The Family 35 archetype for Luke—final form

Wilbur N. Pickering, ThM PhD

This article is based on a complete collation of the following 51 representatives of the family for Luke: 18, 35, 128, 201, 204, 246, 402, 479, 510, 547, 553, 586, 691, 757, 769, 781, 789, 824, 867, 897, 928, 1072, 1111, 1117, 1147, 1328, 1339, 1384, 1435, 1461, 1493, 1496, 1503, 1548, 1551, 1621, 1637, 1652, 1667, 1694, 1713, 2122, 2253, 2352, 2367, 2382, 2466, 2503, 2554, 2765 and Iviron 2110.[1]

At the fifteen places where there is a division of at least 10%, I spot-checked the following **171** MSS: 55,(56),58,61,(66),83,141,147,155,167,170,(189),(285),(290),361,363,386,387,394,(516),520, 521,575,645,664,(676),689,696,758,763,797,932,938,940,952,953,955,958,959,960,962,966,1003, (1017),1018,1020,1023,1025,1030,1040,1046,1059,1062,1075,1088,1092,1095,1116,1119,1131, 1132,1133,1145,1158,1165,1185,1189,1199,1224,1234,(1236),(1247),1250,1251,1323,1329,1334, 1389,(1390),1400,1401,1409,1427,1445,(1453),1462,1471,1476,1480,1482,1487,1488,1489,1490, 1492,1499,1501,1508,(1517),1543,(1544),1559,1560,1572,1576,1584,1591,1599,1600,1601,1614, 1617,1619,1620,1622,(1625),1628,1633,1636,1638,1648,1649,1650,1656,1658,1659,1686,1688, 1700,1702,1703,1705,1779,1786,1789,1813,(2175),2204,2221,2249,2255,2260,2261,2273,2284, 2296,2309,2322,2323,2355,2399,2407,2418,2444,2454,2460,(2483),(2508),2510,2520,2559,2621, 2635,2673,2689,2692,2709,2714,2715,2734,2767.

Those 222 MSS represent a heavy majority of the family representatives that are presently available. I neglected a further 21 MSS that were hard to read, not available, incomplete or scrambled (the pages were bound out of order). There are a good number of further MSS with varying amounts of mixture added to a Family 35 base (just as my model predicts). The MSS within parentheses, in the list above, are marginal members of the family; there are 18.

A few more family representatives may come to light, but not enough to challenge any decisions made here. Notice that the picture based on the 51 fully collated MSS remains the same after adding the 171 spot-checked MSS. Two of the variants went down, and another two went up very slightly, but most went up significantly, and two more than doubled! My explanation is that most of the better family representatives have been collated, and their average is closer to the archetype. My 'presently available' refers to the images that have been posted by both the INTF and the CSNTM (with the exception of Iviron 2110). I say a sincere "Thank you" to both organizations.

I now discuss the divisions that were spot-checked. Only the MSS that support the minority variant are listed. Those within { } were spot-checked. The percentages within [ ] refer to the total of known MSS.

1:55 – εως αιωνος 35ᶜ,769ᶜ,928ᶜ,1493ᶜ,1694ᶜ || εις τον αιωνα [64%] 35,204,402,553,769,928,1117,1493,1694, 2253,2466,2554,I.2110 {58,61,66,141,394,516,521,758,797,1088,1092, 1132,1133,1189,1250,1334,1390,1427,1445ᶜ,1482,1487,1517,1543, 1559,1572,1600,1620,1688,1700,1786,2175,2204,2249,2261,2322, 2407,2734}

Out of the 222 MSS, 4 are missing, so out of 218 MSS (within the family) 49 have the variant, which equals 22.5%. The two phrases are virtually synonymous, with little difference in meaning. But in any case, with less than 23% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. Note also that five were corrected. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

---

[1] All 51 MSS I collated myself. Iviron 2110 does not have a GA number, so far as I know (it is in their treasury).

