, 757^{alt}, 824^{alt}, 986, 1072, 1248, 1328, 1384, 1503^{alt}, 1551, 1617^{alt}, 1637^{alt}, 1732, 1733, 1740^{alt}, 1746, 1771, 1774, 1864^{alt}, 1865, 1957, 2023 (2035) 2041, 2061, 2196, 2201, 2323, 2352, 2431, 2434, 2554, 2656, 2669, 2723

ερημωμενην —35, 757, 824, 986^{alt}, 1075, 1503, 1617, 1637, 1740, 1745, 1864, 1894, 1903, 2041^{alt}, 2821

These are evidently alternate spellings of the same form.

17:16— *φαγονται* —35, 432, 757, 824, 986, 1072, 1075, 1328, 1384, 1551, 1732, 1733, 1774, 1864, 1865, 1894, 1903, 1957, 2023, 2035, 2061, 2196, 2201, 2323, 2352, 2434, 2554, 2656, 2669, 2723

φαγωνται —1248, 1503, 1617, 1637, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1771, 2041, 2431, 2821

These are evidently alternate spellings of the same form.

19:10— *επεσον* —432, 757^{alt}, 824^{alt}, 986, 1072, 1075^{alt}, 1328, 1384, 1503^{alt}, 1617^{alt}, 1637^{alt}, 1732, 1733, 1745^{alt}, 1746, 1771^{alt}, 1864^{alt}, 1865, 1903, 1957, 2035, 2041^{alt}, 2352^{alt}, 2431^{alt}, 2434, 2554, 2656, 2669, 2723

επεσα —35, 757, 824, 1075, 1248, 1503, 1551, 1617, 1637, 1740, 1745, 1771, 1864, 2023, 2041, 2196, 2201, 2323, 2352, 2431, 2821

These are evidently alternate forms of the first person, so there is no difference in meaning. (1894 and 2061 have private readings.)

21:20— *σαρδωνυξ* —432, 757^s, 824, 1075, 1248, 1328, 1384, 1503, 1732, 1733, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1771, 1864, 1865, 1894, 1903, 1957, 2035, 2201, 2431, 2554, 2723, 2821

σαρδωνυξ —35, 986, 1072, 1551, 1617, 1637, 2023, 2041, 2061, 2196, 2323, 2352, 2434, 2669

These are simply alternate spellings of the same word.

22:1— *κρυσταλον* —432, 824, 986, 1072, 1328, 1503, 1551, 1732, 1733, 1745, 1864^c, 1865, 1894, 1957, 2035, 2061, 2196, 2352, 2431, 2434, 2554, 2669, 2723

κρυσταλλον —35, 757^s, 1075, 1248, 1384, 1617, 1637, 1732^c, 1740, 1745^c, 1771, 1864, 1903, 2023, 2041, 2201, 2323, 2656, 2821

These are simply alternate spellings of the same word.

Of the nineteen cases, eleven are mere spelling differences. Fourteen involve a single letter or diphthong. Only two sets involve a slight difference in meaning. I call this incredibly careful transmission—at no point will a reader be misled as to the intended meaning. The original wording of Revelation has been precisely preserved to our day. Even in the Apocalypse, God has preserved His Text!

Where to place a 'comma'--Acts 12:25

Since Acts was written at least two years after Paul arrived in Rome in chains, it would not have been 'published' until into the 60s. When Jerusalem was destroyed in 70, it disappeared from the Christian map for centuries—the center of gravity of the Church was now Asia Minor.

Although Luke himself was no doubt very fluent in Greek, for most Christians in Asia Minor it would be a second language. If this was also true of most people who made copies of NT books (especially in the early decades), and since those books were written without punctuation (or even spaces between words), it was predictable that now and again someone would put a 'comma' in the wrong spot. I imagine that it would have been just such an event that gave rise to the peculiar set of variants that we encounter in Acts 12:25.

Throughout the NT there are numerous places where there is a more or less serious split within Family 35, with two competing readings (usually involving just one letter). But this is the **only** place (yes, only) in the whole NT where the family splinters—there are no fewer than seven variants, five of them being of some consequence.

Instead of "Barnabas and Saul returned to Antioch, having fulfilled their mission", someone (or several someones) put the comma after 'returned', resulting in "Barnabas and Saul returned, having fulfilled their mission to Antioch"—but with that punctuation 'Antioch' must be changed to 'Jerusalem'. (Having done that, we have two ways of saying essentially the same thing—if you get the 'comma' right!) Following that hypothesis, that change must have occurred rather early on, and in circumstances that resulted in that change dominating the transmission of Acts down through the years. To see what I mean we need to have the evidence before us: I have collated 35 MSS for Acts, and 'borrowed' a spot-check of 16 more.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) υπεστρεψαν εις αντιοχειαν | 141, 204, 328, 394, 928, 986, 1247, 1249, 1482, 1725, 1732, 1761, 1855, 1856, 1876, 1897, 2080, 2261 |
| 2) υπεστρεψαν απο ιερουσαλημ | 18, 386, 1100, 2554 |
| 3) υπεστρεψαν απο ιερουσαλημ εις αντιοχειαν | 444, 1548, 2221, 2587 |
| 4) υπεστρεψαν εξ ιερουσαλημ | 547, 1865 |
| 5) υπεστρεψαν εξ ιερουσαλημ εις αντιοχειαν | 432, 604, 1250, 1251, 1865 ^c |
| 6) υπεστρεψαν εις ιερουσαλημ | 35c, 149, 201, 536, 757, 824, 1072, 1075, 1248, 1503, 1617, 1628, 1637, 1864, 1892, 2352, 2466, 2723 |
| 7) υπεστρεψαν εις ιερουσαλημ εις αντιοχειαν | 35 [not a conflation, being nonsense; the copyist was aware of both, and did not know how to choose] |

