

The Family 35 archetype for Mark—final form

Wilbur N. Pickering, ThM PhD

This article is based on a complete collation of the following 58 representatives of the family for Mark: 18, 35, 128, 141, 204, 510, 547, 553, 586, 645, 689, 789, 824, 867, 928, 1023, 1040, 1046, 1072, 1075, 1111, 1117, 1133, 1145, 1147, 1199, 1251, 1339, 1384, 1435, 1461, 1496, 1503, 1572, 1628, 1637, 1652, 1667, 1705, 1713, 2122, 2221, 2253, 2261, 2265, 2273, 2323, 2352, 2382, 2466, 2503, 2554, 2621, 2765, 2875, 2876, Iviron 2110 and Leukosia 65 [the last two do not yet have a GA number, so far as I know].¹

At the thirteen places where there is a division of at least 10%, I spot-checked the following **171** MSS: 55,(56),58,66,83,147,155,167,170,189,201,214,246,290,361,363,386,394,402,(415),479,480,520,521,575,594,664,673,676,685,691,694,696,746,757,758,763,769,781,797,825,890,897,(924),932,938,940,952,953,955,958,959,960,961,962,966,978,986,(1003),1020,1025,(1030),1059,1062,1092,1095,1131,1132,1158,1165,1180,1185,1189,1234,1236,(1247),1250,1323,1328,1329,1334,1389,(1390),1400,1401,1409,1427,1445,(1453),1462,1476,1480,1482,1487,1488,1489,1490,1492,1493,1499,1501,1508,(1517),1543,1544,1548,1551,1552,1559,1560,1576,1584,1591,1596,1599,1600,1601,1609,1614,1617,1619,1620,1621,1622,1625,1633,1636,1638,1648,1649,1650,1656,1658,1659,1680,1686,1688,1694,1700,1702,1779,1786,2204,2249,2255,2260,2284,2296,2322,2355,2367,2399,2407,2444,2454,2460,2483,2496,2508,2520,2559,2598,2635,2673,2689,2692,2709,2714,2767,2774,2806

Those 229 MSS represent a heavy majority of the family representatives that are presently available. I neglected 16 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 9.

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 58 fully collated MSS remains the same after adding the 171 spot-checked MSS. Four of the variants went down, the one with the highest attestation went down 4%. Nine of them went up, six of which went up significantly. 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 and Leukosia 65). 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.

1:44 – προσενεγκαι || προσενεγκε [75%] 689,1133,1199,1384,1705,2221 {56,58,66,290,361,479,520,594,(664)²,797,897,932,953,961,966,986,1020,1059,1095,1131,1132,1165,1323,1329,1389,1453,1462,1476,1480,1499,1508,1517,1543,1552,1584,1599,1609,1614,1621,1638,1648,1649,1658,1659,1700,1702,2204^c,2249,2260,2296,2399,2444,2460,2483,2496,2508,2598,2673,2689}

¹ All 58 MSS I collated myself.

² Parentheses within the examples indicate that the MS has a variation on that reading.

Out of the 229 MSS, 3 are missing, so out of 226 MSS (within the family) 64 have the variant, which equals 28.3%. Is it Infinitive or Imperative? One of the uses of the Infinitive is to command, which is clearly the case in this context. So we have two ways of saying the same thing. But in any case, with less than 29% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

5:41 – κουμι || κουμ (17.4%) 18,789,1046,1111,1117,1713,2253,2352,2382,2503,2554,2621,1.2110 {170,201,214,386,480,594,673,691,694,746,758,940,952,958,962,1025,1062,1185,1234,1250,1389,1401,1488,1492,1501,1548,1596,1600,1622,1636,1648,2255,2355,2559,2635,2774,2806}

Out of the 229 MSS, 2 are missing, so out of 227 MSS (within the family) 50 have the variant, which equals 22%. A difference in the spelling of a foreign word I do not consider to be a proper variant. Since the foreign words are followed by a translation, there is no difference in meaning. But in any case, with only 22% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

6:20 – ακουων 35^c,1023^{alt},1384^{alt} || ακουσας [80%] 35,204,547,645,1023,1199,1251,1384,1572^m,1667^c,2273^c,2466,2765 {147,155,167,189,246^m,361,479,664,676,696,825,938,953,966,1020,1158,1236,1247,1389,1401,1453,1482^m,1490,1493^m,1552,1576^m,1599,1601,1609,1621,1625,1659,2260,2273^c,2296,2367,2444,2460}

Out of the 229 MSS (within the family) 43 have the variant, which equals 18.8%. Is the participle present, or aorist? Is it “consulting him he would do many things”, or “having consulted him he would do many things”? The point is the same. It was predictable that some copyists would be influenced by the massive majority outside the family. But in any case, with less than 19% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