2:40 – αυτω 35alt,586alt,789c || αυτο [58%] 18,35,201,246,510,547,586,757alt,789,1072c,1111,1328,1339,1496alt,
1503alt,1548,1551, 2352alt,2367,2382,2503,2765 {55,56,61,66m,83,147,155,167,285,386,
387,516,645,696,938,940,952,955,958,960,1017,1023,1025,1046c,1062,1075,1158,1185,
1234,1251,1389,1400,1401,1453,1488,1489,1490,1492,1501,1517,1544,1560,1584,1591,
1617alt,1619alt,1622,1628,1633,1650,1656alt,1686,1702,1705,2175,2221,2323,2407,2510,
2559,2709,2715}

Out of the 222 MSS, 5 are missing, so out of 217 MSS (within the family) 74 have the variant, which equals 34.1%. The preposition takes three cases, with little difference in meaning. However, the dative is correct: the grace was resting on Him all the time. But in any case, although 34% attestation is significant, a third of the total is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

3:18 – τω λαω 1072alt || τον λαον [85%] 18,35alt,128,246,402,479altc,547,757alt,781,789alt,824,867,1072,1111,1117,
1328,1384,1435,1503alt,1551,1637alt,1652alt,2122,2367,2466alt,2554,2765,l.2110 {55,66,83c,147,
155,167,189,285,290,363,386,521,645,664,676,696,758,763,938,952,960alt,962alt,1003,1017,
1018,1023,1025,1030,1040c,1046c,1059,1075,1092,1131,1132,1133,1158,1234,1236,1247,1250,
1251,1329,1334,1400,1401,1409,1445,1471,1488alt,1490,1492,1501alt,1508,1517,1543,1560,
1548alt,1600,1622,1625,1633,1650,1656alt,1658,1659c,1686,1700,1703,1705,1779,1786,1813,
2221,2249,2255,2261,2273,2284,2355,2399,2483,2510c,2520,2533, 2689,2692,2709,(2734),[1]
2767}

Out of the 222 MSS, 7 are missing, so out of 215 MSS (within the family) 99 have the variant, which equals 46%. The verb ευαγγελιζω normally takes the dative, although the accusative does occur—there seems to be no difference in meaning, a translation will be the same. Since the normal case for a direct object is the accusative, copyists who were not familiar with the peculiarity of that verb would predictably make the change (witness the [85%]). If the archetype had the accusative, who would change it to dative? Although 46% is almost half, it is not enough to warrant a change, since the proper case for the verb is the dative. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

3:26 – σεμει || σεμεει [45%] 201,1072,1339,1461,1496,1503 {56,58,61,189,285,387,520,575,664,676,758c,797,932,
1003,1017,1030,1040,1092,1095,1165,1236,1323,1390,1476,1488,1489,1544,1619,1620,1622,
1625,1648,1649,2221,2284,2323,2407,2508,2635,2673,2734}

Out of the 222 MSS, 6 are missing, so out of 216 MSS (within the family) 46 have the variant, which equals 21.3%. I do not consider an alternate spelling of a proper name to be a proper variant, since there is absolutely no difference in meaning. But in any case, with less than 22% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

9:27 – εστωτων 246m || εστηκοτων [20%] 246,691,757,781,789c,824,1072,1328,1339,1461,1496,1503,1548,1551,
1637,1652,1694,1713,2352 {66,83,285,516,575,689,758c,763,938,955,958,959,960,962,1003,
1017,1018,1023,1025,1030,1040,1046,1059,1075,1116,1131,1132,1145,1185,1224,1390c,1409,
1453,1462,1487,1488,1489,1501,1508,1543,1544,1559,1560,1584,1591,1614,1617,1619,1620,
1622,1628,1633,1636,1648,1649,1650,1656,1658,1686,1700,1702,1705,2221,2249,2255,2309,
2323,2399,2454,2483,2510,2635,2689,2734}

Out of the 222 MSS, 2 are missing, so out of 220 MSS (within the family) 90 have the variant, which equals 40.9%. These appear to be alternate forms of the perfect active participle of the same verb, so they are two ways of saying the same thing. Although a 41% attestation is certainly significant, it

---

[1] Parentheses within the examples indicate that the MS has a variation on that reading.

