# The Family 35 archetype for Matthew—final form

Wilbur N. Pickering, ThM PhD

This article is based on a complete collation of the following 54 representatives of the family for Matthew: 18, 35, 55, 128, 204, 246, 363, 386, 402, 479, 510, 547, 553, 586, 685, 757, 789, 824, 867, 897, 928, 955, 1040, 1046, 1062, 1072, 1075, 1111, 1117, 1145, 1189, 1339, 1435, 1461, 1496, 1503, 1551, 1560, 1572, 1637, 1652, 1667, 1694, 1713, 2122, 2175, 2253, 2352, 2382, 2466, 2503, 2554, 2765 and I.2110.[1]

At the ten places where there is a division of at least 10% (in the 54), I spot-checked the following **161** MSS: 58,66,83,141,147,155,167,170,189,201,290,361,394,(415),480,516,520,521,536,575,594, 645,(664),673,676,689,691,694,696,746,758,763,769,781,797,825,932,938,940,952,953,958,959, 960,961,962,966,978,986,1003,1023,1025,1030,1059,1088,1092,1095,(1131),1132,1133,1147, 1158,1165,1180,1185,(1199),1234,1236,1250,1251,1323,1328,1334,1384,1389,(1390),1401,1409, 1427,1445,1462,1476,1480,1482,1487,1488,1489,1490,1492,1493,1501,1508,(1517),(1543),1548, (1552),1559,1584,1591,1596,1599,1600,(1609),1614,1617,1619,1620,1621,1622,1625,1628,1636, 1648,(1649),1650,1656,1658,1659,1680,1686,1688,1700,1702,1786,2204,(2221),2255,2260,2261, 2265,2273,2284,2296,2322,2323,2355,2367,2399,2407,2418,2444,2454,2460,2483,2496,2508, 2520,2598,2621,2635,2636,2647,2673,2689,2692,2709,2714,2715,2767,(2774),2806,L65.

Those 215 MSS represent a heavy majority of the family representatives that are presently available. I neglected a further 17 MSS that were hard to read, not available, incomplete, fringe 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 12.

A few more family representatives may come to light, but not enough to challenge any decisions made here. After adding the 161 spot-checked MSS to the 54 that were fully collated, the attestation for the second reading generally went up, sometimes quite a bit. 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 (with one exception) are listed. Those within { } were spot-checked. The percentages within [ ] refer to the total of known MSS. In the examples below, a MS within parentheses has a variation on the variant.

9:17 – απολουνται 928ᶜ,1572ᶜ || απολλυνται [20%] 35,55,128,363,479,547,553,685,867,928,1111,1189,1435, 1572,1694,2466,2765 {58,66,147,155,167,189,290,361,394,520,521,536,645, 676,694,696,758ᶜ,769,781,825,938,952,953,961,962,966,1023,1092,1095, 1132,1133,1165,1180,1199,1236,1251,1323,1334,1389,1401,1427,1476, 1482,1490,1493,1543,1552,1599,1625,1680,1688,2260,2261,2273,2284, 2296,2322,2367,2407,(2444),2483,2508,2520, 2598,2647,2673,(2714), (2715),2767}

Out of the 215 MSS, 20 are missing, so out of 195 MSS (within the family) 85 have the variant, which equals 43.6%. 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? (Perhaps because

the wineskin was more valuable; an old one could be used for water, etc.) Any difference in meaning is almost too slight to translate. Although 43.6% is significant, it is not enough to warrant a change. In the parallel passages in Mark and Luke the verb is future middle without question. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

19:29 – οικιας  586[alt],928[alt],1189[alt],1572[alt]  || οικιαν  [35%] 18,35,55,128,204,386,402,479,510,547,586,685,867,897,
928,1062,1111,1189,1435,1572,1694,2122,2382,2466,2503,2765  {58,66,
141,147,155,167,189,201,361,480,536,594,645,673,676,691,694,696,758,
781,797,825,940,953,961,962,966,986,1088,1092,1095,1132,1133,1147,
1158,1165,1199,1234,1236,1250,1251,1323,1389,1401,1427,1445,1476,
1482,1490,1492,1493,1517,1543,1599,1609,1625,1659,1680,1688,1700,
1786,2204,2260,2261,2265,2273[c],2284,2296,2322[m],2367,2407,2418,2444,
2460,2483,2496,2508,2520,2598,2621,2673,2714,(2715),2767}

