

A Discussion of all Divisions within Family 35 for the whole NT

Wilbur N. Pickering, ThM PhD

The Family 35 archetype for Matthew—final form

This section 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, L.65.

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 Ivron 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 – ἀπολουνται 928^c,1572^c || ἀπολλουνται [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, 694,696,758^c,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, 1552,1599,1625,1680,1688,2260,2273,2284,2296,2322,2367,2407,(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

¹ All 54 MSS I collated myself. Ivron 2110 does not have a GA number, so far as I know (it is in their treasury).

second is present passive. In the immediately prior clauses, both *εκχεται* and *ρηγγυονται* 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,L.65}

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 1072^c,1075^c || ~ 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 1075^{alt},2466^{alt},2765^c || 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),1132,1165,1185,1199,1323,1384,1389,1462,1476,1508,1543,1552,1599,1609,1621,1625,1649,1658,1659,2260,2261,2273^c,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 – συναχθισονται || συναχθησεται [70%] 18^v,35,55,128,204,246ⁱ,363,386,402,479,510,547,553,586,867,897,928,1062,1189,1435,1572,2122,2175,2253,2382,2466,2503,2765 {141,147,155,167,201,290,361,394,415,480,521,536,594,673,689,691,694,696,758,769,781,938,940,962,986,1023,1059,1088,1147,1158^c,1251,1334,1384,1401,1427,1445,1462,1482,1490,1492,1493,1508,1599,1621,1649,1658,1659,1688,1786,2204,2261^c,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 – γεννηματος || γεννηματος [70%] 18,204,246,386,553,685,928,1072,1075,1145,1189,1551,1572,1652^c,1694,2175,2253^c,2466,2503,2554^c {66,141,170,189,201,394,415,480,520,521,575,594,673,676,691,694,746^c,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,
1622,1625,1628,1648,1656,1680,1688,1700,1786,2221,2261,2265,2284,2322,2323,2355,2407,
2418^c,2496, 2508,2598,2621,2636,2673,2692,2714,2774,2806}

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,
1482,1490,1493,1543,1552,1599,1609,1621,1625,1649,1659,1680,1688,1700,1786,2204,2221^c,
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 35^c || εννατης [40%]^{2x} 35^v,363,479,547,897,928,1572,1667,1694,2175,2765 {58,66,147,155,
167,189,290,361,415,516,520,521,536,645,676,696,797,825,932^c,938,953,966,1023,1092^c,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),2204,2260,2273^c,(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.

Chapter 15: 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. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for Mark—final form

This section 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

¹ All 58 MSS I collated myself.

At the thirteen places where there is a division of at least 10%, of the collated MSS, I spot-checked the following **171** MSS: 55, (56), 58, 66, 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 Ivron 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)¹, 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}

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%) 18,789,1046,1111,1117,1713,2253,2352,2382,2503,2554,2621,2110 {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

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

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,L.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 – ἀποκτενοντες 35^c,L.65^c || ἀποκτεννοντες [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”. 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. 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 – γεννηματος || 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% of the collated MSS. 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

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 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.

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. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for Luke—final form

This section 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 Ivron 2110.¹

At the fifteen places where there is a division of at least 10% of those 51, 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.

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

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 Ivron 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 35^c,769^c,928^c,1493^c,1694^c || 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, 1132,1133,1189,1250,1334,1390,1427,1445^c,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.

2:40 – αυτω 35^{alt},586^{alt},789^c || αυτο [58%] 18,35,201,246,510,547,586,757^{alt},789,1072^c,1111,1328,1339,1496^{alt}, 1503^{alt},1548,1551, 2352^{alt},2367,2382,2503,2765 {55,56,61,66^m,83,147,155,167,285,386, 387,516,645,696,938,940,952,955,958,960,1017,1023,1025,1046^c,1062,1075,1158,1185, 1234,1251,1389,1400,1401,1453,1488,1489,1490,1492,1501,1517,1544,1560,1584,1591, 1617^{alt},1619^{alt},1622,1628,1633,1650,1656^{alt},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 1072^{alt} || τον λαον [85%] 18,35^{alt},128,246,402,479^{alt},547,757^{alt},781,789^{alt},824,867,1072,1111,1117, 1328,1384,1435,1503^{alt},1551,1637^{alt},1652^{alt},2122,2367,2466^{alt},2554,2765,I.2110 {55,66,83^c,147, 155,167,189,285,290,363,386,521,645,664,676,696,758,763,938,952,960^{alt},962^{alt},1003,1017, 1018,1023,1025,1030,1040^c,1046^c,1059,1075,1092,1131,1132,1133,1158,1234,1236,1247,1250, 1251,1329,1334,1400,1401,1409,1445,1471,1488^{alt},1490,1492,1501^{alt},1508,1517,1543,1560, 1548^{alt},1600,1622,1625,1633,1650,1656^{alt},1658,1659^c,1686,1700,1703,1705,1779,1786,1813, 2221,2249,2255,2261,2273,2284,2355,2399,2483,2510^c,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

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

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 {56,58,61,189,285,387,520,575,664,676,758^c,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 246^m || εστηκοτων [20%] 246,691,757,781,789^c,824,1072,1328,1339,1461,1496,1503,1548,1551,1637,1652,1694,1713,2352 {66,83,285,516,575,689,758^c,763,938,955,958,959,960,962,1003,1017,1018,1023,1025,1030,1040,1046,1059,1075,1116,1131,1132,1145,1185,1224,1390^c,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 is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

10:41 – ο ιησους ειπεν αυτη || ~ 3412 [59%] 35^c,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%] 201,246,553^c,928,1548,1551,1621,1667,2554^c {66,189,386,394,520,521^c,676,758^c,797,932,938^c,958,1023,1088,1095,1132,1165,1185,1189,1234,1236,1247,1323,1329,1334,1400,1427,1445,1462,1476,1482,1501^{alt},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 {56,58,61,66,141,285^c,290,516,797,938,952,953,958,959,966,1020,1023,1075,1092,1116,1132,1133,1185,1199,1224,1236,1250,1389,1390,1400,1401,1453,1501,1543,1544,1591,1601,1648,1649,1700,1703,1705,1779,1786,1789,1813,2175,2249,2261,2296,2355,2407,2418,2454,2483,2510,2520,2635^v,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 246,1461,1496,1548,1551,1.2110 {290,363,520,575,763,953,958,959,966,1025,1030,1040,1092,1095,1185,1189,1389,1499,1544,1576^c,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 479^c || 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 479^c || 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%] 246,547,757,1111,1117,1384^{alt},1548,1551,1652,1667,1713,2352,2367,2554,2765,1.2110 {(61),66^c,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”. (See the discussion in Matthew and Mark.) 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%] 18,201,402,553,769,928,1147,1493,1621,1667,2466^{alt},2503,2554^c
{61,66,141,189,363,386,394,520^v,521,676,758^c,797,932,940,958,1095,1132,1165,1189,1234,
1236,1247,1250,1323,1329,1334,1427,1445,1453,1476,1480,1482,1492^{alt},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 35^c || εννατης [30%] 35,479,547,691,897,928,1384,1621,1667,1694,2367,2765 {56,58,61,66,
147,155,167,170,189,361,363,387,394,520^v,521,645,676,696, 797^c,932,938,953,966,1020,1023,
1075,1092,1095,1116,1132,1158,1165,1199,1236,1250,1251,1323,1329,1334,1389,1401,1409^s,
1445,1453,1471,1476,1480,1482,1490,1499,1543,1572,1576,1599,1601,1625,1638,1649,1659,
1700,1703,1813,2204,2249,2260,2273^{alt},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 1111^c || --- [50%] 201[?],246,1072,1111,1493,1548,1551,1637,1667,2466,1.2110 {167,170,189,290,387,394,
516,664,676,689,758,763,938,952,953,955^c,958,959,960,962,966,1020,1023,1025,1059,1062,1075,
1088,1092^c,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% of the collated MSS. 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 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

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

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.

Chapter 15: 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. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for John—final form

This section is based on a complete collation of the following 57 representatives of the family for John: 18, 35, 83, 128, 141, 201, 204, 363, 402, 479, 480, 510, 547, 553, 586, 685, 696, 757, 789, 824, 867, 897, 928, 1072, 1075, 1111, 1117, 1145, 1147, 1334, 1339, 1384, 1435, 1461, 1496, 1503, 1559, 1560, 1572, 1617, 1637, 1652, 1667, 1686, 1694, 1700, 1713, 2122, 2253, 2322, 2352, 2382, 2466, 2503, 2554, 2765 and Ivion 2110.¹

At the seven places where there is a division of at least 10% of the 57, I spot-checked the following **170** MSS: 55, 56, 58, 61, 66, 105, 147, 155, 167, 170, 189, 246, 285, 290, 353, 361, 386, 387, 394, 415, 521, 575, 588, 645, 660^s, 664, 676, 689, 691, 758, 763, 768, 769, 781, 797, 806, 825, 932, 938, 940, 952, 953, 955, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 966, 986, 1003, 1017, 1020, 1023, 1025, 1030, 1046, 1059, 1062, 1088, 1092, 1095, 1116, 1119, 1131, 1132, 1133, 1158, 1165, 1180, 1181, 1185, 1189, 1199, 1224, 1236, 1247, 1248, 1250, 1251, 1314, 1323, 1328, 1329, 1348, 1390, 1400, 1401, 1445, 1453, 1462, 1476, 1477, 1482, 1487, 1488, 1489, 1490, 1492, 1493, 1497, 1499, 1501, 1508, 1543, 1544, 1548, 1551, 1584, 1591, 1596, 1599, 1600, 1601, 1614, 1618, 1619, 1620, 1622, 1625, 1628, 1633, 1634, 1636, 1638, 1648, 1649, 1650, 1656, 1657, 1658, 1659, 1702, 1703, 1813, 2131, 2136, 2204, 2221, 2255, 2260, 2261, (2265), 2273, 2284, 2296, 2309, 2355, 2365, 2367, 2399, 2407, 2454, 2460, 2479, 2496, 2508, 2510, 2520, 2559, 2598, 2621, 2636, 2647, 2673, 2689, 2692, 2715, 2767, 2806.

Those 227 MSS represent a heavy majority of the family representatives that are presently available. I neglected a further 15 MSS that were hard to read or scrambled (the pages were bound

¹ All 57 MSS I collated myself. Ivion 2110 does not have a GA number, so far as I know (it is in their treasury).

out of order). There are at least 60 further MSS with varying amounts of mixture added to a Family 35 base (just as my model predicts). 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 57 fully collated MSS remains the same after adding the 170 spot-checked MSS. 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 (with one exception) are listed. Those within { } were spot-checked. The percentages within [] refer to the total of known MSS.

1:32 – εμαρτυρησεν || 1 ο [20%] 201,363,547,553,1435,1667 {147,189,290,575,660^s,676,825,953,1236,1492,1544,1625,1638,1813,2261,2355,2367,2407,2598,2767}

Out of the 227 MSS, 3 are missing, so out of 224 MSS (within the family) 26 have the variant, which equals 11.6%. The addition of the definite article does not affect the meaning; the translation is the same. But in any case, with less than 12% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The shorter form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

6:54 – αυτον 685^c || 1 εν [25%] 685,1339,1496,1617,1637,1700 {56,58,61,66^c,170,189,285,290,353,660^s,676,758,763^c,932,953,986,1003,1017,1095,1116,1158,1165,1180,1236,1314,1323,1329,1348,1390^c,1476,1489,1499,1508,1543,1551,1591,1619,1620,1625,1634,1638,1658,1813,2131,2204,2221,2261,2265,2309,2399,2496,2508,2598,2673,2689,2715,2767}

Out of the 227 MSS, 2 are missing, so out of 225 MSS (within the family) 60 have the variant, which equals 26.7%. Since Greek nouns and adjectives have case endings, that signal grammatical function, a preposition is often implicit in the case ending, as in this case. Making the preposition explicit affects neither the meaning nor a translation, so we have two ways of saying the same thing. If the longer form were original, why would anyone delete the preposition? Adding the preposition to the shorter form would be a ‘natural’. But in any case, with less than 27% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The shorter form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

7:29 – εγω || 1 δε [30%] 141,204,547,553,897,928,1147,1334,1572,2322 {56,394,415,521,588,691,758,769,781,797,806,962,986,1092,1119^c,1133,1180,1181,1189,1247,1248,1250,1445,1477,1482,1493,1625^c,1638,2204,2261^c,2273,2355,2407,2636,2692}

Out of the 227 MSS, 4 are missing, so out of 223 MSS (within the family) 42 have the variant, which equals 18.8%. The conjunction was expected, so adding it would be a ‘natural’. It would make a slight difference in a translation. 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.

8:4 – αυτοφωρω || αυτοφορω [60%] 479^c,1145,1334,1559,1700,2352,2466,1.2110 {56,61,189,285,290,387,394,521,664,689,691,758,763^c,806,940,952,959,961,966,1017,1025,1059,1062,1131,1132,1158,1165,1224,1247,1445,1453,1462,1476,1487,1501,1543,1591,1599,1601,1614,1618,1622,1634,1638,1649,1656,1657,1658,1702,1813,2204,2221,2255,2260,2309,2399,2559,2598,2621,2635,2689,2692,2715}

Out of the 227 MSS, 1 is missing, so out of 226 MSS (within the family) 69 have the variant, which equals 30.5%. But in any case, a mere alternate spelling is not a proper variant, since neither the identity nor the meaning of the word is affected. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

11:21 – ουν || 1 η [40%] 141,204,363,553,928,1147,1334,1572,1667,2322 {290,394,521,660^s,691,758,769,797,806,953,986,1017,1020,1092,1116,1133,1158,1181,1189,1199,1247,1248,1250,1314,1445,1477,1482,1493,1497,1622,1656^c,2136,2204,2261^c,2284,2296,2355,2407,2692,2715}

Out of the 227 MSS, 4 are missing, so out of 223 MSS (within the family) 48 have the variant, which equals 21.1%. The addition of the definite article does not affect the meaning; the translation is the same. 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.

12:6 – ἐμελεν 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 {55,58,61,66,285,361^c,386,691,758,763,769,938^c,940,955,959,1030^c,1132,1189,1247,1390^c,1400,1445,1482,1492,1493,1499,1544,1548,1599,1600^c,1619,1620,1625,1638,1648,1650,1656^c,1702,1813,2131,2136,2221,2260,2284,2496,2559,2598,2621,2635,2636,2692,2806}

εμελλεν [60%] 35,83,128,363,510,547,553,575,586,685,696,757,789,824,867,897,1072,1111,1117,1145,1147,1435,1559,1560,1617,1637,1652,1686,1694,1700,1713,2352,2382,2466,2765,1,2110 {56,105,147,155,170,189,246,290,353,361,387,394,415,521,588,645,660^s,664,676,689,758^c,768,781,797,806,825,932,938,952,953,958,960,961,962,966,986,1003,1017,1020,1023,1030,1025,1046,1059,1062,1088,1092,1095,1116,1119,1131,1133,1158,1165,1180,1181,1185,1199,1224,1236,1248,1250,1251,1314,1323,1328,1329,1348,1390,1401,1453,1462,1476,1477,1488,1489,1490,1497,1499^c,1501,1508,1543,1548,1551,1591,1596,1600,1601,1614,1618,1622,1628,1633,1634,1636,1638,1649,1656,1657,1703,1813,2204,2255,2260,2261,2265,2273,2296,2355,2367,2407,2454,2479,2508,2510,2647,2673,2689,2715,2767}

As is typical of variation within the family, the difference is of one letter. However, in this case that one letter changes the verb! 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') simply 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. Someone reading to himself would do the same. 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—P^{66,75},^κ,^Α,^Β,^Δ,^Q,^W—have the shorter form here, which would go along with my hypothesis above. In spite of the lopsided attestation, since the central meaning of the longer form cannot be correct, being nonsense, I conclude that the first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

18:39 – ημιν || υμιν [80%] 928,1334,1572,1667,1700 {56,58,61,66,105,147,167,189,285,290,353,387,394,588,660^s,676,691,758,768,825,932,952,953,966,986,1003,1017,1095,1165,1180,1181,1185,1224,1236,1247,1248,1250,1323,1329,1348,1445,1476,1477,1482,1497,1622,1625,1633,1648,1703,1813,2136,2204,2221,2260,2261,2265,2284,2296,2479,2496,2508,2598,2673,2692,2715}

Out of the 227 MSS, 16 are missing, so out of 211 MSS (within the family) 71 have the variant, which equals 33.6%. Really now, would Rome release a prisoner based on a Jewish demand? This was evidently a bit of 'pub. rel.' that Rome had decided to do. Since the second person dominated the transmission outside the family, for whatever reason, that may have influenced some copyists. As usual, the difference is one letter, and both vowels were pronounced the same way, adding to the confusion. In any case, 33.6% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. I conclude that the first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the seven places where there is a division of at least 10% of the collated MSS. 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 John, 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, 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 57 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 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter one.