is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

10:41 – ο ιησους ειπεν αυτη || ~ 3412 [59%] 35ᶜ,128,510,586,867,1111,1435,2122,2382 {56,58,61,167,290, 363,516,520, 932,940,1095,1165,1323,1329,1476,1779,2508,2520,2673,2767}

Out of the 222 MSS, 5 are missing, so out of 217 MSS (within the family) 28 have the variant, which equals 12.9%. Since Greek has case endings, a change in the word order usually makes little or no difference in the meaning, a translation will be the same. But in any case, with less than 13% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

12:18 – γενηματα || γεννηματα [7%] 201,246,553ᶜ,928,1548,1551,1621,1667,2554ᶜ {66,189,386,394,520,521ᶜ, 676, 758ᶜ,797,932,938ᶜ,958,1023,1088,1095,1132,1165,1185,1189,1234,1236,1247,1323,1329, 1334,1400,1427,1445,1462,1476,1482,1501ᵃˡᵗ,1572,1576,1625,1649,1656,1659,1688,1700,1779, 2204,2249,2284,2418,2508,2673, 2692,2714}

Out of the 222 MSS, 3 are missing, so out of 219 MSS (within the family) 52 have the variant, which equals 23.7%. The difference of one letter changes the word. The first refers to plant produce; the second refers to animal offspring. In the context, the rich man is clearly referring to produce. But in any case, with less than 24% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

12:23 – πλειων || πλειον [77%] 246,757,1548,1551,1694,2122,2367 {56,58,61,66,141,285ᶜ,290,516,797,938,952, 953,958,959,966,1020,1023,1075,1092,1116,1132,1133,1185,1199,1224,1236,1250,1389,1390,1400, 1401,1453,1501,1543,1544,1591,1601,1648,1649,1700,1703,1705,1779,1786,1789,1813,2175,2249, 2261,2296,2355,2407,2418,2454,2483,2510,2520,2635ᵛ,2715}

Out of the 222 MSS, 2 are missing, so out of 220 MSS (within the family) 65 have the variant, which equals 29.5%. The difference of one letter changes the gender from masculine/feminine to neuter. In the context, the subject of the comparison is feminine, so the first form is clearly correct. But in any case, with less than 30% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

13:9 – εκκοψεις || εκκοψης 246,1461,1496,1548,1551,l.2110 {290,363,520,575,763,953,958,959,966,1025,1030, 1040,1092,1095,1185,1189,1389,1499,1544,1576ᶜ,1619,1620,1648,1649,2255,2355,2418,2635,2673, 2715}

Out of the 222 MSS, 2 are missing, so out of 220 MSS (within the family) 35 have the variant, which equals 15.9%. The difference of one letter changes the tense/mode from future indicative to aorist subjunctive. Either form makes good sense, and the difference in meaning is slight. In cursive handwriting the two forms can be very similar. But in any case, with less than 16% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

15:24 – απολωλως 479ᶜ || απολωλος [50%] 246,479,547,691,1072,1328,1339,1461,1493,1496,1503,1551, 1637,1667,2122,2352,2367,2466 {56,83,155,167,189,290,387,394,521,575,645,664,763, 797,958,959,960,962,1025,1062,1088,1092,1116,1132,1133,1165,1185,1224,1234,1236, 1250,1251,1329,1334,1401,1409,1453,1476,1480,1487,1489,1490,1499,1501,1508,1543, 1559,1576,1591,1601,1614,1619,1620,1622,1633,1636,1638,1648,1649,1658,1686,1700, 1703,1705,1779,1789,1813,2175,2204,2249,2255,2273,2355,2407,2418,2444,2460,2483, 2621,2635, 2673,2692,2714,2715}

Out of the 222 MSS, 1 is missing, so out of 221 MSS (within the family) 102 have the variant, which equals 46.2%. The difference of one letter changes the case/gender from nominative masculine to accusative neuter. As an aid to discussion, I will start with a translation: "this son of mine was dead and came to life; he was lost and is found". The referent, "son", is nominative masculine, clearly so, so where did the variant come from? Well, 'dead', νεκρος, is an adjective, and is nominative masculine, but 'lost' is a perfect active participle, and the ending is different. I suppose that copyists treated the participle like an adjective and repeated the ending. Also, both forms were pronounced the same, and in cursive handwriting the two forms can be similar. Although 46.2% is almost half, it is not enough to warrant a change, since the correct form is clearly the nominative masculine. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