8:1 – παμπολλου 141^c,1147^{alt},L.65^c || παμπολου [5%] 141,1133,1147,1705,2122,2261,2265,2323,2352,L.65 {56,58,66,167^c,214,290,664,781,953,978,1020,1025,1247,1250,1323,1389,1409,1476,1487,1488,1543,1544,1617,1621,1633,1638,1648,1649,1659,1700,1786,2255,2673,2774,2806}

Out of the 229 MSS, 5 are missing, so out of 224 MSS (within the family) 44 have the variant, which equals 19.6%. I do not consider an alternate spelling of an adjective to be a proper variant, since there is absolutely no difference in meaning. But in any case, with less than 20% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

8:3 – νηστις 1145^c || νηστεις [70%] 928,1133,1145^v,1572,1667^c,2221,2261,2323^c,2877 {66,246,290,394,521,575,594,676,691,758,825^c,953,959,961,978,986,1020,1030,1092,1132,1189,1247,1334,1389,1390,1427,1445,1482,1487,1543,1544,1576,1622,(1638),1649,1650^c,1680,1694,1700,1779,1786,2204,2407,2444,2460,2635,2692,2714}

Out of the 229 MSS, 6 are missing, so out of 223 MSS (within the family) 53 have the variant, which equals 23.8%. We have two forms of the same word, that seems to function as either a noun or an adjective. The accusative plural would be correct if it is functioning as a normal adjective, as in the main Byzantine reading. But with less than 24% attestation within the family, that variant is not a credible candidate. The first form may have acted as a frozen form, but in any case, the meaning is the same. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

8:25 – ενεβλεψεν || ανεβλεψεν [45%] 128,547,689,1023,1145,1199,1251,1435,1705,2876,1,2110 {56,58,147,155,167,(170),201,246,290,363,394,402,415,520,521,664,691,763,781,938,952,(953),958,966,986,1003,1020,1030,1131,1165,1185,1234,1236,1247,1334,1390,1400,1401,(1453),1462,1476,1480,1488,1489,1490,1499,1508,1544,1548,1551,1584,1596,1600,1609,1614,1622,1633,1648,1649,1658,(1686),1700,1702,1779,1786,2204,2367,2399,(2444),2454,(2460),2483^c,2496,2689,2692,2709,2767,2806}

Out of the 229 MSS (within the family) 88 have the variant, which equals 38.4%, which is the highest percentage for any of the variants. The difference of only one letter changes the verb. Is it εμβλεπω, or αναβλεπω? The immediately following adverb controls the meaning, so the two verbs are synonymous here. Although the 38.4% attestation is significant, it is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

9:20 – ιδον || ιδων [70%] 553,645,689^c,1023^c,1072,1133,1251,1384,1705,2261,2875,L.65 {56,58,66,155,167,201,214,290,386,479,694,758,781,953,958,959,961,966,978,1020,1062,1092,1132,1234,1247,1323,1328,1389,1390,1401,1409,1453,1480,1487,1490,1499,1543,1560,1576,1591,1596,1599,1601,1609,1614,1617,1621,1622,1633,1638,1648,1700,1702,1786,2249,2260,2355,2367,2399^c,2407,2454,2483,2635,2692,2714,2774,2806}

Out of the 229 MSS, 1 is missing, so out of 228 MSS (within the family) 76 have the variant, which equals 33.3%. The difference of one letter changes the gender from neuter to masculine. Is the subject of the verb the demon, or the boy? In the context, the demon is clearly the subject, so the neuter is correct. But in any case, with only a third of the attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

12:5 – αποκτενοντες 35^c,L.65^c || αποκτενοντες [15%] 35,204,553,689,789,1046,1072,1147,1251^c,1503,1667,2382^c,L.65 {83,361,415,746,769,825,952,955,978,1059^c,1180,1185,1409^c,1462,1488,1493,1548,1584,1601^c,1614,1650,1656,1658^c,2322,2399,2444,2460,2508,2598}

Out of the 229 MSS (within the family) 36 have the variant, which equals 15.7%. The difference of one letter merely reflects an alternate spelling for the verb. There is no difference in meaning. 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.

12:43 – βαλλοντων 2466^c || βαλοντων [39%] 1145,1199,1384,1705,2221,2323,2466 {(56),58,189,479,520,676,685,746,758,797,825,932,938^c,953,966,1020,1095,1165,1180,1236,1323,1389,1400,1427,1453,1476,1517,1544,1552,1584^c,1601,1621,1625,1659,1680,2255,2260,2284,2296,(2496),2508,2559,2598,2673,2714}

Out of the 229 MSS, 2 are missing, so out of 227 MSS (within the family) 50 have the variant, which equals 22%. The difference of one letter changes the tense from present to aorist. In the context, they are two ways of saying the same thing. But in any case, with only 22% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