Chapter 2: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 57 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 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter two.

Chapter 3: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 57 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 31 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 three.

Chapter 4: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 57 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 31 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 four.

Chapter 5: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 57 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 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter five.

Chapter 6: No variant has more than six MSS. Of the 57 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 six.

Chapter 7: No variant has more than ten MSS. Of the 57 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 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter seven.

Chapter 8: No variant has more than seven MSS. Of the 57 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 eight.

Chapter 9: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 56 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 42 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 9 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter nine.

Chapter 10: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 57 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 12 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter ten.

Chapter 11: No variant has more than ten MSS. Of the 57 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 eleven.

Chapter 12: No variant has more than thirty-five MSS (please read the discussion of the division in 12:6). Of the 57 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), only 11 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 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twelve.

Chapter 13: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 56 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 11 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter thirteen.

Chapter 14: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 57 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 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter fourteen.

Chapter 15: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 57 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 10 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter fifteen.

Chapter 16: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 57 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 10 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter sixteen.

Chapter 17: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 57 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 4 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter seventeen.

Chapter 18: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 56 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 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter eighteen.

Chapter 19: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 54 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 18 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter nineteen.

Chapter 20: 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 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty.

Chapter 21: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 54 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 15 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty-one.

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35, for the book of John, based on the available evidence. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for Acts—final form

This section is based on a complete collation of the following 63 representatives of the family for Acts: 18, 35, 141, 149*, 201, 204, 328, 386, 394, 444, 604*, 757, 801, 824, 928, 986, 1040*, 1058*, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1140, 1247*, 1248*, 1249, 1482, 1503, 1508*, 1548, 1617, 1619*, 1628, 1636*, 1637, 1652, 1656*, 1723, 1732, 1740, 1746*, 1749*, 1761, 1855, 1856, 1858^{frag}, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892*, 1897, 2080, 2218, 2255*, 2261, 2303^{frag}, 2352, 2378, 2431*, 2441, 2466, 2554, 2587 and 2723.¹

At the twenty-nine places where there is a division of at least 10% of the 63, I spot-checked the following 27 MSS: 206^s, 432, 634, 664, 1101, 1618, 1725², 1733, 1737, 1745, 1748, 1752, 1754^s, 1763, 1766, 1767, 1768, 2175, 2221, 2289, 2626, 2653, 2691, 2704, 2777, 2778, 2926^s. Those 90 MSS represent the total of family representatives that are presently available, with the exception of GA 1400 whose microfilm is very hard to read. A few more family representatives may come to light, but not enough to challenge any decisions made here. My ‘presently available’ refers to the images that have been posted by both the INTF and the CSNTM. 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.³ Those within { } were spot-checked. The percentages within [] refer to the total of known MSS.

1:11 – ουτος || 1 ο [80%] 18,35,141,204,328,386,444,1100,1732,1876,1897,2255,2466,2554 {432,634,1101,1733,1766⁴,1768,2221,2653,2926^{s,5}}

Out of the 90 MSS, 16 are missing, so out of 74 extant MSS (within the family) 23 have the variant, which equals 31%. A demonstrative pronoun defines, even more than a definite article, so the article is redundant here. To include the article affects neither the meaning nor a translation, so it is unnecessary. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

3:1 – ενατην 35^c,141^c || εννατην [30%] 35,141,204,328,394,928,1247,1249,1749,1855,1856,1876,2080,2255,2261,2431 {1101,1748⁶,2175,2653,2926^s}

¹ The MSS marked with an asterisk (*) were collated by Dr. Eduardo Flores; the rest I collated myself. 1858 contains 23:6 – 28:31 and 2303 contains 8:19 – 15:25.

² The first four chapters are not f³⁵.

³ There is a subgroup whose core is composed of MSS 328,394,928,1249,2431 and 2441, with 1247, 1723 and 1856 in a second tier, plus a scattering of others. This subgroup appears in most of the divisions.

⁴ 1766 has 1:1 – 2:31; 16:1-29; 19:40 – 20:28.

⁵ 2926^s has 1:1 – 4:21.

⁶ 1748 is missing 4:13-22.

Out of the 90 MSS, 14 are missing, so out of 76 extant MSS (within the family) 21 have the variant, which equals 27.6%. But in any case, a mere alternate spelling is not a proper variant, since neither the identity nor the meaning of the word is affected. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

9:7 – ενεοι 35^c,2466^c || εννεοι [40%] 35,141^c,328,386,394,801,928,986,1040,1058,1140,1247,1249,1482,1508,1548,1723,1746,1749,1761,1855,1856,1892,2218,2255,2431,2466,2587 {634,664,1101,1725¹,1748,1752²,1763³,2175,2653,2704}

Out of the 90 MSS, 11 are missing, so out of 79 extant MSS (within the family) 37 have the variant, which equals 46.8%. But in any case, a mere alternate spelling is not a proper variant, since neither the identity nor the meaning of the word is affected. The first form, attested by the better representatives, reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

10:3 – ενατην 35^c || εννατην [35%] 35,328,394,928,986,1247,1249,1482,1508,1732,1749,1855,1856,2255,2431 {1725,1748,2175,2653}

Out of the 90 MSS, 11 are missing, so out of 79 extant MSS (within the family) 19 have the variant, which equals 24.1%. But in any case, a mere alternate spelling is not a proper variant, since neither the identity nor the meaning of the word is affected. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

10:30 – ενατην 35^c || εννατην [35%] 35,328,394,928,986,1247,1249,1482,1508,1732,1749,1855,1856,2255,2431 {1101,1748,1763,2175,2653}

Out of the 90 MSS, 11 are missing, so out of 79 extant MSS (within the family) 20 have the variant, which equals 25.3%. But in any case, a mere alternate spelling is not a proper variant, since neither the identity nor the meaning of the word is affected. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

11:9 – εκ δευτερου φωνη || ~ 312 [80%] 328,394,928,986,1247,1249,1482,1723,1749,1855,1856,2255,2431,2441 {1748,1752,1763,2175,2704}

Out of the 90 MSS, 10 are missing, so out of 80 extant MSS (within the family) 19 have the variant, which equals 23.8%. Since Greek nouns and adjectives have case endings, that signal grammatical function, changing the order of the words within a phrase rarely makes any difference in the meaning; they are two ways of saying the same thing, as in this case. Either choice affects neither the meaning nor a translation, but with less than 25% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

11:26 – συναχθηναι 35^c,1508^c,1652^c,1746^c || 1 εν [20%] 35,141,204,328,394,444,604,801,928,986,1058,1247,1249,1482,1508,1723,1732,1746,1749,1761,1855,1856,1876,1897,2080,2255,2261,2431,2554,2587 {432,1725,1748,1752,1763,1768,2175,2221,2704}

Out of the 90 MSS, 10 are missing, so out of 80 extant MSS (within the family) 39 have the variant, which equals 48.75% (if we subtract the corrections, it would be 43.75%). Since Greek nouns and adjectives have case endings, that signal grammatical function, a preposition is often implicit in the case ending, as in this case. Making the preposition explicit affects neither the meaning nor a translation, so we have two ways of saying the same thing. If the longer form were original, why would anyone delete the preposition? Adding the preposition to the shorter form would be a

¹ 1725 had a different exemplar in the first four chapters.

² 1752 begins at 8:11.

³ 1763 begins at 4:25.

‘natural’. Although the variant has the strongest attestation that we have seen so far, it is not enough to warrant replacing the first reading. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

12:4 – αναγαγειν 1723^c || αγαγειν 328,394,928,986,1249,1508,1723,1749,1855,1856,2255,2431 {1725}

Out of the 90 MSS, 12 are missing, so out of 78 extant MSS (within the family) 13 have the variant, which equals 16.7%. There could be a slight difference in meaning between the verbs, but the attestation for the variant is so low that it is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

12:25 – εις αντιοχειαν 141,204,328,394,801,928,986,1140,1247,1249,1482,1723,1732,1749,1761,1855,1856,1876,1897,
2080,2255,2261,2378,2431,2441 {1725}
απο ιερουσαλημ 18,386,1100,2554 {634,1101,1733,2303}
απο ιερουσαλημ εις αντιοχειαν 444,1058,1548,2587 {664,1400,1752,1763,2221,2704}
εξ ιερουσαλημ 1865
εξ ιερουσαλημ εις αντιοχειαν 604,1865^c {432,1767,1768}
εις ιερουσαλημ 35^c,149,201,757,824,1040,1072,1075,1248,1503,1508,1617,1619,1628,1636,1637,1656,1723^c,
1740,1746,1864,1892,2352,2431^c,2466,2723 {1618,1737,1748,2653,2691}
εις ιερουσαλημ εις αντιοχειαν 35 (not a conflation, because it is nonsense; the copyist knew both readings
and recorded them both)
Lacking: 1652,2218 {206^{s,fr},1745^{fr},1754^{s,fr},1766^{fr},1858^{fr},2175^{fr},2289^{fr},2626^{fr},2777^{fr},2778^{fr},2926^{s,fr}}

Totals:

εις αντιοχειαν = 26

απο ιερουσαλημ = 8

απο ιερουσαλημ εις αντιοχειαν = 10

εξ ιερουσαλημ = 1

εξ ιερουσαλημ εις αντιοχειαν = 4

εις ιερουσαλημ = 28

Lacking = 13

Comment: The first five readings are votes against the sixth, so the vote is 49:28. However, 15 of the 28 are from the M. Lavras monastery (Mt. Athos), which probably indicates a common influence. The vote for the sixth reading should probably be reduced, making the advantage of the first reading all the stronger (if the 15 represent 5 exemplars, the vote would be 49:18). The reading of the archetype is the first, εις αντιοχειαν. Within the context, ‘to Jerusalem’ is nonsense. For a complete discussion, please see my article, “Where to Place a ‘Comma’—Acts 12:45”.

14:10 – ηλλατο 35^c || ηλατο [15%] 35,328,386,394,444,801,928,986,1058,1247,1249,1482,1508,1548,1746,1749,
1855^c,1856,2255,2431,2441,2587 {634,1748,1752,2704}

Out of the 90 MSS, 11 are missing, so out of 79 extant MSS (within the family) 25 have the variant, which equals 31.6%. The first reading is presumably an unusual form of the 1st aorist that some ‘corrected’ by making it imperfect (as in HF, RP, and TR), while others deleted the ‘extra’ λ, producing the normal 1st aorist form (as in OC and NU). If we have alternate spellings of the 1st aorist, then there is no difference in the meaning or a translation. That some copyists would change an unusual form to the expected one is predictable, but who would change the expected form to an unusual one? Why? In any case, 31.6% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. I conclude that the first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

14:17 – υμιν || ημιν [15%] 328,386,394,604,801,928,986,1140,1247,1249,1482,1508,1652,1723,1732,1746,1749,1855,1856,1892,1897,2080,2218,2255,2441 {432,634,1101,1737,1763,1768,2653}

Out of the 90 MSS, 10 are missing, so out of 80 extant MSS (within the family) 32 have the variant, which equals 40%. Is it 'giving you rain from heaven', or 'giving us rain from heaven'? Within the context, the extemporaneous 'sermon' in Lystra, it makes no difference; the 'us' would be inclusive, including the hearers. That said, the 40% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. I conclude that the first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

16:26 – ανεθι || ανειθι [15%] 328,394,928,986,1058,1249,1482,1723,1746,1749,1855,1856,2255,2352,2431,2441,2587 {664,1752,1763,1768,2289¹,2704}

Out of the 90 MSS, 9 are missing, so out of 81 extant MSS (within the family) 23 have the variant, which equals 28.4%. We have alternate spellings for the aorist passive, so they are two ways of saying the same thing. Either choice affects neither the meaning nor a translation, but with less than 30% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

17:4 – εξ αυτων επεισθησαν || ~312 328,394,928,1247,1249,1508,1723,1749,1856,2431 {664,1748,2289}

Out of the 90 MSS, 10 are missing, so out of 80 extant MSS (within the family) 13 have the variant, which equals 16.25%. Since Greek nouns and adjectives have case endings, that signal grammatical function, changing the order of the words within a phrase rarely makes any difference in the meaning; they are two ways of saying the same thing, as in this case. Either choice affects neither the meaning nor a translation, but with only 16.25% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

17:25 – διδους πασιν ζων και πνοην || ~21543 394,928,1247,1249,1508,1723,1749,1856,2431 {1748,2289}

Out of the 90 MSS, 11 are missing, so out of 79 extant MSS (within the family) 11 have the variant, which equals 13.9%. Since Greek nouns and adjectives have case endings, that signal grammatical function, changing the order of the words within a phrase rarely makes any difference in the meaning; they are two ways of saying the same thing, as in this case. Either choice affects neither the meaning nor a translation, but with only 13.9% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

18:17 – εμελλεν 1652^c || εμελεν [14%] 18,141^c,149,201,386,394,444,604,757,928,1040,1058,1072,1075^c,1100,1247,1248,1249^c,1482,1503,1548,1619,1628,1636,1652,1656^c,1723,1740,1761,1855,1864,2218,2255,2352,2554^c,2587 {634,1101,1737,1754^s,2221}

Out of the 90 MSS, 11 are missing, so out of 79 extant MSS (within the family) 36 have the variant, which equals 45.6%. Here we have different verbs, although the difference is of only one letter. Is the verb μελλω or μελω? If the former, the meaning is not common and could easily give rise to the latter; the reverse change would be unlikely. Render: 'None of this was a delay to Gallio'; Gallio is in the dative case. His name should be in the nominative case, if he is taken to be the subject of the verb. 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 Acts 22:16 the same verb has the sense of 'delay'. Taking all relevant considerations into account, the 45.6% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. I conclude that the first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

¹ 2289 has 15:36 – 28:31.