15:32 – απολωλως 479ᶜ || απολωλος [40%] 204,479,547,691,1072,1328,1339,1461,1637,1667,2122,2352, 2367 {56,155,167,290,387,394,521,575,645,664,758,763,959,1088,1092,1116,1132,1165, 1185,1224,1234,1247,1250,1251,1334,1401,1409,1453,1476,1487,1490,1499,1501,1508, 1543,1559,1576,1614,1619,1620,1622,1638,1648,1649,1656,1658,1686,1700,1703,1705, 1789,2175,2204,2249,2255, 2407,2418,2444,2460,2483,2621,2635,2692,2714,2715}

Out of the 222 MSS, 1 is missing, so out of 221 MSS (within the family) 78 have the variant, which equals 35.3%. The discussion above obtains here as well, except that the referent is now 'brother'. The percentage dropped ten points, a considerable difference. Why? Perhaps some of the copyists caught their mistake, did not repeat it, but did not bother to go back and correct it. In any case, with only 35.3% attestation, there is even less reason to change here than the first time. The correct form continues to be the nominative masculine. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

21:33 – παρελευσεται || παρελευσονται [68%] 246,547,757,1111,1117,1384ᵃˡᵗ,1548,1551,1652,1667,1713, 2352,2367,2554,2765,I.2110 {(61),66ᶜ,147,155,167,170,189,285,516,645,696,938,958, 960,962,1017,1018,1023,1025,1040,1046,1075,(1088),1145,1158,1185,1247,1251,1400, 1401,1453,1471,1488,1490,1501,1517,1544,1576,1600,1628,1633,1636,1638,1686,1705, 2175,2221,2255,2323,2407,2483,2510}

Out of the 222 MSS, 1 is missing, so out of 221 MSS (within the family) 66 have the variant, which equals 29.9%. Are "the heaven and the earth" to be treated as a unit (singular), or as distinct entities (plural)? In English, the translation is the same, "will pass away". In any case, with less than 30% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

22:18 – γενηματος || γεννηματος [15%] 18,201,402,553,769,928,1147,1493,1621,1667,2466ᵃˡᵗ,2503,2554ᶜ {61,66,141,189,363,386,394,520ᵛ,521,676,758ᶜ,797,932,940,958,1095,1132,1165,1189,1234, 1236,1247,1250,1323,1329,1334,1427,1445,1453,1476,1480,1482,1492ᵃˡᵗ,1543,1572,1576,1600, 1625,1649,1659,1700,1705,1779,2175,2204,2249,2284,2296,2322,2355,2418,2508,2559,2673, 2692,2714}

Out of the 222 MSS, 2 are missing, so out of 220 MSS (within the family) 65 have the variant, which equals 29.5%. The difference of one letter changes the word. The first refers to plant produce; the second refers to animal offspring. In the context, the Lord Jesus is clearly referring to produce. But in any case, with less than 30% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

23:44 – ενατης 35ᶜ || εννατης [30%] 35,479,547,691,897,928,1384,1621,1667,1694,2367,2765 {56,58,61,66, 147,155,167,170,189,361,363,387,394,520ᵛ,521,645,676,696, 797ᶜ,932,938,953,966,1020,1023,

1075,1092,1095,1116,1132,1158,1165,1199,1236,1250,1251,1323,1329,1334,1389,1401,1409ˢ,
1445,1453,1471,1476,1480,1482,1490,1499,1543,1572,1576,1599,1601,1625,1638,1649,1659,
1700,1703,1813,2204,2249,2260,2273ᵃˡᵗ,2284,2296,2399,2407,2444,2460,2483,2508,2510,
2635,2673,2692,2714,2715}

Out of the 222 MSS, 5 are missing, so out of 217 MSS (within the family) 90 have the variant, which equals 41.5%. I do not consider an alternate spelling of a number to be a proper variant, since there is absolutely no difference in meaning. Although the 41.5% attestation is significant, it is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