Out of the 215 MSS, 2 are missing, so out of 213 MSS (within the family) 108 have the variant, which equals 50.7%. However, five of the MSS for the singular have the plural as an alternate, plus six corrections, which put the plural ahead. Plural or singular? As with the brothers, if you only have one, that is all you can leave; and if you have none, you leave none. In the parallel passages in Mark and Luke, the evidence is all but unanimous for the singular, so where did Matthew get the plural? Since comparatively few people would have more than one house, presumably, the singular is expected. If the original of Matthew was singular, why would anyone change it to plural, since no one did it in Mark or Luke? But if the original was plural, there would be obvious pressure to change it to singular. The cruel fact is that the family representatives are evenly divided, but I consider that the better representatives are generally on the side of the plural. Putting it all together, I consider that the first form reproduces the archetype, even though there is reasonable doubt. In any case, the change makes no difference to the point of what the Lord was saying; you can't leave what you don't have.

20:5 – ενατην  35[c],1072[c]  || εννατην  [40%] 35,363,479,897,928,1072,1572,1667[c],1694,2175,2765  {58[c],66,147,
155,167,189,290,361,415,516,520,521,536,645,676,691,696,797,825,932[c],
938,953,961,966,986,1023,1030,1088,1092,1095,1132,1133,1158,1165,1180,
1199,1251,1323,1334,1384,1389,1401,1476,1482,1490,1552,1599,1609,
1625,1628,1648,1659,1680,1700,1786,2204,2260,2273[c],2284,2296,2407,
2418,2444,2460,2508,2598,2635,2647,2673,2692,2714,2715}

Out of the 215 MSS, 2 are missing, so out of 213 MSS (within the family) 79 have the variant, which equals 36.7%. 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 36.7% attestation is significant, it is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

21:42 – ημων  || υμων  479,685,1072,1560,1694,2175  {58,66,141,167,189,290,361,415,520,664,689,758,781,797,825,
938,953, 958,961,966,978,986,1023,1025,1059,1092,1131,1132,1133,1199,1236,1323,1384,
1389,1390[c],1401,1445,1462,1476,1508,1543,1552,1584[c],1596,1599,1609,1614,1622,1625,1649,
1658,1659,1680,1700,1702,1786,2204,2221,2255,2260,2261,2265,2296,2323,2399,2407,2418,
2444,2454,2460,2483,2508,2598, 2635,2689,2714,2774,L65}

Out of the 215 MSS, 3 are missing, so out of 212 MSS (within the family) 82 have the variant, which equals 38.7%. First or second person? This is a quote from Psalm 118:22-23. The Hebrew Text has the first person, as does the LXX. Outside Family 35, probably less than 3% of the MSS have the second person, so the comparatively heavy attestation here would appear to be variation within the family. The two forms were pronounced the same way. The change makes no difference to the point that the Lord was making here. The better family representatives are heavily on the side of the first person. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

24:2 – παντα ταυτα 1072ᶜ,1075ᶜ || ~ 21 479,685,1072,1075,1694,2175 {58,66,189,520,664,673,676,694,758,797, 932,938,953,961,962,966,986,1023,1092,1131,1132,1133,1165,1180,1199, 1234,1236,1323,1384,1389,1476,1488,1517,1543,1552,1584,1599,1609, 1621,1622,1625,1648,1659,1700,1786,2204,2360,2261,2296,2355,2407, 2418,2508,2520,2598,2715}

Out of the 215 MSS, 1 is missing, so out of 214 MSS (within the family) 62 have the variant, which equals 29%. Since Greek nouns, pronouns and adjectives have case endings, changing the order of the words does not affect the meaning, so they are two ways of saying the same thing. In any case, a 29% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