19:34 – επιγνοντες 35^c,1249^c || επιγνοντων [5%] 35,328,394,604,928,986,1247,1249,1482,1723,1749,1855,1856,2080,2255 {432,2289}

Out of the 90 MSS, 11 are missing, so out of 79 extant MSS (within the family) 17 have the variant, which equals 21.5%. Is the case nominative, or genitive? In the context, the nominative is grammatically correct. In any case, with only 21.5% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

20:3 – γνωμη || γνωμης [7%] 328,394,928,986,1058,1247,1249,1482,1749,1856,2255 {1752,1763,1766,2704}

Out of the 90 MSS, 10 are missing, so out of 80 extant MSS (within the family) 15 have the variant, which equals 18.75%. Is the case nominative, or genitive? Being the subject of the verb, the nominative is correct. In any case, with only 18.75% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

20:9 – απο || υπο [30%] 328,394,1140,1247,1249^c,1732,1749,1761,1856,1897 {432,1725,1766,2289}

Out of the 90 MSS, 10 are missing, so out of 80 extant MSS (within the family) 13 have the variant, which equals 16.3%. Both prepositions work with the genitive case, and both can mean 'by'. The second is more common in that function, which probably accounts for the change. In any case, with only 16.3% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

22:20 – στεφανου του μαρτυρος σου || ~2341 328,394,928,1247,1249,1508,1723,1749,2441 {664,2289,2653}

Out of the 90 MSS, 10 are missing, so out of 80 extant MSS (within the family) 12 have the variant, which equals 13.3%. Since Greek nouns and adjectives have case endings, that signal grammatical function, changing the order of the words within a phrase rarely makes any difference in the meaning; they are two ways of saying the same thing, as in this case. Either choice affects neither the meaning nor a translation, but with only 13.3% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

23:24 – φιλικα 35^c || φιληκα [25%] 35,328,394,604,757,928,1040,1058,1072,1247,1248,1249,1482,1503,1508,1548,1617,1619,1636,1637,1652,1723,1740,1746,1749,1761,1855^c,1892,2218,2255,2352,2431,2441,2587 {432,664,1618,1737,1745¹,1748,1752,1754^s,1763,1768,2289,2653,2704,2777²}

Out of the 90 MSS, 7 are missing, so out of 83 extant MSS (within the family) 47 have the variant, which equals 56.6%. We are dealing with alternate spellings of a proper name, a name that occurs nine times with division in chapters 23-25. This discussion will serve for all nine. The attestation ranges between 47 and 41. The first reading is attested by codices B and Aleph, and P⁴⁸, which indicates that the spelling is not a late invention. But in any case, a mere alternate spelling is not a proper variant, since neither the identity nor the meaning of the word is affected. That said, however, we must choose one to print in the Text. Almost all Greek texts and translations have 'Felix', so that is the accepted spelling. Most of the better family representatives attest the first spelling. I see no adequate reason for innovating a new spelling. I conclude that the first spelling reproduces the archetype.

23:27 – των || --- 328,394,1247,1249,1508,1723,1749,2441 {664,2289}

Out of the 90 MSS, 7 are missing, so out of 83 extant MSS (within the family) 10 have the variant, which equals 12%. In the context, the omission of the article would not make much difference, but

¹ 1745 has 23:8 – 24:22, 25:18 – 28:31.

² 2777 has 20:19 – 21:21, 23:6 – 25:22, 26:7 – 28:31.

with only 12% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

25:11 – το 141^c || του [35%] 141,801,1617,1723,1876,2255,2261,2441 {1752,1767,2626,2704}

Out of the 90 MSS, 10 are missing, so out of 80 extant MSS (within the family) 12 have the variant, which equals 15%. Both forms are possible, and the translation will be the same in either case, but with only 15% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

26:3 – ζητηματων || 1 επισταμενος [20%] 328,394,928,986,1247,1249,1482,1508,1723,1749,1855^c,2255,2441 {664,2289}

Out of the 90 MSS, 8 are missing, so out of 82 extant MSS (within the family) 14 have the variant, which equals 17%. The addition of the participle is harmless, but with only 17% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

26:29 – ευξαιμην || ευξαμην [40%] 18,35,386,1058,1100,1247,1865,2466,2587,2723 {634,1101,1733,1752,2691,2704}

Out of the 90 MSS, 6 are missing, so out of 84 extant MSS (within the family) 16 have the variant, which equals 19%. Is the mode optative, or indicative? Within the context, the optative is better, but in any case, with only 19% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

27:2 – ατραμυτινω || ατραμυτινω 328,394,928,986,1058,1247,1249,1482,1508,1548,1749,1855,1856,2255,2587 {664,1752}

Out of the 90 MSS, 6 are missing, so out of 84 extant MSS (within the family) 17 have the variant, which equals 20.2%. We are dealing with alternate spellings of a proper name (there are several further spellings). But in any case, a mere alternate spelling is not a proper variant, since neither the identity nor the meaning of the word is affected. With only 20.2% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

28:14 – εις την ρωμην ηλθομεν || ~4123 328,394,928,1247,1249,1508,1723,1749,1856,2441 {664,2289,(2626),2777}

Out of the 90 MSS, 6 are missing, so out of 84 extant MSS (within the family) 14 have the variant, which equals 16.7%. Since Greek nouns and adjectives have case endings, that signal grammatical function, changing the order of the words within a phrase rarely makes any difference in the meaning; they are two ways of saying the same thing, as in this case. Either choice affects neither the meaning nor a translation, but with 16.7% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

28:22 – παρα σου ακουσαι || ~312 [13%] 328,394,444,604,928,1247,1249,1508,1723,1740,1749,1856,2261,2441,2466 {432,664,1768,2289}

Out of the 90 MSS, 6 are missing, so out of 84 extant MSS (within the family) 19 have the variant, which equals 22.6%. Since Greek nouns and adjectives have case endings, that signal grammatical function, changing the order of the words within a phrase rarely makes any difference in the meaning; they are two ways of saying the same thing, as in this case. Either choice affects neither the meaning nor a translation, but with 22.6% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

28:25 – ημων || υμων [22%] 444,1075,1248,1503,1652,1740,1746,2261,2352,2431 {1618,1745,1748,1754^s,2777}

Out of the 90 MSS, 6 are missing, so out of 84 extant MSS (within the family) 15 have the variant, which equals 17.9%. Within the context, either pronoun makes good sense, but with 17.9% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

28:27 – ιασωμαι || ιασομαι [75%] 141,1058,1075,2218,2261,2303,2378,2554 {1763,2221}

Out of the 90 MSS, 6 are missing, so out of 84 extant MSS (within the family) 10 have the variant, which equals 11.9%. Is the verb aorist subjunctive, or future indicative? There is a slight difference in meaning, but with 11.9% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the twenty-nine 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 Acts, 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: Aside from the division in verse 11, no variant has more than three MSS. Including verse 11, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 33 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 6 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter one.

Chapter 2: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 30 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 19 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter two.

Chapter 3: Aside from the division in verse 1, no variant has more than four MSS. Including verse 1, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 39 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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 five MSS. Of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 36 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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.

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

Chapter 5: No variant has more than seven MSS. Of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 31 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter five.

Chapter 6: No variant has more than one MS (but this chapter is very short). Of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 50 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 11 more (which gives us all 61 MSS!). It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter six.

Chapter 7: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 27 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter (and it is very long), and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 14 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter seven.

Chapter 8: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 40 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 15 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter eight.

Chapter 9: Aside from the division in verse 7, no variant has more than four MSS. Including verse 7, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 23 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 11 more. (And if we ignore the division, since it is merely an alternate spelling, we will add even more.) It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter nine.

Chapter 10: Aside from the divisions in verses 3 and 30, that are parallel, no variant has more than three MSS. Including verses 3 and 30, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 30 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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: Aside from the divisions in verses 9 and 26, no variant has more than five MSS. Including verses 9 and 26, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 23 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 3 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter eleven.

Chapter 12: Aside from the divisions in verses 4 and 25, no variant has more than two MSS. Including verses 4 and 25, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), only 9 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter (because of the splinter in verse 25). If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 9 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twelve.

Chapter 13: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 23 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 13 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter thirteen.

Chapter 14: Aside from the divisions in verses 10 and 17, no variant has more than three MSS. Including verses 10 and 17, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 25 are perfect

representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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 four MSS. Of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 31 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 16 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter fifteen.

Chapter 16: Aside from the division in verse 26, no variant has more than three MSS. Including verse 26, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 28 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 15 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter sixteen.

Chapter 17: Aside from the divisions in verses 4 and 25, no variant has more than six MSS. Including verses 4 and 25, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 27 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 10 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter seventeen.

Chapter 18: Aside from the division in verse 17, no variant has more than four MSS. Including verse 17, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 21 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 4 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter eighteen.

Chapter 19: Aside from the division in verse 34, no variant has more than six MSS. Including verse 34, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 25 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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: Aside from the divisions in verses 3 and 9, no variant has more than three MSS. Including verses 3 and 9, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 30 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 15 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty.

Chapter 21: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 24 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 11 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty-one.

Chapter 22: Aside from the division in verse 20, no variant has more than three MSS. Including verse 20, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 27 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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-two.

Chapter 23: Aside from the divisions in verses 24, 26 and 27, no variant has more than two MSS. Including verses 24, 26 and 27, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 17 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a

few 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-three.

Chapter 24: Aside from the six parallel spelling divisions, no variant has more than five MSS. Including those six divisions, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 14 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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-four.

Chapter 25: Aside from the divisions in verses 11 and 14, no variant has more than five MSS. Including verses 11 and 14, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 11 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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-five.

Chapter 26: Aside from the divisions in verses 3 and 29, no variant has more than six MSS. Including verses 3 and 29, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 23 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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-six.

Chapter 27: Aside from the division in verse 2, no variant has more than five MSS. Including verse 2, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 18 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 11 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty-seven.

Chapter 28: Aside from the divisions in verses 14, 22, 25 and 29, no variant has more than five MSS. Including verses 14, 22, 25 and 29, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 18 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 13 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 Acts, based on the available evidence. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for Romans—final form

This section is based on a complete collation of the following thirty-nine representative MSS—18, 35, 141, 201, 204, 386, 394, 757, 824, 928, 986, 1040, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1249, 1482, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1652, 1704, 1725, 1732, 1733, 1761, 1855, 1856, 1858, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 1897, 2080, 2466, 2554, 2587 and 2723. At the twelve places where there is a division of at least 10% of the 39, I spot-checked the following 60 MSS: 110, 149, 328, 432, 522, 604, 634, 664, 801, 913, 959, 986, 1058, 1247, 1248, 1508, 1610, 1617, 1618, 1628, 1636, 1656, 1726, 1737, 1740, 1743, 1745, 1746, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1754, 1763, 1767, 1768, 1830, 1867, 1929, 1948, 1950, 1958, 2009, 2102, 2194, 2218, 2221, 2255, 2261, 2288, 2289, 2352, 2374, 2378, 2431, 2501, 2626, 2691, 2704, 2774, 2777.

Those 99 MSS represent the total of family representatives that are presently available. I neglected a further six that were hard to read.¹ 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 39 fully collated MSS remains the same after adding the 60 spot-checked MSS, with the exception of the

¹ 228, 1161, 1400, 1899, 1913, 2675.

last variant set. My ‘presently available’ refers to the images that have been posted by both the INTF and the CSNTM. 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.

1:32 – πρᾶσσουσιν || πρᾶττουσιν [2%] 201,757,824,986,1040,1072,1075,1503,1637,1652,1864,1892 {149,432,522,604,986,1248,1617,1618,1628,1636,1656,1737,1740,1743,1745,1746,1748,1756,1768,1948,1958,2009,2102,2218,2352,2431,2777}

Out of the 99 MSS, one is missing, so out of 98 extant MSS (within the family) 39 have the variant, which equals 39.8%. But in any case, a mere alternate spelling is not a proper variant, since neither the identity nor the meaning of the word is affected. This spelling difference is almost the exclusive property of Family 35; outside the family, almost all MSS have the first form. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

2:5 – του || --- [1%] 201,757,824,986,1072,1075,1503,1548,1637,1652,1864,1892 {149,432,522,604,913,986,1508^c,1610,1617,1618,1628,1636,1656,1740,1745,1746,1748,1754,1768,1830,1929,1948,1958,2288,2352,2431,2777}

Out of the 99 extant MSS, one is missing, so out of 98 extant MSS (within the family) 39 have the variant, which equals 39.8%. Within the context, omitting the article does not affect the meaning. This omission is almost the exclusive property of Family 35; outside the family, almost all MSS have the article.¹ The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

4:7 – ἀφειθησαν || ἀφειθησαν [10%] 201,394,928,986,1040,1249,1482,1548,1704^c,1855,1856,2587 {149,328,432,522,604,664,959^c,986,1058,1247,1508,1617^{alt},1743,1746^c,1749,1752,1763,1768,1929,1948,1950,1958,2009,2255,2261,2288,2289,2374,2704,2777}

Out of the 99 MSS, one is missing, so out of 98 extant MSS (within the family) 38 have the variant, which equals 38.8%. But in any case, a mere alternate spelling is not a proper variant, since neither the identity nor the meaning of the word is affected.² The first form, attested by the better representatives, reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

6:8 – πιστευομεν 141^c,1761^c || πιστευωμεν 35^c,141,204,394,928^{alt},1482^{alt},1732^{alt},1761,1855^{alt},1856^{alt},1858,1865^{alt},1876,1897,2080^c,2587,2723^{alt} {328,664,1508,1726,1749,1767,1950,2255,2261,2289,2378,2626}

Out of the 99 extant MSS (within the family) 20 have the variant, which equals 20.2%. The difference of one letter changes the mood, from Indicative to Subjunctive, which causes a slight difference in a translation. But with only 20% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate, in any case. This spelling difference is almost the exclusive property of Family 35; outside the family, almost all MSS have the first form. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

7:13 – ἀλλᾶ || ἀλλ [30%] 204,394,1249,1482,1725,1732,1761,1855,1856,1858,1876,1897,2080,2554,2587 {110,328,664,801,913,959,1058,1247,1508,1636,1726,1749,1752,1830,1929,1950,2102,2221,2255,2261,2288,2289,2378,2501,2626,2691,2704,2774}

¹ Notice that the lists for these first two sets of variants are almost identical; we evidently have a subgroup of some size. Since the better representatives are generally on the other side, the subgroup remains a subgroup.

² There is some overlap with the first two cases, but the mix is different.

Out of the 99 MSS, one is missing, so out of 98 extant MSS (within the family) 43 have the variant, which equals 43.9%. This is merely a phonological change caused by the following vowel. But in any case, a mere alternate spelling is not a proper variant, since neither the identity nor the meaning of the word is affected. The 44% is not sufficient to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

9:3 – εϋχομην || ηϋχομην [60%] 201,757,824,986,1040,1072,1075,1503,1637,1652,1864,1892 {149,522,664,913, 986,1248,1610,1617,1618,1628,1636,1656,1737,1740,1745,1746,1748^c,1754,1830,1929, 1948,1950,1958,2009,2102,2218,2352,2431,2777}

Out of the 99 extant MSS (within the family) 41 have the variant, which equals 41.4%. We have the same subgroup as in the first two sets. We are looking at alternate forms, or alternate spellings, of the imperfect of εϋχομαι; they are two ways of saying the same thing. Either choice affects neither the meaning nor a translation, but with only 41% attestation, the more so since it is a subgroup, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

11:10 – συγκαμψον 141^c,1892^c || συγκαψον [20%] 141,1072,1856,1876,1892,2466 {328,432,522,604,801,913, 1247,1610,1628,1656,1746,1749,1763,1768,1830,1950,1958,2009,2194,2218,2261, 2289, 2352,2374,2378,2431,2501,2626,2691,2774}

Out of the 99 MSS, one is missing, so out of 98 extant MSS (within the family) 36 have the variant, which equals 36.7%. But in any case, a mere alternate spelling is not a proper variant, since neither the identity nor the meaning of the word is affected. The first form, attested by the better representatives, reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

15:24 – σπανιαν || ισπανιαν (27%) 18^c,35,394,928,1249,1482,1548,1855^c,1856,2587 {328,432,522,604,664,913, 959,1058,1247,1610,1749,1752,1754,1763,1767,1768,1830,1867,1929,1950,1958^c, 2102,2194,2255,2288,2289,2704}

Out of the 99 extant MSS (within the family) 34 have the variant, which equals 34.3%. But in any case, a mere alternate spelling is not a proper variant, since neither the identity nor the meaning of the word is affected. The first form, attested by the better representatives, reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

15:28 – σπανιαν || ισπανιαν [25%] 394,928,1249,1482,1548,1855^c,1856,1892^c,2587 {328,432,522,604,664,(913), 959,1058,(1610),1749,1752,1754,1763,1767,1768,1830,1929,1950,1958^c,2102,2194, 2255,2288,2289,2704}

Out of the 99 MSS, one is missing, so out of 98 extant MSS (within the family) 31 have the variant, which equals 31.6%. But in any case, a mere alternate spelling is not a proper variant, since neither the identity nor the meaning of the word is affected. The first form, attested by the better representatives, reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