13:31 – παρελευσεται 1145^c || παρελευσονται [40%] 547,645,789,824,1023,1040,1046,1075,1145,1339,1461,1496,1503,1628,1637,1652,1667,1705,1713,2221,2323,2352,2765 {83,147,155,167,189,246,575,685,691,696,757,763,924,932,938,952,955,958,959,960,962,978,1025,1158,1185,1236,1328,1390,1401,1409,1489,1490,1501,1517,1548,1551,1560,1576,1584,1591,1596,1617,1619,1620,1622,1633,1638,1650,1656,1686,1702,2255,2367,2454,2508,2635,2709}

Out of the 229 MSS, 3 are missing, so out of 226 MSS (within the family) 80 have the variant, which equals 35.4%. 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”. Curiously, the percentage dropped four points, compared to the fully collated MSS. Although the 35.4% attestation is significant, it is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

14:25 – γενηματος || γεννηματος [25%] 18,141,204,553,928,1133,1147^{alt},1572,1705,2221,2253^c,2261,2323,2466,2503,2554^c {58,66,170,189,201,214,386,394,402,415,480,520,521,594,664,676,694,746^c,758,769,797,825,932,940,961,1092,1095,1132,1158,1165,1180,1189,1234,1236,1247,1323,1334,1390^c,1427,1445,1476,1482,1487,1492,1493,1559,1621^c,1625,1649,1656,1659,1680,1688,1694,1700,1779,1786,2204,2284,2322,2355,2407,2496,2508,2559,2598,2673,2692,2714,2774,2806}

Out of the 229 MSS, 4 are missing, so out of 225 MSS (within the family) 81 have the variant, which equals 36%. 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, so the first form is correct. The second form works as a derived meaning. Although the 36% attestation is significant, it is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

15:33 – ενατης 35^c,1075^c || εννατης [20%] 35,547,645,928,1023,1075,1199,1251,1572,1667^c,2765 {56,58,66,147,155,167,189,290,361,363^c,394,415,479,520,521,676,696,797^c,825,897,932,938,953,966,986,1020,1092^c,1095,1158,1165,1180,1236,1247,1323,1334,1389,1390,1401,1445,1453,1476,1480,1482,1490,1499,1552,1559,1576,1599,1601,1609^c,1621,1622,1625,1633,1638,1659,1680,1700,2204,2260,(2284),2296,2367,2407,2444,2460,2496,2508,2598,2635,2673,2692,2714}

Out of the 229 MSS, 5 are missing, so out of 224 MSS (within the family) 80 have the variant, which equals 35.7%. 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 35.7% attestation is significant, it is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

15:46 – επι την θυραν 35^c,1111^{alt},2273^c || 1 τη θυρα [1%] 35,141,553,928,1111,1133,1147,1572,2253,2261,2554,2876,1.2110 {66,170,394,402,521,746^c,758,769,797,890,961,986,1092,1132,1189,1247,1250,1334,1427,1445,1482,1487,1493,1517^c,1543,1559,1600,1636,1680,1688,1694,1700,1779,1786,2204,2322,2355,2407,2508,2692,2714,2806}

Out of the 229 MSS, 5 are missing, so out of 224 MSS (within the family) 56 have the variant, which equals 25%. Is the noun phrase accusative or dative? The preposition works with three cases, those two plus the genitive. In the context, the translation is the same, “against the door”. If the idea of ‘motion toward’ is included in the accusative, then it is especially appropriate here. But in any case, with only 25% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the thirteen 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 Mark, 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 six MSS. Of the 58 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 34 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter (which is rather long), and the MSS yet to be collated will doubtless add many more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 13 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter one.

Chapter 2: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 58 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 41 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 two.

Chapter 3: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 58 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 30 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 three.

Chapter 4: No variant has more than six MSS. Of the 58 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 9 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter four.

Chapter 5: No variant has more than twelve MSS. Of the 58 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 10 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter five.

Chapter 6: No variant has more than ten MSS. Of the 58 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 14 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter (it is unusually long), 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 six.

Chapter 7: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 58 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 34 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 15 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter seven.

Chapter 8: No variant has more than eleven MSS. Of the 58 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 20 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 eight.

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

Chapter 9: No variant has more than ten MSS. Of the 58 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 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter nine.

Chapter 10: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 58 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 14 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter ten.

Chapter 11: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 58 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 14 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter eleven.

Chapter 12: No variant has more than eleven MSS. Of the 58 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 17 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 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twelve.

Chapter 13: No variant has more than twenty-three MSS. Of the 58 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 3 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter thirteen.

Chapter 14: No variant has more than thirteen MSS. Of the 58 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 fourteen.

Chapter 15: No variant has more than fourteen MSS. Of the 58 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 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter fifteen.

Chapter 16: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 58 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 48 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 sixteen, all twenty verses.

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