24:35 – παρελευσονται 1075ᵃˡᵗ,2466ᵃˡᵗ,2765ᶜ || παρελευσεται [20%] 35,479,1075,1694,2175,2466,2765 {58,66,361,520,536,664,676,689,758,797,825,938,953,961,966,1059, (1131),1132,1165,1185,1199,1323,1384,1389,1462,1476,1508,1543, 1552,1599,1609,1621,1625,1649,1658,1659,2260,2261,2273ᶜ,2296, 2399,2444,2460,2508,2598,2467,2689,2715}

Out of the 215 MSS, 1 is missing, so out of 214 MSS (within the family) 54 have the variant, which equals 25.2%. 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", losing the distinction between singular and plural. In Greek and Hebrew the distinction is maintained. Why do I mention Hebrew? Well, Jesus taught in Hebrew, and Matthew was right there with Him, probably taking notes, in Hebrew. (Luke certainly was not there, and Mark probably was not; they offer parallel accounts, and I will come to them presently.) I suppose that Jesus used the plural form of the verb, that Matthew duly registered, and when translating his note into Greek he retained the plural. There can be little doubt that the archetype had the plural. So much for Matthew. Both Mark and Luke have the verb in the singular: the plural garners 35% in Mark and 30% in Luke, within the family. In all three Gospels 'the heaven' is singular, not plural. Since there are at least three heavens, the reference here must be to the earth's atmosphere, that contains birds and clouds. So it is this planet with its atmosphere that will be destroyed, and it is perfectly reasonable to handle them as a unit, as Mark and Luke do. It was certainly within the Holy Spirit's prerogative to have Matthew do it one way and Mark and Luke the other. The meaning is the same in either case.

25:32 – συναχθησονται || συναχθησεται [70%] 18ᵛ,35,55,128,204,246ᵗ,363,386,402,479,510,547,553,586, 867,897,928,1062,1189,1435,1572,2122,2175,2253,2382,2466,2503,2765 {141,147,155,167,201,290,361,394,415,480,521,536,594,673,689,691,694, 696,758,769,781,938,940,962,986,1023,1059,1088,1147,1158ᶜ,1251,1334, 1384,1401,1427,1445,1462,1482,1490,1492,1493,1508,1599,1621,1649, 1658,1659,1688,1786,2204,2261ᶜ,2265,2273,2284,2296,2322,2355,2367, 2399,2418,2444,2460,2483,2520,2647,2689,2692,2715,2767,2806}

Out of the 215 MSS, none is missing, so out of 215 MSS (within the family) 96 have the variant, which equals 44.7%. Singular, or plural; mass noun, or not? The meaning is the same in either case. Although the 44.7% attestation is significant, it is not enough to warrant a change; the more so since the better representatives are generally with the plural. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

26:29 – γενηματος || γεννηματος [70%] 18,204,246,386,553,685,928,1072,1075,1145,1189,1551,1572,1652ᶜ, 1694,2175,2253ᶜ,2466,2503,2554ᶜ {66,141,170,189,201,394,415,480,520,521, 575,594,673,676,691,694,746ᶜ,758,769,797,825,932,952,958,961,962,1030,1088, 1092,1095,1132,1133,1147,1165,1180,1185,1234,1236,1323,1334,1390,1427, 1445,1476,1482,1488,1492,1493,1501,1548,1596,1622,1625,1628,1648,1656,

Out of the 215 MSS, 1 is missing, so out of 214 MSS (within the family) 94 have the variant, which equals 43.9%. 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 much so, that a reader seeing the longer form would give it the secondary meaning, and we have two ways of saying the same thing. Although the 43.9% attestation is significant, it is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

27:35 – βαλοντες  ||  βαλλοντες  [70%] 35,128,204,363,402,479,510,547,553,586,867,897,928,1189,1435,1572,
1667,1694,2122,2175,2382,2466,2765  {58,66,141,147,155,167,189,290,361,394,
415,516,521,536,645,664,676,696,746,758,769,781,797,825,932,938,940,953,(961),
966,986,1023,1088,1092,(1095),1132,1133,1147,1158,1165,1180,1199,1236,1251,
1323,1334,1384,1389,1390,1401,1427,1445,1476,1482,1490,1493,1543,1552,1599,
1609,1621,1625,1649,1659,1680,1688,1700,1786,2204,2221ᶜ,2260,2261,2265,2273,
2284,2296,2322,2355,2367,2407,2418,2444,2460,2496,2520,2598,2647,(2673),2692,
2714,2767}