16:6 – υμας || ημας (75.5%) 394,1732,1761,1892 {110,328,432,604,664,913,1248,1508,1610,1617,1618,1726,1740, 1743,1745,1754,1763,1768,1830,1929,2102^c,2194,2218,2261,2288,2289,2352,2374^c,2501,2774,2777}

Out of the 99 MSS, one is missing, so out of 98 extant MSS (within the family) 33 have the variant, which equals 33.7%. The change of one letter changes the pronoun; is it 'ye', or 'we'? Within the context, it makes little difference. The heavy attestation for the first person outside the family may have influenced some copyists, the more so since the second person would be unexpected. In any case, the 34% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form, attested by the better representatives, reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

16:19 – ειναι 1249^c || --- 201,394,928,1249,1856 {149,328,522,959,1656,1749,1948,1958,2009}

Out of the 99 extant MSS (within the family) 14 have the variant, which equals 14.1%. Within the context, omitting the verb does not affect the meaning. Either choice affects neither the meaning nor a translation, but with only 14% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

16:24 – ημων || υμων [82%] 18,386,757,824,986,1040,1072,1075,1100,1503,1637,1652,1856,1864,1892,2554^c
{110,328,432,522,604,634,664,801,986,1058,1247,1248,1508,1617,1618,1628,1636,1656,1737,
1740,1743,1745,1746,1748,1754,1763,1768,1867,2218,2221,2288,2352,2374,2431,2626,2691,
2777}

Out of the 99 MSS, one is missing, so out of 98 extant MSS (within the family) 52 have the variant, which equals 53%. Without the spot-checked MSS, the variant has 38.5%; that is because most of the better MSS have been collated. The first person pronoun is the private property of Family 35; almost all MSS outside the family have the second person, which is how Paul ended all his letters, except for Ephesians and 1 Timothy. Romans is the only letter where Paul's secretary (Tertius) adds his own greetings at the end. Tertius certainly wrote verses 22 and 23 on his own, and I see no reason to doubt that he did the same with verse 24. In that event, the first person is especially appropriate, coming from Tertius. But the first person is unexpected, and copyists would write the customary pronoun without thinking. If the original were the second person, who would change it to first person? Is not such a change rather improbable? Notice also that the subgroup that caused the divisions in 1:32, 2:5 and 9:3 is the dominant factor here in 16:24; without it the variant would fall below 20%. However, within the context, the choice between the two pronouns makes little or no difference. All in all, it seems to me that the only way to explain the first person is to take it as the archetypal form. The first form, attested by the better representatives, reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the twelve places where there is a division of at least 10% of the 39. 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 Romans, 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 collated MSS, but due consideration needs to be given to the discussion of the divisions, above. Mere alternate spellings should be discounted (seven of the twelve), and so on.¹

Chapter 1: No variant has more than twelve MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 17 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter one.

Chapter 2: No variant has more than twelve MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 16 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 9 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter two.

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

Chapter 3: No variant has more than one MS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 29 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter three.

Chapter 4: No variant has more than eleven MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 19 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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 two MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 30 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter five.

Chapter 6: No variant has more than eight MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 25 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 4 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter six.

Chapter 7: No variant has more than 14 MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 17 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 4 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter seven.

Chapter 8: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 28 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 9 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter eight.

Chapter 9: No variant has more than twelve MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 16 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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 one MS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 32 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter ten.

Chapter 11: No variant has more than six MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 22 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 4 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter eleven.

Chapter 12: No variant has more than one MS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 30 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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 two MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 30 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will

probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter thirteen.

Chapter 14: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 34 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 2 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter fourteen.

Chapter 15: No variant has more than eight MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 18 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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 15 MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 14 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 3 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter sixteen.

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35, for the book of Romans, based on the available evidence. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for 1 Corinthians—final form

This section is based on a complete collation of the following thirty-four representative MSS—18, 35, 141, 201, 204, 386, 394, 444, 604, 757, 824, 928, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1249, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1761, 1855, 1864, 1865, 1892, 1897, 2080, 2352, 2431, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2723 and 2817. At the fourteen places where there is a division of at least 10% (in the collated MSS), I spot-checked the following 54 MSS: 149, 328, 432, 522, 634, 664, 801, 959, 1040, 1058, 1248, 1400, 1482, 1508, 1617, 1618, 1628, 1636, 1652, 1656, 1704, 1725, 1726, 1732, 1733, 1737, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1763, 1767, 1768, 1856, 1858, 1876, 1899, 1948, 1958, 2009, 2218, 2221, 2255, 2261, 2289, 2378, (2501), 2626, 2691, 2704, 2774, 2777. Those 88 MSS represent a nearly complete roster of family representatives that are presently available. I neglected a further four that were hard to read or not available.¹ 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 34 fully collated MSS remains the same after adding the 54 spot-checked MSS. My ‘presently available’ refers to the images that have been posted by both the INTF and the CSNTM. 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.

1:13 – υμων 1865^{alt} || ημων [15%] 141,757,824,1072,1637^{alt},1864,1865,1892,2080,2431,2466,2723 {634,801^c,959,1508,1656,1704,1725,1726,1732,1733,1748,1752,1858,2261,2378,2626,2774}

Out of the 88 MSS, none is missing, so out of 88 extant MSS (within the family) 27 have the variant, which equals 30.7%. The second person is clearly better, but the first person is possible. In the context the change makes little difference (it may have resulted from dittography). In any case, the

¹ 228, 1161, 1913, 2675. By the bye, I offer an observation to any who follow in my footsteps. In the Pauline corpus the Byzantine bulk tends to be more ‘conservative’ than in Acts and the Generals, the MSS deviate less from the Family 35 core. It can be difficult to draw the line between ‘f³⁵’ and ‘non-f³⁵’; a fair number of MSS are on the fringe (and I do not include them in the family roster).

31% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

1:28 – αγενη || αγεννη [5%] 394,604,928,1249,1548,1855,2587 {328,432,664,959,1058,1482,1749,1752,1768,1856,2255^c,2289,2704}

Out of the 88 MSS, two are missing, so out of 86 extant MSS (within the family) 19 have the variant, which equals 22.1%. But in any case, a mere alternate spelling is not a proper variant, since neither the identity nor the meaning of the word is affected. Also, with only 22% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

2:4 – πειθοις || πειθοι (11.9%) 18,141,204,386 {432,634,801,1704,1725,1732,1768,1858,2691}

Out of the 88 MSS, four are missing, so out of 84 extant MSS (within the family) 13 have the variant, which equals 15.5%. But in any case, a mere alternate spelling is not a proper variant, since neither the identity nor the meaning of the word is affected. Also, with only 15.5% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

3:2 – ηδυνασθε || εδυνασθε [38%] 201,604,757,824,986,1072,1075,1503,1637,1864,1892,2352,2431,2817 {149,432,(522),959,1040,1248,1617,1618,1628,1636,1652,1656,1737,1740,1745,1746,1748,1763,1768,1948,1958,2009,2218,2777}

Out of the 88 MSS, one is missing, so out of 87 extant MSS (within the family) 38 have the variant, which equals 43.7%. These are alternate spellings of the imperfect middle/passive, and a mere alternate spelling is not a proper variant, since neither the identity nor the meaning of the word is affected. Also, the first form is Attic, and in later years it would naturally be changed to the Koine, but not the reverse. Although a 43.7% attestation is certainly significant, the variant is not a credible candidate, since it can be phonologically explained. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

4:6 – μη || --- [50%] 604,986,1075,1548,1637,1855,1892,2080,2352,2431 {432,664,1040,1248,1618,1636,1652,1704,1725,1737,1740,1745,1746,1748,1752,1763,1768,1899,2218,2255,2289,2501,2704,2777}

Out of the 88 MSS, one is missing, so out of 87 extant MSS (within the family) 34 have the variant, which equals 39.1%. The negative particle is repeated for emphasis; omitting the repetition does not change the basic meaning, not the translation. Also, the particle is generally attested by the better representatives. Although a 39.1% attestation is certainly significant, it is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

5:11 – νυνι || νυν [45%] 394,928,1249,1855 {328,959,1482,1508,1749,1856,2255,2289}

Out of the 88 MSS, one is missing, so out of 87 extant MSS (within the family) 12 have the variant, which equals 13.8%. We have alternate spellings of the same adverb, the first being more emphatic. A mere alternate spelling is not a proper variant, since neither the identity nor the meaning of the word is affected. But in any case, with only 14% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

6:5 – διακριναι || ανακριναι [20%] 18,35,201,204,1249,1892,2466,2587,2723 {432,522,801,1876,2261,2501,2626,2691,2774}

Out of the 88 MSS, one is missing, so out of 87 extant MSS (within the family) 18 have the variant, which equals 20.1%. Although the verbs are different, in the context they function as virtual

synonyms, resulting in the same translation. But in any case, with only 20% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

7:13 – ητις || ει τις [10%] 201,757,824,1072,1503,1637^c,1864,1892,2352,2431 {149,664,1248,1617,1618,1628,1636,1652,1656,1740,1745,1746,1748,1948,1958^v,2009,2626,2777}

Out of the 88 MSS, one is missing, so out of 87 extant MSS (within the family) 27 have the variant, which equals 31%. 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. But in any case, the 31% attestation is not sufficient to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

7:17 – ει 928^c || η [15%] 394,928,1548,1855,2080,2466,2587 {328,664,1058,1482,1508,1726^m,1732^{alt},1733^{alt},1752,1763,1856,1858,2289,2378,2501,2704^{alt}}

Out of the 88 MSS, two are missing, so out of 86 extant MSS (within the family) 19 have the variant, which equals 22.1%. The particle may be the result of dittography, that once it became an exemplar was faithfully copied. In the context, verse 17 appears to be dealing with situations not covered in the prior context. Whether ει μη or η μη, the translation should be ‘otherwise’, or something of the sort. But in any case, with only 22% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

9:9 – ἄλωοντα || αλωοντα [70%] 35^c,386,394,928,1249,1637^c,1761,1855,2587 (1864,2554 are ambiguous, but are aspirated in the next example) {328,634,959,1040,1058,1482,1617,1652,1656,1726,1740,1745,1746,1748,1749,1752,1763,1767,1876,2221,2255,2691,2704,2774}

Out of the 88 MSS, two are ambiguous and one is illegible, so out of 85 extant MSS (within the family) 31 have the variant, which equals 36.5%. Breathing marks can be quite ambiguous, if not carefully written. In this case we are looking at alternate forms, or alternate spellings; they are two ways of saying the same thing. Either choice affects neither the meaning nor a translation. The 36.5% attestation is not sufficient to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

9:10 – ἄλωων || αλωων [70%] 35^c,386,394,928,1249,1637^c,1761,1855,2587 {328,634,959,1040,1058,1400,1482,1617,1652,1656,1740,1745,1746,1748,1749,1752,1763,1767,2221,2255,2626,2704,2774}

Out of the 88 MSS, one is illegible, so out of 87 extant MSS (within the family) 30 have the variant, which equals 34.5%. Breathing marks can be quite ambiguous, if not carefully written. In this case we are looking at alternate forms, or alternate spellings; they are two ways of saying the same thing. Either choice affects neither the meaning nor a translation. The 34.5% attestation is not sufficient to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

11:13 – θεω || κυριω 394,928,1249,1855 {328,1482,1508,1749,1856,1899,2255,2289}

Out of the 88 MSS, three are missing, so out of 85 extant MSS (within the family) 12 have the variant, which equals 14.1%. In the context the two words refer to the same Person. But in any case, with only 14% attestation the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

13:3 – καθησομαι || καυθησωμαι (44.7%) 386,604,1548,1637,2080 {432,634,664,801,1508,1617,1618,1737,1748,1763,1768,2218,2289^c,2626,2691,2777}

Out of the 88 MSS, none is missing, so out of 88 extant MSS (within the family) 20 have the variant, which equals 22.7%. Is the verb future passive Indicative, or future passive Subjunctive? Since Greek does not normally have a future Subjunctive, the variant is improbable, to say the least! Since the conjunction *hina* normally takes the Subjunctive, although the Indicative is not infrequent, copyists apparently made the change without thinking. But in any case, with only 23% attestation the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

16:2 – εὐοδουται || εὐοδωται [61%] 394,928,1249,1548,1855,1865,2080,2587,2723,2817 {328,664,801,959,1058,1482,1508,1726,1746,1749,1752,1763,1767^{alt},1856,1876,1899,2255,2289,2378,2626,2691,2704,2774}

Out of the 88 MSS, three are missing, so out of 85 extant MSS (within the family) 32 have the variant, which equals 36.4%. 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. Although a 36.4% 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 fourteen places where there is a division of at least 10% of the collated MSS. 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 1 Corinthians, 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 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 eleven MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 10 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 1 more. There are two subgroups, both of which came into play in this chapter. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter one.

Chapter 2: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 22 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 6 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter two.

Chapter 3: No variant has more than fourteen MS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 12 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 1 more. The two subgroups again. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter three.

Chapter 4: No variant has more than ten MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 19 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 1 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter four.

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

Chapter 5: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 21 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 4 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter five.

Chapter 6: No variant has more than nine MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 21 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 1 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter six.

Chapter 7: No variant has more than nine MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 12 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 4 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter seven.

Chapter 8: No variant has more than one MS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 27 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter eight.

Chapter 9: No variant has more than seven MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 20 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter nine.

Chapter 10: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 20 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 11 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter ten.

Chapter 11: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 20 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 6 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter eleven.

Chapter 12: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 20 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twelve.

Chapter 13: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 28 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 1 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter thirteen.

Chapter 14: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 21 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 10 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter fourteen.

Chapter 15: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 23 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will

probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 6 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter fifteen.

Chapter 16: No variant has more than ten MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 17 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 6 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter sixteen.

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35, for the book of 1 Corinthians, based on the available evidence. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for 2 Corinthians—final form

This section is based on a complete collation of the following thirty-six representative MSS—18, 35, 141, 201, 204, 328, 386, 432, 444, 757, 824, 928, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1249, 1482, 1503, 1548, 1617, 1637, 1652, 1725, 1740, 1855, 1864, 1865, 1892, 1897, 2352, 2431, 2466, 2554, 2587 and 2723. At the eighteen places where there is a division of at least 10% (in the collated MSS), I spot-checked the following 55 MSS: 149, 394, 522, 604, 634, 664, 801, 959, 1040, 1058, 1247, 1248, 1400, 1508, 1618, 1628, 1636, 1656, 1704, 1723, 1726, 1732, 1733, 1737, 1745, 1746, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1761, 1763, 1767, 1768, 1856, 1858, 1876, 1899, 1948, 1958, 2009, 2080, 2218, 2221, 2255, 2261, 2289, 2378, (2501), 2626, 2653, 2691, 2704, 2774, 2777, 2817. Those 91 MSS represent a nearly complete roster of family representatives that are presently available. I neglected a further four that were hard to read or not available.¹ A few more family representatives may come to light, but not enough to challenge any decisions made here. My ‘presently available’ refers to the images that have been posted by both the INTF and the CSNTM. I say a sincere “Thank you” to both organizations.

I now discuss the divisions that were spot-checked. With one exception, 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.