It is evident that variants 2) - 5) were created deliberately; the copyists were reacting to the meaning of the whole phrase within the context (in this situation it will not do to consider the name of each city in isolation; the accompanying preposition must also be taken into account). But they were reacting to variant 6), not variant 1). However, once they were created, and as they became exemplars, those who made copies would see no problem and simply reproduce what was in front of them [so we may not add the percentages for 2) - 6) and say that

Jerusalem has over 90% of the vote]. Having myself collated at least one book in over 110 MSS (and over twenty entire MSS), I have observed repeatedly that the copyist faithfully reproduced a nonsensical reading—either they weren't paying attention, or their respect for the Text was such that they did not venture to change it (or in later years the monks may have been instructed to not make changes, precisely to preserve the variety of readings that had come down to them [their superiors may not have felt that they had the competence to choose one form to the exclusion of others])—so the 60% does not mean that all those copyists agreed with what they copied, or even that they understood it.

Since the normal meaning of the syntax here is the first one (they returned to Antioch), and since both the Holy Spirit and Luke knew how to write good Greek (Koine), my presuppositions lead me to choose it. But it is not only my presuppositions; consider:

- a) Acts 11:30, ο και εποησαν αποστειλαντες, "which they also did, having sent . . . by B. & S." An aorist participle is prior in time to its main verb, in this case also aorist—their purpose is stated to have been realized. The author clearly implies that the offering did arrive, or had arrived, in Judea/Jerusalem. [In Acts the author seems almost to use "Jerusalem" and "Judea" inter-changeably, perhaps to avoid repetition. E.g.: 11:1 Judea, 11:2 Jerusalem (were the apostles not in Jerusalem, or immediate environs?); 11:27 Jerusalem, 11:29 Judea, 11:30 the elders (would not the ruling elders be in Jerusalem?); 12:1-19 took place in Jerusalem, but v. 19 says Herod went down from Judea to Caesarea; 15:1 Judea, 15:2 Jerusalem; 28:21 letters from "Judea" probably means Jerusalem.] Note that the next verse (12:1) places us in Jerusalem.
- b) Acts 12:25 (12:1-24 is unrelated, except that verses 1-19 take place in Jerusalem), βαρναβας και σαυλος—the action includes **both**.
- c) Acts 12:25, υπεστρεψαν . . . πληρωσαντες την διακονιαν, "they returned . . . having fulfilled the mission". Again, both the participle and the main verb are aorist, and both plural. "Having fulfilled the mission" defines the main verb. Since the mission was to Judea, which of necessity includes Jerusalem as its capital city, the 'returning' must be to the place where the mission originated.
- d) Acts 12:25, "also taking with them John, the one called Mark"—we have no record that John Mark had ever been in Antioch before this, so how could he return to Jerusalem if he was already there? Acts 13:13 raises the same question.

Barnabas could be viewed as returning to Jerusalem, having completed his mission to Antioch, but this could not be said of Saul. I conclude that 'to Jerusalem' cannot be correct here even though attested by 60% of the MSS. We observe that the other 40% of the MSS, plus the three ancient versions, are agreed that the motion was away from Jerusalem, not toward it. It seems to me that there is only one way to 'save' the majority variant here: place a comma between υπεστρεψαν and εις, thereby making 'to Jerusalem' modify 'the ministry'. (This was my opening hypothesis.) But such a construction is unnatural to the point of being unacceptable—had that been the author's purpose we should expect την εις ιερουσαλημ διακονιαν or την διακονιαν εις ιερουσαλημ (assuming that both the Holy Spirit and Luke were good at Greek). The other sixteen times that Luke uses υποστρεφω εις we find the normal, expected meaning, 'return to'. As a linguist (PhD) I would say that the norms of language require us to

use the same meaning in Acts 12:25. Which to my mind leaves εἰς ἀντιοχείαν as the only viable candidate for the Original reading in this place. (Which, however, would not prevent copyists who were not native speakers of Greek from putting the 'comma' in the wrong spot.)

The whole contour of the evidence is troubling, strange, and as I have already observed, it is absolutely the only place in the whole NT where Family 35 splinters. Variants 1) through 5) are all votes against 6), but we must choose one of them to stand against 6)—the clear choice is 1). "To Jerusalem" has 'Number', 'Antiquity' and 'Continuity'. "To Antioch" has 'Antiquity', 'Variety', 'Continuity' and 'Reasonableness'. As Burgon would say, this is one of those places where 'Reasonableness' just cannot be ignored. I believe he would agree that his 'notes of truth' give the nod to Antioch.

To conclude, I have presented and discussed a total of 84 'significant splits' within Family 35 for the whole New Testament. There are only 84 for the whole NT! If any other 'family' even exists in all 27 books, I would not expect it to come anywhere close to this number; it would have many more. Not only that, fully 60 cases involve a single letter or diphthong. Apart from that, 27 are alternate spellings of the same word or form; another 15 are two ways of saying the same thing; another 21 can be covered by a single translation. That leaves 21: of these, 20 may be said to represent a slight difference in meaning, but they do not do damage to the context—the reader will not be deceived as to the message of the passage. Only one may be said to constitute a proper 'problem', Acts 12:25, and I believe I have offered a reasonable explanation. All said and done, the original wording of the whole NT has been precisely preserved to our day (where there is doubt, it is one of the variants; no original wording has been lost!) **God has preserved His Text!**