Out of the 215 MSS, 7 are missing, so out of 208 MSS (within the family) 113 have the variant, which equals 54.3%. Is it aorist, or present? The controlling clause goes like this: "Having crucified Him they distributed His clothes among themselves, . . ." Is it "casting lots", or "having cast lots"? Either one makes good sense, but strictly speaking, the distributing happened after the casting.[1] For that reason, and because most of the better representatives have the aorist, I here chose the minority reading to represent the archetype. In either case, the basic meaning is not changed.

27:45 – ενατης  35ᶜ  ||  εννατης  [40%]²ˣ 35ᵛ,363,479,547,897,928,1572,1667,1694,2175,2765
{58,66,147,155,167,189,290,361,415,516,520,521,536,645,676,696,797,825,932ᶜ,
938,953,966,1023,1092ᶜ,1095,1158,1165,1180,1199,1236,1251,1323,1334,1384,
1389,1390,1401,1427,1445,1476,1482,1490,(1501),1552,1599,1609,1621,1625,1659,
1680,1700,(1702),2204,2260,2273ᶜ,(2284),2296,2367,2407,(2418),2444,2460,2496,
2508,2598,2635,2647,2673,2692,2709,2714,2715}

Out of the 215 MSS, 4 are missing, so out of 211 MSS (within the family) 80 have the variant, which equals 37.9%. 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 37.9% 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 ten places where there is a division of at least 10% among the collated MSS. As is typical of variation within the family, there is very little difference in meaning between the options. Generally, the difference is of a single letter. As I have demonstrated, we are able to affirm the precise form of the family archetype for the whole book of Matthew, 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.

---

[1] According to Greek grammar, a participle in the aorist tense means that it happened before the time of the main verb to which it is subordinated; a participle in the present tense means it is simultaneous to the main verb.

I will now consider the force of the evidence chapter by chapter, simply counting the collated MSS, 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 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 one.

Chapter 2: No variant has more than one MS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 46 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 two.

Chapter 3: No variant has more than one MS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 47 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 4 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter three.

Chapter 4: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 51 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 40 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 four.

Chapter 5: No variant has more than four 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 13 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter five.

Chapter 6: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 53 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 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 54 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 38 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 seven.

Chapter 8: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 54 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 36 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 eight.

Chapter 9: No variant has more than 17 MSS. Of the 52 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 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter nine.

Chapter 10: No variant has more than two 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

---

[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 13 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter ten.

Chapter 11: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 52 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 2 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter eleven.

Chapter 12: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 52 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 28 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 14 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twelve.

Chapter 13: No variant has more than four 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 14 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter thirteen.

Chapter 14: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 53 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 12 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter fourteen.

Chapter15: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 53 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 37 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 fifteen.

Chapter 16: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 53 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 39 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 11 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter sixteen.

Chapter 17: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 53 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 16 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter seventeen.

Chapter 18: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 52 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 38 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 eighteen.

Chapter 19: No variant has more than 26 MSS. Of the 53 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 4 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter nineteen.

Chapter 20: No variant has more than ten MSS. Of the 53 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 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty.

Chapter 21: No variant has more than six MSS. Of the 53 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 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty-one.

Chapter 22: No variant has more than one MS. Of the 53 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 twenty-two.

Chapter 23: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 53 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 twenty-three.

Chapter 24: No variant has more than seven MSS. Of the 54 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 12 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty-four.

Chapter 25: No variant has more than 27 MSS. Of the 54 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 21 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 2 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty-five.

Chapter 26: No variant has more than 17 MSS. Of the 54 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 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty-six.

Chapter 27: No variant has more than 23 MSS. Of the 54 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 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty-seven.

Chapter 28: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 54 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 42 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 4 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty-eight.

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