1:17 – βουλευομενος 1548^c || βουλομενος [20%] 201,204,824,1548,1725,1897 {149,522,664,801,959,1247, 1704,1752,1761,1858,1948,1958,2009,2261,2378,2501,2691,2704}

Out of the 91 MSS, two are missing, so out of 89 extant MSS (within the family) 24 have the variant, which equals 27%. The verbs are different, but are virtual synonyms. In the context the change makes little difference, the translation can be the same. In any case, the 27% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

1:20 – το 1617^c,1637^c,1864^c,2723^c || τω [10%] 35^c,204,328,928,1249,1482,1548,1617,1637,1725,1855,1864,1897,2466^c, 2587,2723 {394,522^{c1x},664,801,959,1058,1247,1508,1618,1704,1723,1726,1749, 1752,1856^{c1x},1858,1876,1899,1948^{1x},2080,2255,2261,2289,2378,(2501),2626,2691, 2704,2774^{c1x},2777}

Out of the 91 MSS, three are missing, so out of 88 extant MSS (within the family) 40 have the variant, which equals 45.5%. This one is complicated. I have handled ‘the yes’ and ‘the amen’ as a single variation unit, since almost all the MSS are the same for both. However, there are no fewer than eleven corrections (about evenly divided), and two MSS split their vote. But what happened here? The grammar calls for the nominative, rather than the dative, but the translation will be the same. However, in both cases the immediately preceding pronoun is dative, which would have

¹ 228, 1161, 1913, 2675.

exerted attraction. Also, if the monk was not paying attention to the meaning, he could make the case agree, as a reflex action. Neither of those observations would explain the nominative, if the original were the dative. Further, the dative is almost the exclusive property of the f³⁵ splinter; all the early MSS (that are extant here) and almost all other MSS have the nominative. Although a 45.5% attestation is certainly significant, everything considered it is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

2:6 – επιτιμία || επιτιμησις 328,928,1249,1482,1855 {394,959,1247,1508,1723,1749,1856,1899,2255,2289}

Out of the 91 MSS, two are missing, so out of 89 extant MSS (within the family) 15 have the variant, which equals 16.9%. These are synonyms, two ways of saying the same thing. However, with only 16.9% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

5:14 – εἰ || --- [50%] 986,1503,1637,1892 {1040,1247,1618,1737,1746,1748,1749,2218,2777}

Out of the 91 MSS, none is missing, so out of 91 extant MSS (within the family) 13 have the variant, which equals 14.3%. The conjunction makes better sense in the context, but the variant is possible. But in any case, with only 14.3% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

5:20 – δεομεθα || 1 ουν 328,928,1249,1482,1855 {394,664,959,1247,1508,1723,1749,1856,1899,2255,2289}

Out of the 91 MSS, none are missing, so out of 91 extant MSS (within the family) 16 have the variant, which equals 17.6%. The conjunction simply is not necessary; it may even get in the way. But in any case, with only 17.6% attestation the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

7:12a – υμων || ημων [8%] 328,432,1482^{alt},1503,1548,1725,1855^c,2466^c {604,664,959,1040,1058^{alt},1247,1704,1723,1732^{alt},1752,1761,1763,1768,1856^c,1858,1876,1899,2080,2255^c,2261,2289,2626,2704}

Out of the 91 MSS, none is missing, so out of 91 extant MSS (within the family) 24 have the variant, which equals 26.4%. This case works in tandem with the next one. 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. But in any case, with only 26.4% attestation the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

7:12b – ημων || υμων [14%] 204,328,432,928^c,1482^{alt},1548,1725,1855^c,1897,2466,2587^c {604,664,801,959,1040,1058^{alt},1247,1704,1723,1732^{alt},1752,1761,1763,1768,1858,1876,1899,2080,2255,2261,2289,2501,2626,2691,2704}

Out of the 91 MSS, none is missing, so out of 91 extant MSS (within the family) 30 have the variant, which equals 33%. See the discussion above. Why did the attestation for the variant go up? Whatever the answer, since this case works in tandem with the prior one, the 33% attestation is not sufficient to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

7:12c – υμας 928^c,1855^c,2587^c || ημας 386,928,1249,1482^{alt},1855,2587 {664^v,801,1058,1856,2691}

Out of the 91 MSS, none is missing, so out of 91 extant MSS (within the family) 10 have the variant, which equals 11%. The confusion here may have spilled over from the prior two cases. But in any

case, with only 11% attestation the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

8:9 – ημας 18,35,141,204,386,444,928,986,1100^v,1249,1482,1855,1865,2466,2554,2587,2723 {394,522,634,664,801,1400,1508,1732,1733,1737,1767,1856,1876,2080,2218,2221, 2255,2261,2289,2626,2653,2691,2774}
 υμας [60%] 35^c,201,328,432,444^c,757,824,928^c,1072,1075,1503,1548,1617,1637,1652,1725,1740,1855^c,1864,1892,1897, 2352,2431,2587^c {149,394^{alt},604,801^c,959,1040,1247,1248,1618,1628,1636,1656,1704,1723,1726,1732^{alt},1745,1746^v,1748,1749,1752,1761,1763,1768,1856^c,1858,1899,1948,1958,2009,2378,2501,2704,2777,2817}

Out of the 91 MSS, one is missing, so out of 90 extant MSS (within the family) 50 have the variant, which equals 55.6%. This one is difficult. ‘For your sakes’ agrees with the complement; “for our sakes” is more inclusive; both are true. Since the second person agrees with the complement, it is expected, so if the second person were original, why would anyone change it to the first person? So where did the first person come from? The better representatives generally have the first person. Furthermore, we have a curious circumstance: 28 of the MSS having the second person form the second subgroup identified in 1 Peter, and about half of them come from a single monastery, M. Lavras. 28 is over half of 50. At an earlier point in the history of the transmission of the family, the second person was probably the minority variant. The difference is slight, but the first person includes the other, but not vice versa. Although there is doubt, I consider that the first form reproduces the archetype.

8:15 – ο || --- [39%] 18,201,1100,1725,2431 {149,522,959,1248,1508,1704,1737,1763,1948,1958,2009,2218,2255,2289,2653}

Out of the 91 MSS, none is missing, so out of 91 extant MSS (within the family) 20 have the variant, which equals 22%. We have two parallel clauses in a compound sentence; omitting the parallel article does not change the basic meaning, nor the translation. But the article is not omitted; with only 22% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

8:20 – ημας || υμας [15%] 141,201,757,824,1072,1075,1503,1637,1652,1864,2352 {149,522,1618,1628,1636,1656,1737,1745,1746,1748,1763,1948,1958,2009,2218,2653,2777}

Out of the 91 MSS, none is missing, so out of 91 extant MSS (within the family) 28 have the variant, which equals 30.8%. In the context the first person is clearly better, but the second person is possible. In any case, with only 30.8% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

8:24 – εις αυτους 1249^m(2431) || --- 328,928,1249,1482,1855 {394,959,1247,1723,1749,1856,1899,2255,2289}

Out of the 91 MSS, one is missing, so out of 90 extant MSS (within the family) 14 have the variant, which equals 15.6%. The omission of the phrase is clearly inferior in the context, since it would make the Corinthians represent the foreign congregations. But in any case, with only 15.6% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

9:4 – συν εμοι 1249^m || --- 328,928,1249,1482,1855 {394,959,1723,1749,1856,1899,2255,2289}

Out of the 91 MSS, one is missing, so out of 90 extant MSS (within the family) 13 have the variant, which equals 14.4%. The omission of the phrase is inferior in the context, although it does not affect the basic meaning. But in any case, with only 14.4% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

9:10 – γενηματα || γενηματα [6%] 328,386,432,444,928,1249,1482,1548,1725,1855,2554^c,2587 {394,604,634,959,1058,1247,1508,1704,1723,1732,1749,1752,1768,1856,1858,2221,2255,2289,2704}

Out of the 91 MSS, one is missing, so out of 90 extant MSS (within the family) 30 have the variant, which equals 33.3%. 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. The 33.3% attestation is not sufficient to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

11:7 – εαυτον || εμαυτον [78%] 141,328,386,432,444,1249,1482,1725,1855,2554^c {394,604,959,1058^v,1247,1508,1704,1723,1749,1768,1856,1858,1899,1958^c,2221,2289,2817}

Out of the 91 MSS, none is missing, so out of 91 extant MSS (within the family) 25 have the variant, which equals 27.5%. Is it “humbling self”, or ‘humbling myself’? The second is more direct, but they are two ways of saying the same thing. The 27.5% attestation is not sufficient to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

11:16 – με δοξη || ~ 21 328,432,928,1249 {394,604,959,1247,1508,1723,1749,1768,1856,1899,2289}

Out of the 91 MSS, none is missing, so out of 91 extant MSS (within the family) 15 have the variant, which equals 16.5%. In Greek, a change in the word order often makes little or no difference in the meaning, as here; they are two ways of saying the same thing. But in any case, with only 16.5% attestation the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

12:1 – δη || δει [37%] 141,1892,2431,2723 {801,1737,1763,1767,2255,2653,2691,2774}

Out of the 91 MSS, one is missing, so out of 90 extant MSS (within the family) 12 have the variant, which equals 13.3%. Is it a particle, or an impersonal verb? Both make sense, but with only 13.3% attestation the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

13:3 – δυνατει || δυνατοι [2%] 141,432,1249,1617 {604,1704,1737,1763,1768,2218,2653,2704,2774}

Out of the 91 MSS, two are missing, so out of 89 extant MSS (within the family) 13 have the variant, which equals 14.6%. Is it a verb, or an adjective? In the context the subject of the verb is singular, but the adjective is plural. The adjective would be possible if it were singular, but not plural. But in any case, with only 14.6% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the eighteen places where there is a division of at least 10% of the collated MSS. 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 2 Corinthians, 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 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 fourteen MSS. Of the 35 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 11 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 6 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter one.

Chapter 2: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 26 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 3 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter two.

Chapter 3: No variant has more than three MS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 21 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 9 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter three.

Chapter 4: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 35 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 27 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 6 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter four.

Chapter 5: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 35 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 18 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 4 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter five.

Chapter 6: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 27 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 6 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter six.

Chapter 7: No variant has more than seven MSS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 19 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 2 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter seven.

Chapter 8: No variant has more than nineteen MS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 9 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 1 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter eight.

Chapter 9: No variant has more than eleven MSS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 18 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 2 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter nine.

Chapter 10: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 28 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.

probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 6 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter ten.

Chapter 11: No variant has more than nine MSS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 16 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter eleven.

Chapter 12: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 22 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twelve.

Chapter 13: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 23 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 4 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter thirteen.

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35, for the book of 2 Corinthians, based on the available evidence. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for Galatians—final form

This section is based on a complete collation of the following thirty-seven representative MSS—18, 35, 201, 204, 328, 386, 394, 444, 604, 757, 824, 928, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1248, 1249, 1503, 1548, 1617, 1637, 1725, 1732, 1761, 1855, 1864, 1865, 1892, 2080, 2352, 2431, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2723 and 2817. At the five places where there is a division of at least 10% (in the collated MSS), I spot-checked the following 52 MSS: 141, 149, 432, 522, 634, 664, 801, 959, 1040, 1058, 1247, 1400, 1482, 1508, 1618, 1628, 1636, 1652, 1704, 1723, 1726, 1733, 1737, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1763, 1767, 1768, 1856, 1858, 1876, 1899, 1948, (1958), 2009, 2218, 2221, 2255, 2261, 2289, 2378, 2501, 2626, 2653, 2691, 2704, 2774, 2777. Those 89 MSS represent a nearly complete roster of family representatives that are presently available. I neglected a further four that were hard to read or not available.¹ The MS within () is a marginal member. A few more family representatives may come to light, but not enough to challenge any decisions made here. My ‘presently available’ refers to the images that have been posted by both the INTF and the CSNTM. 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.

1:8 – ευαγγελιζεται || ευαγγελιζεται (43.7%) 757,824,986,1072,1503,1617,1855,1864,2352,2431 {141,522,664,1628,1737,1748,1876,2255,2289,2501,2774,2777}

Out of the 89 MSS, none is missing, so out of 89 extant MSS (within the family) 22 have the variant, which equals 24.7%. Is the verb, Subjunctive or Indicative? In the context either is possible, but the 24.7% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

3:19 – ω || ο [25%] 201,1503,1855,2431 {141,149,522,634,1508,1704,1748,1763,1899,1948,1958,2009,2255}

¹ 228, 1161, 1913, 2675.

Out of the 89 MSS, none is missing, so out of 89 extant MSS (within the family) 17 have the variant, which equals 19.1%. Is it 'to whom it was promised', or 'that was promised'? In the context either is possible, but with only 19.1% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

3:26 – ιησου || --- 328,394,928,1249 {959,1247,1749,1856,2289}

Out of the 89 MSS, none is missing, so out of 89 extant MSS (within the family) 9 have the variant, which equals 10.1%. Is it 'faith in Christ Jesus', or 'faith in Christ'? In the context either is possible, but with only 10.1% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

4:7 – δια 394^c || 1 ιησου (15.1%) 394,1248,1732,2080 {1636,1704,1726,1740,1746,1899,2218,2221,2653,2774}

Out of the 89 MSS, one is missing, so out of 88 extant MSS (within the family) 14 have the variant, which equals 15.9%. Is it 'through Christ', or 'through Jesus Christ'? In the context either is possible, but with only 15.9% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

5:26 – γινωμεθα || γενωμεθα [20%] 18,1548,1732,1761,1892 {141,959,1508,1618,1737,1746,1763,1767,1899,2218,2501,2653,2691,2704,2774,2777}

Out of the 89 MSS, two are missing, so out of 87 extant MSS (within the family) 21 have the variant, which equals 24.1%. Is the verb present tense, or aorist? In the context they are virtually two ways of saying the same thing. In any case, the 24.1% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the five places where there is a division of at least 10% of the collated MSS. 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 Galatians, 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 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 ten MSS. Of the 37 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 16 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter one.

Chapter 2: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 37 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 23 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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 four MSS. Of the 37 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 21 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.

probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter three.

Chapter 4: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 37 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 19 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 12 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter four.

Chapter 5: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 37 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 19 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter five.

Chapter 6: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 37 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 27 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 6 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter six.

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35, for the book of Galatians, based on the available evidence. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for Ephesians—final form

This section is based on a complete collation of the following thirty-seven representative MSS—18, 35, 201, 204, 328, 386, 394, 444, 604, 757, 824, 928, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1248, 1249, 1503, 1548, 1617, 1637, 1725, 1732, 1761, 1855, 1864, 1865, 1892, 1897, 2080, 2352, 2431, 2466, 2554, 2587 and 2723. At the five places where there is a division of at least 10% (in the collated MSS), I spot-checked the following 53 MSS: 141, 149, 432, 522, 634, 664, 801, 959, 1040, 1058, 1247, 1400, 1482, 1508, 1618, 1628, 1636, 1652, 1704, 1723, 1726, 1733, 1737, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1763, 1767, 1768, 1856, 1858, 1876, 1899, 1948, (1958), 2009, 2218, 2221, 2255, 2261, 2289, 2378, 2501, 2626, 2653, 2691, 2704, 2774, 2777, 2817. Those 90 MSS represent a nearly complete roster of family representatives that are presently available. I neglected a further four that were hard to read or not available.¹ The MS within () is a marginal member. A few more family representatives may come to light, but not enough to challenge any decisions made here. My ‘presently available’ refers to the images that have been posted by both the INTF and the CSNTM. 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.

1:13 – ημεις || υμεις [40%] 604,1075,1637,1761,2080,2587 {141,432,959,1040,1618,1652,1704,1737,1752,1763, 1768,1948,2218,2221,2289,2653,2777}

Out of the 90 MSS, one is missing, so out of 89 extant MSS (within the family) 23 have the variant, which equals 25.8%. Is it ‘we had heard’, or ‘ye had heard’? Verse 13 is a continuation of, and subordinate to, verse 12, wherein the subject of both verbs is first person plural; so the first form is correct. In any event, the 25.8% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

¹ 228, 1161, 1913, 2675.