24:10 – η 1111ᶜ || --- [50%] 201ˀ,246,1072,1111,1493,1548,1551,1637,1667,2466,l.2110 {167,170,189,290,387,394,
516,664,676,689,758,763,938,952,953,955ᶜ,958,959,960,962,966,1020,1023,1025,1059,1062,
1075,1088,1092ᶜ,1095,1116,1119,1131,1132,1185,1199,1236,1247,1389,1400,1453,1462,1471,
1476,1480,1489,1499,1501,1508,1543,1544,1576,1614,1620,1622,1625,1628,1633,1636,1658,
1659,1686,1700,1702,1703,1705,1779,1786,1789,1813,2175,2249,2255,2261,2309,2355,2407,
2444,2454,2483,2508,2520,2621,2635,2673, 2689,2709,2714,2715}

Out of the 222 MSS, 3 are missing, so out of 219 MSS (within the family) 98 have the variant, which equals 44.7%. Is it, "and the Mary of James", or "and Mary of James"? Since there is another 'Mary' four words earlier, and a number of other 'Maries' in the Gospels, the use of the article is appropriate; but it could also be deemed to be unnecessary. Most versions, including mine, have 'the mother of', although the word 'mother' is not in the Text (the alternative would be 'wife'). Might that be the purpose of the article? Although the 44.7% attestation is significant, it is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the fifteen places where there is a division of at least 10%. As is typical of variation within the family, there is very little difference in meaning between the options. As I have demonstrated, we are able to affirm the precise form of the family archetype for the whole book of Luke, beyond reasonable doubt. It is reproduced in my Greek Text, *The Greek New Testament according to Family 35*. Should someone prefer one or more of the alternates, it remains true that none of the text has been lost; it is one or the other. I maintain that the family archetype has been perfectly preserved, but in any case, it has been completely preserved: no wording has been lost.

I will now consider the force of the evidence chapter by chapter, simply counting the MSS that have been collated, but due consideration needs to be given to the discussion of the divisions, above. Mere alternate spellings should be discounted, and so on.[1]

Chapter 1: No variant has more than thirteen MSS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 19 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter (which is very long), and the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 15 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter one.

Chapter 2: No variant has more than seventeen MSS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 23 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 10 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter two.

Chapter 3: No variant has more than twenty MSS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 19 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will

---

[1] I do not guarantee complete accuracy. An occasional mistake will not alter the big picture.

doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter three.

Chapter 4: No variant has more than one MS! Of the 50 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 33 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 17 more (for a total of 50). It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter four.

Chapter 5: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 28 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 14 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter five.

Chapter 6: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 17 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 16 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter six.

Chapter 7: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 27 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 12 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter seven.

Chapter 8: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 50 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 22 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 16 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter eight.

Chapter 9: No variant has more than eighteen MSS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 19 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 9 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter nine.

Chapter 10: No variant has more than eight MSS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 24 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter ten.

Chapter 11: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 24 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 19 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter eleven.

Chapter 12: No variant has more than seven MSS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 16 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter. However, the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 15 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twelve.

Chapter 13: No variant has more than six MSS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 25 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 9 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter thirteen.

Chapter 14: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 26 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter fourteen.

Chapter15: No variant has more than eighteen MSS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 25 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter fifteen.

Chapter 16: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 33 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter sixteen.

Chapter 17: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 32 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 6 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter seventeen.

Chapter 18: No variant has more than one MS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 43 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter eighteen.

Chapter 19: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 50 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 29 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 14 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter nineteen.

Chapter 20: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 35 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 9 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty.

Chapter 21: No variant has more than fifteen MSS. Of the 50 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 18 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 9 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty-one.

Chapter 22: No variant has more than eleven MSS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 18 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 12 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty-two.

Chapter 23: No variant has more than twelve MSS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 23 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 10 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty-three.

Chapter 24: No variant has more than eleven MSS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 29 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will

doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty-four.

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35, for the book of Luke, based on the available evidence. What I have done for Acts, Romans, John and Luke, I believe that I can do for the remaining NT books as well. **God has preserved His Text!**