4:16 – ἀφης || αφης 757,1248,1732,1865,1892,2352 {141,801,1058,1247,1400,1746,1763,1767,2218,2221,2255,2501,2691,2704}

Out of the 90 MSS, one is missing, so out of 89 extant MSS (within the family) 20 have the variant, which equals 22.5%. Is the first vowel aspirated, or not? The aspiration is correct, but it's lack would merely be an alternate spelling, and therefore not a proper variant. In any case, with only 22.5% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

5:5 – ιστε || εστε [70%] 18,35,386,1100,2466 {141,634,1247,1733,1767,1876,1899,1958^m,2221,2774}

Out of the 90 MSS, four are missing, so out of 86 extant MSS (within the family) 14 have the variant, which equals 16.3%. Is the verb 'to know', or 'to be'? It forms a verb phrase with the following participle. In the context either is possible, but with only 16.3% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

6:5 – της 1503^c || --- [20%] 328,1249,1503,1892 {664,1247,1628,1767,1768}

Out of the 90 MSS, two are missing, so out of 88 extant MSS (within the family) 9 have the variant, which equals 10.2%. They are two ways of saying the same thing: 'in sincerity of your heart'. In the context omitting the article does not affect the meaning, but with only 10.2% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

6:15 – υποδησαμενοι || υποδυσαμενοι [25%] 328,1249,1855,2080,2431 {141,522,959,1058,1247,1508,1652,1746,1749,1752,2009,2218,2255,2378,2501,2653}

Out of the 90 MSS, two are missing, so out of 88 extant MSS (within the family) 21 have the variant, which equals 23.9%. The verbs are different, but in the context they are virtually two ways of saying the same thing. In any case, the 23.9% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the five places where there is a division of at least 10% of the collated MSS. 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 Ephesians, 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 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 six MSS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 20 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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 three MSS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 20 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.

probably add a few 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 one MS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 28 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter three.

Chapter 4: No variant has more than six MSS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 19 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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 five MSS. Of the 35 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 21 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter five.

Chapter 6: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 23 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter six.

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35, for the book of Ephesians, based on the available evidence. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for Philippians—final form

This section is based on a complete collation of the following thirty-seven representative MSS—18, 35, 201, 204, 328, 386, 394, 432, 444, 604, 757, 824, 928, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1248, 1249, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1725, 1732, 1761, 1855, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 1897, 2080, 2352, 2466, 2554, 2587 and 2723. At the four places where there is a division of at least 10% (in the collated MSS), I spot-checked the following 52 MSS: 141, 149, 522, 634, 664, 801, 959, 1040, 1058, 1247, 1400, 1482, 1508, 1617, 1618, 1628, 1636, 1652, 1704, 1723, 1726, 1733, 1737, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1763, 1767, 1768, 1856, 1858, 1899, 1948, (1958), 2009, 2218, 2221, 2255, 2261, 2378, 2431, 2501, 2626, 2653, 2691, 2704, 2774, 2777, 2817. Those 89 MSS represent a nearly complete roster of family representatives that are presently available. I neglected a further five that were hard to read or not available.¹ The MS within () is a marginal member. A few more family representatives may come to light, but not enough to challenge any decisions made here. My ‘presently available’ refers to the images that have been posted by both the INTF and the CSNTM. 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.

1:4 – πασιν || 1 τη [5%] 432,604,1897,2587 {664,1058,1723,1767,1768}

Out of the 89 MSS, one is missing, so out of 88 extant MSS (within the family) 9 have the variant, which equals 10.2%. The translation will be ‘in all my prayers’ in either case. The possessive

¹ 228, 1161, 1913, 2289, 2675.

pronoun defines, with, or without, the article. In any case, with only 10.2% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

1:10 – εἰλικρινεῖς || ειλικρινεις 201,432,604,757,1548,1761,1865 {141,149,522,801,1636,1704,1767,1768,1899,1948,1958,2009,2221^c,2255,2691,2817}

Out of the 89 MSS, none is missing, so out of 89 extant MSS (within the family) 22 have the variant, which equals 24.7%. Since aspiration is phonemic in Greek, it should be written, when applicable. In this case, we have alternate spellings of the same word. The first half of the word appears to relate to the word for sunlight, which is aspirated, which could explain why a derivative is also aspirated. But in any case, with only 24.7% attestation the variant is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

2:26 – υμας || ιδειν [25%] 18,386,1100,1761,1876 {141^c,634,801,1247,(1958^m),2501,2626,2691,2774}

Out of the 89 MSS, one is missing, so out of 88 extant MSS (within the family) 12 have the variant, which equals 13.6%. Is it 'longing for you all', or 'longing to see you all'? In the context either is possible, but with only 13.6% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

2:27 – λυπην || λυπη [10%] 604,986,1075,1761,1892,2080,2466 {141^c,1652,1763,1899,2221,2774,2777,2817}

Out of the 89 MSS, one is missing, so out of 88 extant MSS (within the family) 14 have the variant, which equals 15.9%. Is the case accusative, or dative? The preposition here is perhaps the most versatile of all, working with three cases. In the context the accusative is probably the best choice, but in any case, with only 15.9% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the four places where there is a division of at least 10% of the 37. 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 Philippians, 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 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 seven MSS. Of the 37 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 19 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter one.

Chapter 2: No variant has more than seven MSS. Of the 37 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 20 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 3 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter two.

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

Chapter 3: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 37 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 25 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 3 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter three.

Chapter 4: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 37 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 25 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter four.

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35, for the book of Philippians, based on the available evidence. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for Colossians—final form

This section is based on a complete collation of the following thirty-seven representative MSS—18, 35, 201, 204, 328, 386, 394, 444, 604, 757, 824, 928, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1248, 1249, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1725, 1732, 1761, 1768, 1855, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 1897, 2080, 2352, 2466, 2554, 2587 and 2723. At the five places where there is a division of at least 10% (in the collated MSS), I spot-checked the following 52 MSS: 141, 149, 432, 522, 634, 664, 801, 959, 1040, 1058, 1247, 1400, 1482, 1508, 1617, 1618, 1628, 1636, 1652, 1704, 1723, 1726, 1733, 1737, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1763, 1767, 1856, 1858, 1899, 1948, (1958), 2009, 2218, 2221, 2255, 2261, 2378, 2431, 2501, 2626, 2653, 2691, 2704, 2774, 2777, 2817. Those 89 MSS represent a nearly complete roster of family representatives that are presently available. I neglected a further five that were hard to read or not available.¹ The MS within () is a marginal member. A few more family representatives may come to light, but not enough to challenge any decisions made here. My ‘presently available’ refers to the images that have been posted by both the INTF and the CSNTM. 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.

1:2 – κολοσσαις || κολασσαις [40%] 201,328,394,604,757,986,1075,1249,1548,1855,1864^c,2352,2587 {149,522, 664,(959),1040,1058,1247,1482,1618,1628,1636,1723,1737^c,1740^c,1746,1749,1752, 1763,1767,1856,1899,1948,1958,2009,2218,2255,2261,2431,2626,2704,2777}

Out of the 89 MSS, one is missing, so out of 88 extant MSS (within the family) 41 have the variant, which equals 46.6%. We have alternate spellings of a proper name, which is not a proper variant, since neither the identity nor the meaning is affected. Both spellings are early, and the Byzantine bulk is also divided. Either vowel will work, but to print a text a choice must be made. So far as I know, all printed Bibles have the ‘ο’, and I see no reason to create confusion. A 46.6% attestation is certainly significant, but it is not enough to warrant a change; the more so since most of the better representatives have the ‘ο’. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

2:14 – ηρκεν || ηρεν [40%] 201,328,394,928^c,986,1072^c,1249,1768,1876,1892^c {141,149,522,664,959,1247,1508, 1618,1723,1737,1749,1856,1899,1948,1958,2009,2218,2431,2626,2653,2774,2777}

Out of the 89 MSS, none is missing, so out of 89 extant MSS (within the family) 29 have the variant, which equals 32.6%. Is the tense perfect, or aorist? Is it ‘indeed He has taken’, or ‘and He took’? Our verb here is surrounded by other verbs in the aorist tense, which would exert pressure on the perfect tense, if it were original; if the original were aorist, there would be no need to change it. In

¹ 228, 1161, 1913, 2289, 2675.

the context either form makes sense, but although the 32.6% attestation is significant, it is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

2:16 – υμας || ημας 328,394,604,928,1249,1855 {959,1247,1482,1723,1749,1856,1899,2255}

Out of the 89 MSS, none is missing, so out of 89 extant MSS (within the family) 14 have the variant, which equals 15.7%. Is it 'let no one judge you', or 'let no one judge us'? In the context the second person is certainly better, and with only 15.7% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

2:19 – ἄφων || αφων [25%] 1248,1725,1732,1876,2352 {141,801,1058,1247,1636,1704,1746,1763,1767,1948,1958, 2218,2221,2255,2691,2704,2774,2817}

Out of the 89 MSS, none is missing, so out of 89 extant MSS (within the family) 23 have the variant, which equals 25.8%. Is the first vowel aspirated, or not? The aspiration is correct, but it's lack would merely be an alternate spelling, and therefore not a proper variant. In any case, with only 25.8% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

4:3 – ο θεος ανοιξη ημιν || ~ 3412 328,394,604,928,1249 {959,1247,1508,1723,1749,1856,1899}

Out of the 89 MSS, none is missing, so out of 89 extant MSS (within the family) 12 have the variant, which equals 13.5%. In Greek, a change in the word order often makes little or no difference in the meaning, as here; they are two ways of saying the same thing. But in any case, with only 13.5% attestation the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the five places where there is a division of at least 10% of the 37. 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 Colossians, 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 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 thirteen MSS. Of the 37 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 16 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter one.

Chapter 2: No variant has more than eight MSS. Of the 37 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 15 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 4 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter two.

Chapter 3: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 37 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 21 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.

probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 6 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter three.

Chapter 4: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 37 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 23 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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.

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35, for the book of Colossians, based on the available evidence. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for 1 Thessalonians—final form

This section is based on a complete collation of the following thirty-nine representative MSS for 1 Thessalonians—18, 35, 149, 201, 204, 328, 386, 394, 444, 604, 757, 824, 928, 959, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1248, 1249, 1250, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1725, 1732, 1761, 1768, 1855, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 1897, 2080, 2466, 2554, 2587 and 2723. At the five places where there is a division of at least 10% (in the collated MSS), I spot-checked the following 52 MSS: 141, 432, 522, 634, 664, 801, 1040, 1058, 1247, 1400, 1482, 1508, 1617, 1618, 1628, 1636, 1652, 1704, 1723, 1726, 1733, 1737, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1763, 1767, 1856, 1858, 1899, 1948, (1958), 2009, 2218, 2221, 2255, 2261, 2352, 2378, 2431, 2501, 2626, 2653, 2691, 2704, 2774, 2777, (2817). Those 91 MSS represent a nearly complete roster of family representatives that are presently available. I neglected a further four that were hard to read or not available.¹ The MSS within () are marginal members. A few more family representatives may come to light, but not enough to challenge any decisions made here. My ‘presently available’ refers to the images that have been posted by both the INTF and the CSNTM. 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.

1:9 – απαγγελλουσιν || απαγγελουσιν [15%] 149,201,1250,1876 {522,1948,1958,2009,2255}

Out of the 91 MSS, one is missing, so out of 90 extant MSS (within the family) 9 have the variant, which equals 10%. Is the verb present tense, or future? In the context the present tense is correct. In any case, with only 10% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

2:7 – ηπιοι || ήπιοι 394,444,604,824,928,959,1249,1548,1761,1768,1855,1865,1892,2587^v {634,664,801,1058,1247, 1400,1482,1508,1723,1740,1749,1752,1767,1856,2255,2378,2501,2626,2653}

Out of the 91 MSS, four are missing, so out of 87 extant MSS (within the family) 33 have the variant, which equals 37.9%. Is the first vowel aspirated, or not? We have alternate spellings of the same word, which is not a proper variant, since the identity and meaning remain the same. However, the ‘smooth breathing’ is correct. Wherever the ‘rough breathing’ came from, although the 37.9% attestation is significant, it is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

2:8 – μειρομενοι 35^c,2554^c || ομειρομενοι [30%] 35,386,1100,1732,1761,1768,2466,2554 {432,634,1400, 1726,1733^c,1899, 2221,2261,2501,2817}

¹ 228, 1161, 1913, 2675.

Out of the 91 MSS, two are missing, so out of 89 extant MSS (within the family) 17 have the variant, which equals 19.1%. Although the verbs are different, they are synonyms, two ways of saying the same thing. But with only 19.1% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

3:8 – στηκητε || στηκετε [60%] 959,1249,1250,1876 {432,801,1247,1752,2255,2261,2501^v,2691,2704,2777, 2817}

Out of the 91 MSS, one is missing, so out of 90 extant MSS (within the family) 15 have the variant, which equals 16.7%. Is the verb Subjunctive, or Indicative? Although the conjunction normally works with the Subjunctive, the Indicative does occur. In the context, either one makes good sense; Timothy's good news may have led some copyists to make the change. But in any case, with only 16.7% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

5:21 – δοκιμαζετε || δοκιμαζοντες [40%] 604,1761,1768,2080 {141,1723,1899,2221,2774}

Out of the 91 MSS, one is missing, so out of 90 extant MSS (within the family) 9 have the variant, which equals 10%. Is the verb Imperative, or a participle? In the context the Imperative is correct. But in any case, with only 10% attestation the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the five places where there is a division of at least 10% of the 39. 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 1 Thessalonians, 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 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 four MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 30 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 3 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter one.

Chapter 2: No variant has more than fourteen MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 11 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 5 more. It happens that the two largest divisions in the book fall in this chapter. For any given word the attestation never falls below 25 of the 39.² It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter two.

Chapter 3: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 29 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.

² By way of retrospect, for all the books, for any given chapter and any given word within that chapter, its minimal attestation will be the total of collated MSS (for the chapter) less the number of MSS for the biggest division.

probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 6 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter three.

Chapter 4: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 24 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter four.

Chapter 5: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 17 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter five.

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35, for the book of 1 Thessalonians, based on the available evidence. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for 2 Thessalonians—final form

For this book the family is very solid; no variant has more than two MSS! It follows that there were no divisions to be checked. There is simply no question about the wording of the archetype. However, I will give the force of the evidence chapter by chapter, simply counting the collated MSS.

Chapter 1: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 38 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 28 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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 two MSS. Of the 38 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 27 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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 two MSS. Of the 38 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 22 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 12 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter three.

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35, for the book of 2 Thessalonians, based on the available evidence. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for 1 Timothy—final form

This section is based on a complete collation of the following thirty-seven representative MSS—18, 35, 201, 204, 328, 386, 394, 444, 604, 757, 824, 928, 959, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1247, 1249, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1725, 1732, 1761, 1768, 1855, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 1897, 2080, 2466, 2554, 2587 and 2723. At the seven places where there is a division of at least 10% (in the collated MSS), I spot-checked the following 53 MSS: 141, 149, 432, 522, 634, 664, 801, 1040, 1058, 1248, 1250, 1400, 1482, 1508, 1617, 1618, 1628, 1636, 1652, 1704, 1723, 1726, 1733, 1737, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1763, 1767, 1856, 1858, 1899, 1948, (1958), 2009, 2218, 2221, 2255, 2261, 2352, 2378, 2431, 2501, 2626, 2653, 2691, 2704, 2774, 2777, (2817). Those 90 MSS represent a nearly complete roster of family representatives that are presently available. I neglected a further five

that were hard to read or not available.¹ The MSS within () are marginal members. A few more family representatives may come to light, but not enough to challenge any decisions made here. My ‘presently available’ refers to the images that have been posted by both the INTF and the CSNTM. 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.

1:9 – πατραλοιαις || πατρολωαις [34%] 201,757,824,986,1072,1075,1503,1637,1864,1865,1876,1892,2080,2723
{(141),149,522,1040,1248,1508,1617,1618,1628,1636,1652,1726,1740,1745,
1746,1748,1767,1948,1958,2009,2352,2378,2431,2626,(2774),2777,2817}

1:9 – μητραλοιαις || μητρολωαις [40%] 201,757,824,986,1072,1075,1503,1637,1864,1865,1876,1892,2080,2723
{(141),149,522,1040,1248,1508,1617,1618,1628,1636,1652,1726,1740,1745,
1746,1748,1767,1948,1958,2009,2352,2378,2431,2626,(2774),2777,2817}

The attestation is all but identical for the two sets, so I will discuss them together. Out of the 90 MSS, three are missing and two are mixed, so out of 85 extant MSS (within the family) 41 have the variants, which equals 48.2%. Liddell & Scott consider the first readings to be the earlier and basic forms, and that the variants are alternate spellings of the same words. Alternate spellings are not proper variants, since the identity and meaning of the words are not affected. Why would medieval monks resurrect classical forms, if their exemplar had the current Koine spellings? The pressure would be in the opposite direction. Liddell & Scott 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. Although the 48.2% attestation is certainly significant, in this case it is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

4:1 – πλανοις 1876^c || πλανης [30%] 201,328,394,604,928,959,1247,1249,1855,1876,2080 {141,149,522,664,801,
1250,1508,1618,1704,1723,1737,1746,1749,1763,1767,1856,1899,1948,1958,2009,
2218,2255,2431,2653,2691,2704,2774,2777}

Out of the 90 MSS, none is missing, so out of 90 extant MSS (within the family) 39 have the variant, which equals 43.3%. Is it an adjective, or a noun? Is it ‘deceiving spirits’, or ‘spirits of deception’? They are two ways of saying the same thing, so it could be either one. Although the 43.3% attestation is certainly significant, in this case it is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

5:3 – εκγονα || εγγονα [10%] 328,394,928,959,1247,1249,1855,2587 {664,1058,1482,1508,1723,1749,1752,1763,
1856,1899,2255,2704}

Out of the 90 MSS, none is missing, so out of 90 extant MSS (within the family) 20 have the variant, which equals 22.2%. The variants are alternate spellings of the same word, the second being a simple case of phonetic assimilation or attraction. In any case, with only 22.2% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

5:18 – ἄλωοντα || αλωοντα 35,328,386,394,444,959,1247,1249,1855,1865,2587 {634,1040,1058,1250,1482,1652,
1745,1746,1749,1752,1767,2255,2691,2704,2817}

¹ 228, 1161, 1913, 2289, 2675.

Out of the 90 MSS, two are missing, so out of 88 extant MSS (within the family) 26 have the variant, which equals 29.5%. Is the first vowel aspirated, or not? The aspiration is correct, but it's lack would merely be an alternate spelling, and therefore not a proper variant. The noun equivalent is everywhere spelled with rough breathing. In any case, the 29.5% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

5:21 – προσκλινιν || προσκλησιν [75%] 35,204,386^{alt},444,604,757,986,1100,1247,1249,1503,1548,1637,1732,1768,1855,1865,1892,2080,2466,2723 {141,522,634,1040,1400,1508,1617^{alt},1628,1704,1723,1726,1737,1746,1763,1767,1958,2218,2255,2261,2378,2653,2691,2704,2777,2817}

Out of the 90 MSS, one is missing, so out of 89 extant MSS (within the family) 44 have the variant, which equals 49.4%. Here we have an even division. They are different nouns, but each occurs only here in the NT, so we do not have different contexts to help us. The basic meaning of the second form was 'a judicial summons', which simply does not fit in this context. However, precisely for this context, the two forms apparently were regarded as synonyms meaning 'partiality' (the two vowels were pronounced the same way). According to my presuppositions, both the Holy Spirit and the apostle Paul were good at Greek, so if they meant to say 'partiality', they would use the word with that basic meaning. So then, in spite of the division, I consider that the first form reproduces the archetype.

6:20 – παρθικην 35^c || παρακαταθηκην [20%] 35,604,1732^c,1768,2080 {141,801,1704,1723^c,1737,1746,1899,(1948^m),1958,2218,2501,2653,2691}

Out of the 90 MSS, one is missing, so out of 89 extant MSS (within the family) 15 have the variant, which equals 16.9%. The nouns are different, but in the context they are virtually two ways of saying the same thing. In any case, the 16.9% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the seven 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 1 Timothy, 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 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 fourteen MSS. Of the 37 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 14 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter one.

Chapter 2: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 37 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 26 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.

probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter two.

Chapter 3: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 37 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 29 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 6 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter three.

Chapter 4: No variant has more than eleven MSS. Of the 37 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 20 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 3 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter four.

Chapter 5: No variant has more than twenty MSS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 6 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 3 more. The largest division, plus two middle-sized ones, all fall in chapter 5. No single word will have less than 16 MSS. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter five.

Chapter 6: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 21 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter six.

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35, for the book of 1 Timothy, based on the available evidence. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for 2 Timothy—final form

This section is based on a complete collation of the following thirty-six representative MSS—18, 35, 201, 204, 328, 386, 394, 444, 604, 757, 824, 928, 959, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1247, 1249, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1725, 1732, 1761, 1768, 1855, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 2080, 2466, 2554, 2587 and 2723. At the three places where there is a division of at least 10% (in the collated MSS), I spot-checked the following 54 MSS: 141, 149, 432, 522, 634, 664, 801, 1040, 1058, 1248, 1250, 1400, 1482, 1508, 1617, 1618, 1628, 1636, 1652, 1704, 1723, 1726, 1733, 1737, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1763, 1767, 1856, 1858, 1897, 1899, 1948, (1958), 2009, 2218, 2221, 2255, 2261, 2352, 2378, 2431, 2501, 2626, 2653, 2691, 2704, 2774, 2777, (2817). Those 90 MSS represent a nearly complete roster of family representatives that are presently available. I neglected a further five that were hard to read or not available.¹ The MSS within () are marginal members. A few more family representatives may come to light, but not enough to challenge any decisions made here. My ‘presently available’ refers to the images that have been posted by both the INTF and the CSNTM. 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.

1:16 – επησχυνθη 35^c,1732^c || επαισχυνθη [49%] 35,204,1732,2466 {141,522,801,1726,1737,1763,1897, 2218,2261,2378,2431,2501,2653,2691,2774}

Out of the 90 MSS, none is missing, so out of 90 extant MSS (within the family) 19 have the variant, which equals 21.1%. These are alternate spellings of the aorist passive Indicative of the same verb,

¹ 228, 1161, 1913, 2289, 2675.

so this is not a proper variant. In any case, with only 21.1% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

3:6 – ενδυνοντες || ενδυνοντες [77%] 328,394,604,928,959,1247,1249,1768,1892^c,2587 {141,432,664,1058,1482,1508,1618,1723,1737,1746,1749,1752,1763,1856,1897,1899,2218,2221,2501,2653,2704,2777,2817}

Out of the 90 MSS, none is missing, so out of 90 extant MSS (within the family) 32 have the variant, which equals 35.6%. We have different verbs, the second meaning to ‘sneak’ or ‘worm’ in. The basic meaning of the first verb is ‘to enter’, or ‘to press in’, 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. 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. The first verb is presumably correct. Although the 35.6% attestation is significant, it is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

3:14 – επιστωθης || επιστευθης [10%] 204,444,1548,1725,1732,1761,1768,1855,1876,2080,2554,2587 {432,664,801,1058,1250,1704,1726,1752,2221,2255,2261,2378,2501,2626,2691,2704,2774}

Out of the 90 MSS, four are missing, so out of 86 extant MSS (within the family) 29 have the variant, which equals 33.7%. Again we have two very similar verbs, both aorist passive Indicative. 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. However, the 33.7% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the three 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 2 Timothy, 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 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 four MSS. Of the 35 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 22 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 9 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter one.

Chapter 2: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 20 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter two.

Chapter 3: No variant has more than twelve MSS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 10 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 3 more. The

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

two largest divisions fall in chapter three. No single word will have less than 24 MSS. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter three.

Chapter 4: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 17 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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.

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35, for the book of 2 Timothy, based on the available evidence. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for Titus—final form

This section is based on a complete collation of the following thirty-six representative MSS for Titus—18, 35, 201, 204, 328, 386, 394, 444, 604, 757, 824, 928, 959, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1247, 1249, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1725, 1732, 1761, 1768, 1855, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 2080, 2466, 2554, 2587 and 2723. At the four places where there is a division of at least 10% (in the collated MSS), I spot-checked the following 54 MSS: 141, 149, 432, 522, 634, 664, 801, 1040, 1058, 1248, 1250, 1400, 1482, 1508, 1617, 1618, 1628, 1636, 1652, 1704, 1723, 1726, 1733, 1737, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1763, 1767, 1856, 1858, 1897, 1899, 1948, (1958), 2009, 2218, 2221, 2255, 2261, 2352, 2378, 2431, 2501, 2626, 2653, 2691, 2704, 2774, 2777, (2817). Those 90 MSS represent a nearly complete roster of family representatives that are presently available. I neglected a further five that were hard to read or not available.¹ The MSS within () are marginal members. A few more family representatives may come to light, but not enough to challenge any decisions made here. My ‘presently available’ refers to the images that have been posted by both the INTF and the CSNTM. 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.

2:2 – πρεσβυτας || πρεσβυτερους 328,394,928,959,1247,1249 {1482,1508,1652,1723,1749,1856,1899}

Out of the 90 MSS, one is missing, so out of 89 extant MSS (within the family) 13 have the variant, which equals 14.6%. Is it a noun, or an adjective? In the context the noun is clearly correct. In any case, with only 14.6% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

2:7 – αδιαφοριαν || αδιαφοριαν (7.8%) 35^c,201,204,386,444,757,824,986,1075,1503^c,1637^c,1725,1732,1768,1864^c,1865,1876,2466,2554,2723^c {149,432,522,634,801,1250,1400,1617,1628,1704,1733,1748,1767,1858,1948,1958,2009,2221,2261,2352,2378,2501,2626,2691}

Out of the 90 MSS, none is missing, so out of 90 extant MSS (within the family) 39 have the variant, which equals 43.3%. αδιαφορια, ‘indifference/carelessness’, was a common word in classical Greek, while αδιαφορια, ‘integrity’, apparently did not exist in classical Greek, and some scribes may have written the more common word without thinking. Also, φθ → φ would be an easier alteration than the reverse, being a predictable phonetic simplification; also, the double consonant is more difficult to pronounce. 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. According to my presuppositions, both

¹ 228, 1161, 1913, 2289, 2675.

the Holy Spirit and the apostle Paul were good at Greek, so if they meant to say ‘integrity’, they would use the word with that basic meaning. So then, in spite of the division, I consider that the first form reproduces the archetype.

2:11 – γαρ || --- 328,394,432,1100,1247 {432,664,1400,1749,1763,1767}

Out of the 90 MSS, none is missing, so out of 90 extant MSS (within the family) 11 have the variant, which equals 12.2%. In the context the conjunction is expected, although not strictly necessary. But in any case, with only 12.2% attestation the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

3:9 – ερις 394^c,1768^c || ερεις [75%] 201,394,604,986,1247,1249^c,1548,1768,1855^c {149,522,664,801,1508,1723,1737, 1899,1948,1958,2009,2218,2255,2626,2653,2691,2817}

Out of the 90 MSS, none is missing, so out of 90 extant MSS (within the family) 24 have the variant, which equals 26.7%. Is the noun singular, or plural? The other nouns in the list are all plural, and copyists would change a singular to plural without thinking, but what reason would anyone have for making the reverse change? Although the singular is unexpected, it makes good sense; the 26.7% attestation does not warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the four 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 Titus, 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 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 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 27 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 9 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter one.

Chapter 2: No variant has more than fifteen MSS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 13 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. It happens that three of the divisions in the book fall in this chapter. For any given word the attestation never falls below 21 of the 36. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter two.

Chapter 3: No variant has more than seven MSS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 22 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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.

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

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35, for the book of Titus, based on the available evidence. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for Philemon—final form

For this book the family is very solid; no variant has more than a single MS! It follows that there were no divisions to be checked. There is simply no question about the wording of the archetype. However, I will give the force of the evidence for the one chapter, simply counting the collated MSS.

Chapter 1: No variant has more than one MS. Of the 36 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 29 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and therefore for the book, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add many more (the book is so short that the copyists didn't have time to get tired or bored). If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of this letter.

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35, for the book of Philemon, based on the available evidence. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for Hebrews—final form

This section is based on a complete collation of the following thirty-four representative MSS—18, 35, 201, 204, 328, 386, 394, 444, 604, 757, 824, 928, 959, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1248, 1249, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1725, 1732, 1761, 1768, 1855, 1864, 1865, 1892, 2080, 2466, 2554, 2587 and 2723. At the eight places where there is a division of at least 10% (in the collated MSS), I spot-checked the following 53 MSS: 149, 432, 522, 634, 664, 801, 986, 1040, 1058, 1247, 1250, 1400, 1482, 1508, 1617, 1618, 1628, 1636, 1652, 1704, 1723, 1726, 1733, 1737, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1763, 1767, 1856, 1876, 1899, 1948, (1958), 2009, 2218, 2221, 2255, 2261, 2352, 2378, 2431, 2501, 2626, 2653, 2691, 2704, 2774, 2777, (2817). Those 87 MSS represent a nearly complete roster of family representatives that are presently available. I neglected a further five that were hard to read or not available.¹ The MSS within () are marginal members. A few more family representatives may come to light, but not enough to challenge any decisions made here. My 'presently available' refers to the images that have been posted by both the INTF and the CSNTM. I say a sincere "Thank you" to both organizations.

I now discuss the divisions that were spot-checked. With one exception, 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.

3:17 – επεσεν || επεσον [18%] 959,1248,1548,1892 {664,801,986,1617,1618,1723,1726,1737,1740,1746,1752, 1763,2218,2501,2653,2691,2704,2777}

Out of the 87 MSS, one is missing, so out of 86 extant MSS (within the family) 22 have the variant, which equals 25.6%. Singular, or plural? The subject of the verb is 'whose members', referring to the limbs or members of the body, but presumably the author was not saying that those people lost an arm or a leg at a time. It was the whole body, or corpse that fell, and each person just had one body to fall. The members are treated as a unit, and therefore singular, as in all early MSS and most Byzantine MSS. Some copyists missed the point and changed the verb to agree with the plural noun. In any case, the 25.6% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

¹ 228, 1161, 1913, 2289, 2675.

4:16 – προσερχόμεθα || προσερχομεθα [25%] 394,824,1725,1768 {522,1058,1250,1508,1749,1763,1876,1899,2009,2255,2501,2704,2774}

Out of the 87 MSS, one is missing, so out of 86 extant MSS (within the family) 17 have the variant, which equals 19.8%. Subjunctive, or Indicative? In the context the Subjunctive is better, although the Indicative is possible. However, with only 19.8% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

7:14 – μωσσης || μωσης (24.7%) 328,386,394,1249 {634,664,1247,1482,1508,1745,1749,1856,1899,2218,2626}

Out of the 87 MSS, none is missing, so out of 87 extant MSS (within the family) 15 have the variant, which equals 17.2%. We have alternate spellings of a proper name, which is not a proper variant. In any case, with only 17.2% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

9:1 – πρωτη 35^c,1503^c,1637^c,1864^c,2723^c || 1 σκηνη [30%] 35,757,824,1075,1249,1503,1548,1637,1761,1864^{*2},1865,1876,1892,2466,2587,2723 {149,664,801,1040,1058,1247^{alt},1250,1400,1508,1617,1618^c,1628,1636^c,1652,1723^c,1726,1737^c,1740,1745,1746,1748,1749,1752,1763,1767,1876,1948,1958,2218,2261,2352,2387,2431,2501,2626,2691,2704,2774}

Out of the 87 MSS, two are different, so out of 85 extant MSS (within the family) 49 have the variant, which equals 57.6%. This one is bothersome. All of chapter 8 is about a new and better covenant, compared to the first one, 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, nor in a considerable majority of the Byzantine MSS). Here we have evidence that the copyists faithfully reproduced the exemplar they were copying; few of them would be analyzing the text as they went along. However, to put ‘tabernacle’ in verse 1 is clearly inaccurate, since the first tent, the Holy Place, did not contain the Holy of Holies; they were separated by a heavy curtain. The ‘earthly sanctuary’, end of verse 1, did indeed contain both places, and was itself part of the first covenant. So then, although the first form is attested by a minority of MSS within the family, I consider that it reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

9:7 – προσφερει || προσφεροι 757,824,1072,1075,1503,1864,1892 {1040,1628,1636,1652,1733,1740,1745,1748,2352}

Out of the 87 MSS, none is missing, so out of 87 extant MSS (within the family) 16 have the variant, which equals 18.4%. Indicative, or Optative? In the context the Indicative is clearly correct. But in any case, with only 18.4% attestation the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

9:12 – ευρομενος || ευραμενος [80%] 201,204,604,959,1248,1732,1761,1768,1855,1892,2587 {149,432,522,664,801,1058,1247,1250,1618,1636,1723,1726,1740,1752,1763,1876,1948,1958,2009,2221,2255,2261,2378,2501,2626,2653,2691,2704,2774,2777}

Out of the 87 MSS, one is missing, so out of 86 extant MSS (within the family) 41 have the variant, which equals 47.7%. These are alternate spellings of the same form, so it is not a proper variant; they are two ways of saying the same thing. The Byzantine MSS massively attest the ‘α’, which presumably influenced some copyists; the better family representatives have the ‘ο’. Although the 47.7% attestation is certainly significant, it is not sufficient to warrant a change. I consider that the first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

9:14 – υμων || ημων [15%] 201,328,394,604,928 {149,522,1040,1247,1482,1508,1723,1749,1856,1899,1948,1958,2009,2221,2431}

Out of the 87 MSS, two are missing, so out of 85 extant MSS (within the family) 20 have the variant, which equals 23.5%. Is it 2nd person, or 1st person? Either makes excellent sense, and both are true. However, with only 23.5% attestation the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

11:9 – εις || 1 την [20%] 1100,1248,1761,1768 {664,801,1247,1723,1740c,1899,2218,2378,2431,2501,2691}

Out of the 87 MSS, two are missing, so out of 85 extant MSS (within the family) 14 have the variant, which equals 16.5%. Is it 'into a land', or 'into the land'? Either makes good sense, but with only 16.5% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the eight places where there is a division of at least 10% of the 34. As is typical of variation within the family, there is very little difference in meaning between the options (with one exception). As I have demonstrated, we are able to affirm the precise form of the family archetype for the whole book of Hebrews, 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 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 two MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 22 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 10 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter one.

Chapter 2: No variant has more than one MS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 25 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 9 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter two.

Chapter 3: No variant has more than four MS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 18 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 10 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter three.

Chapter 4: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 23 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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 two MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 30 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.

probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 2 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter five.

Chapter 6: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 26 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 4 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter six.

Chapter 7: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 23 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter seven.

Chapter 8: No variant has more than two MS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 24 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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 sixteen MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 4 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. It chances that four of the eight divisions fall in this chapter, including the two biggest ones. However, no single word will have fewer than 18 MSS. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 2 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter nine.

Chapter 10: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 22 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 9 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter ten.

Chapter 11: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 10 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 12 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter eleven.

Chapter 12: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 21 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twelve.

Chapter 13: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 34 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 24 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter thirteen.

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35 for the book of Hebrews, based on the available evidence. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for James—final form

This section is based on a complete collation of the following 44 representatives of the family for James: 18, 35, 141, 149, 201, 204, 328, 386, 394, 432, 604, 757, 824, 928, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1248, 1249, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1725, 1732, 1754, 1761, 1768, 1855, 1858, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 1897, 2221, 2303, 2352, 2431, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2626 and 2723. At the three places where there is a division of at

least 10%, I spot-checked the following 45 MSS: 209, 226, 634, 664, 801, 1040, 1058, 1101, 1140, 1247, 1250, 1482, 1508, 1617, 1618, 1619, 1628, 1636, 1652, 1656, 1704, 1726, 1733, 1737, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1763, 1766, 1767, 1856, 1899, 2080, 2218, 2261, 2378, (2501), (2653), 2691, 2704, 2777. Those 89 MSS represent a nearly complete roster of the family representatives that are presently available; I neglected four others that are scrambled, incomplete or hard to read. A few more family representatives may come to light, but not enough to challenge any decisions made here. My ‘presently available’ refers to the images that have been posted by both the INTF and the CSNTM. 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.

2:6 – ητιμασατε 1892^c || ητοιμασατε [5%] 149,201,328,986,1072,1892,2352 {1617,1767,2704}

Out of the 89 MSS, 1 is different, so out of 88 extant MSS (within the family) 10 have the variant, which equals 11.4%. This one is curious, because the extra vowel changes the verb, from ‘to dishonor’ to ‘to prepare’, which makes no sense in the context. Perhaps it was a case of dittography. In any event, with only 11% attestation the variant is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

2:13 – ελεον || ελεος [20%] 328,394,432,604,928,986,1249,1548,1725,1732^{alt},1897,2587 {209,634,664,1058,1247, 1482,1619^c,1636,1749,1752,1766,1856,2080,2704}

Out of the 89 MSS, none are missing, so out of 89 extant MSS (within the family) 24 have the variant, which equals 27%; however, 13 of them are part of a subgroup, which could reduce that percentage by about half. Is the case Accusative or Nominative? In the context, I take it that ‘law of liberty’ should be understood as the subject of the verb, and in that event the Accusative is correct. But in any case, with only 27% (or much less) attestation the variant is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

2:14 – εχει || εχη [47%] 141,328,386,394,604,928,986,1075,1249,1548,1855,1876,2431,2587,2626 {634,664,801, 1058,1140,1247,1250,1482,1508,1656,1704,1737,1746,1748,1749,1752,1766,1856,1899,2218,2501, 2653,2704}

Out of the 89 MSS, 1 is missing, so out of 88 extant MSS (within the family) 38 have the variant, which equals 43.2%; however, 15 of them are part of a subgroup (with several more on its fringe), which could reduce that percentage by about a third. Indicative, or Subjunctive? In the context, “if someone says” is properly Subjunctive, while “but does not have works” is properly Indicative. It is the fact of no works that makes the claim spurious. Although the 43.2% attestation for the variant is significant, it is not enough to warrant a change (the more so if we subtract the subgroup). The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the three places where there is a division of at least 10%. As is typical of variation within the family, the change involves a single letter; in the third case the forms had the same pronunciation. As I have demonstrated, we are able to affirm the precise form of the family archetype for the book of James, 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 fully collated, but due consideration needs to be given to the discussion of the divisions, above.¹

Chapter 1: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 44 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 27 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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: All three of the divisions discussed above are in this chapter; those discussions come into play here. No variant has more than fifteen MSS. Of the 44 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 11 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 3 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter two.

Chapter 3: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 44 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 29 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 10 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter three.

Chapter 4: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 44 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 26 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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 three MSS. Of the 44 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 23 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter five.

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35, for the book of James, based on the available evidence. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for 1 Peter—final form

This section is based on a complete collation of the following 43 representatives of the family for 1 Peter: 18, 35, 141, 149, 201, 204, 328, 386, 394, 432, 604, 757, 824, 928, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1248, 1249, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1725, 1732, 1754, 1761, 1768, 1855, 1858, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 1897, 2221, 2352, 2431, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2626 and 2723. At the nine places where there is a division of at least 10% (of the 43), I spot-checked the following 46 MSS: 209, 226, 634, 664, 801, 1040, 1058, 1101, 1140, 1247, 1250, 1482, 1508, 1617, 1618, 1619, 1628, 1636, 1652, 1656, 1704, 1723, 1726, 1733, 1737, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1763, 1766, 1767, 1856, 1899, 2080, 2218, 2261, 2378, (2501), (2653), 2691, 2704, 2777. Those 89 MSS represent a nearly complete roster of the family representatives that are presently available; I neglected four others that are scrambled, incomplete or hard to read. A few more family representatives may come to light, but not enough to challenge any decisions made here. My 'presently available' refers to the images that have been posted by both the INTF and the CSNTM. 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 I do not guarantee complete accuracy. An occasional mistake will not alter the big picture.

1:23 – αλλ || αλλα [60%] 149,201,432,604,757,824,1072,1075,1248,1503,1548,1637,1754,1768,1864,1892,2352,2431
{209,226,1040,1250,1617,1618,1619,1628,1636,1652,1656,1723,1740,1745,1746,1748,1763,2691^c,
2777}

Out of the 89 MSS, 2 are missing, so out of 87 extant MSS (within the family) 36 have the variant, which equals 41.4%; however, 27 of them are part of a subgroup, which would reduce that percentage by well over half. The following word begins with an *alpha*, and it is normal phonology for two identical vowels to reduce to one when juxtaposed. In this case we have alternate spellings that do not affect the meaning. Although a 41.4% attestation for the variant would be significant, if it is reduced by well over half, it is no longer a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

2:9 – εξαγγελητε 757^c,1503^c,1637^c,1864^{alt} || εξαγγελητε 604,757,1075,1503,1548,1637,1754,1864,2352
{1619,1628,1652,1656,1740,1745,2691}

Out of the 89 MSS, 1 is missing and 6 are different, so out of 82 extant MSS (within the family) 16 have the variant, which equals 19.5%. Is the tense aorist, or present? In the context, the translation will be the same. But in any case, with only 19.5% attestation the variant is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

2:11 – απεχεσθαι 1072^{alt} || απεχεσθε [35%] 149,201,204,604^c,757^c,824,1072,1248,1503^c,1548,1637^c,1864^{alt},
2352,2431 {209^{alt},1040^{alt},1617,1618,1619^{alt},1628^{alt},1652^{alt},1656^c,1745^{alt},
1746,1748,1899,2704,2777}

Out of the 89 MSS, 2 are missing, so out of 87 extant MSS (within the family) 16 have the variant, which equals 18.4%; however, 13 are part of a subgroup, which would disqualify this variant. It appears that the Infinitive and Imperative were often used interchangeably, with little or no difference in meaning, as here. But in any case, with only 18.4% attestation (or less) the variant is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

2:24 – απογενομενοι || απογεννωμενοι 394,432,928,986,1249,1548,1768,1855,2587 {664,1058,1247,1482,
1508,1723,(1749^c),(2704)}

Out of the 89 MSS, 6 are different, so out of 83 extant MSS (within the family) 16 have the variant, which equals 19.3%. The variant appears to be based on a verb not otherwise found in the NT that can mean 'to destroy', but it would be awkward in this context. But in any case, with only 19.3% attestation the variant is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

3:6 – εγεννηθητε || εγεννηθητε [35%] 604,1637,1732,1876,2431,2587,2626 {209,226,664,801,1058,1247,1250,
1618,1748,1752,1763,1899,2653,2704,2777}

Out of the 89 MSS, 2 are different, so out of 87 extant MSS (within the family) 22 have the variant, which equals 25.3%. The extra *nu* changes the verb, making them bear Sarah's children by doing good, which makes bad sense; the extra *nu* is probably just a mistake. But in any case, with only 25.3% attestation the variant is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

4:2 – του || --- [78%] 149,201,432,604,757,824,1072,1075,1248,1503,1548,1637,1761,1768,1864,1892,2352,2431
{209,226,1040,1101,1508^c,1617,1618,1619,1636,1652,1656,1737,1740,1745,1746,1748,1766,1856,1899,
2218,2261,2501,2653,2691,2777}

Out of the 89 MSS, 2 are missing, so out of 87 extant MSS (within the family) 42 have the variant, which equals 48.3%; however, 28 of them are part of a subgroup, which would reduce that percentage by well over half. The genitive case defines: 'God's will' = 'the will of God', so the

translation will be the same with either variant. The massive attestation for the variant outside the family probably influenced a number of copyists. Although a 48.3% attestation for the variant would be significant, if it is reduced by well over half, it is no longer a serious contender. I take it that the first form reproduces the archetype, even though there may be some doubt.

4:11 – ως || ης [28%] 141^c, 149, 201, 432, 604, 757, 824, 1072, 1075, 1248, 1503, 1637, 1864, 1982, 2352, 2431 {226, 1040, 1508, 1617, 1618, 1619, 1628, 1636, 1652, 1656, 1737, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1748, 1856, 2218, 2691, 2777}

Out of the 89 MSS, 1 is different, so out of 88 extant MSS (within the family) 34 have the variant, which equals 38.6%; however, 24 of them are part of a subgroup, which would reduce that percentage by well over half. Is it ‘as God supplies’, or ‘which God supplies’? Both make good sense, and the change could be made almost without thinking. Although a 38.6% attestation for the variant would be significant, if it is reduced by well over half, it is no longer a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

5:7 – μελει || μελλει [20%] 141, 432, 604, 824, 986, 1248, 1249, 1768, 1876, 1892, 2352, 2431, 2626 {209, 226, 801, 1247, 1250, 1508, 1617, 1723, 1726, 1748, 1752, 1763, 1766, 1899, 2261, 2501, 2653, 2691}

Out of the 89 MSS, 3 are missing and 1 is different, so out of 85 extant MSS (within the family) 31 have the variant, which equals 36.5%; however, 10 of them are part of a subgroup, which would reduce that percentage by nearly a third. The added letter changes the verb from ‘to care’ to ‘to be about to’. In the context, the variant makes no sense. For some reason, this particular variant set occurs repeatedly in the NT. Although the 36.5% attestation for the variant is significant (if not reduced), it is not enough to warrant a change, the more so since it makes no sense. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

5:8 – καταπιειν 394^{alt} || καταπιη [22%] 328, 394, 604, 928, 986, 1075, 1249, 1761, 1855, 1892^c, 2431, 2587^c {664, 1058^c, 1247, 1482, 1508, 1628^{alt}, 1723, 1745^m, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1763, 1766, 899, 2704}

Out of the 89 MSS, 3 are missing and 1 is different, so out of 85 extant MSS (within the family) 22 have the variant, which equals 25.9%; however, 16 of them are part of a subgroup, which would disqualify this variant. Is it Infinitive, or Subjunctive; ‘someone to devour’, or someone he may devour? They are almost two ways of saying the same thing. But in any case, with only 25.9% (or less) attestation the variant is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the nine places where there is a division of at least 10% (of the 43). As is typical of variation within the family, the differences are slight. As I have demonstrated, we are able to affirm the precise form of the family archetype for the book of 1 Peter, 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 fully collated, but due consideration needs to be given to the discussion of the divisions, above.¹

Chapter 1: No variant has more than 17 MSS. Of the 43 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 11 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.

probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter one.

Chapter 2: No variant has more than nine MSS. Of the 43 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 14 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter two.

Chapter 3: No variant has more than seven MSS. Of the 43 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 16 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 9 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter three.

Chapter 4: No variant has more than 17 MSS. Of the 43 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 16 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter four.

Chapter 5: No variant has more than twelve MSS. Of the 43 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 17 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter five.

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35 for the book of 1 Peter, based on the available evidence. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for 2 Peter—final form

This section is based on a complete collation of the following 43 representatives of the family for 2 Peter: 18, 35, 141, 149, 201, 204, 328, 386, 394, 432, 604, 757, 824, 928, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1248, 1249, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1725, 1732, 1754, 1761, 1768, 1855, 1858, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 1897, 2221, 2352, 2431, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2626 and 2723. At the six places where there is a division of at least 10% (in the 43), I spot-checked the following 45 MSS: 209, 226, 634, 664, 801, 1040, 1058, 1101, 1140, 1247, 1250, 1482, 1508, 1617, 1618, 1619, 1628, 1636, 1652, 1656, 1704, 1726, 1733, 1737, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1763, 1766, 1767, 1856, 1899, 2080, 2218, 2261, 2378, (2501), (2653), 2691, 2704, 2777. Those 88 MSS represent a nearly complete roster of the family representatives that are presently available; I neglected four others that are scrambled, incomplete or hard to read. A few more family representatives may come to light, but not enough to challenge any decisions made here. My ‘presently available’ refers to the images that have been posted by both the INTF and the CSNTM. 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.

1:14 – ταχινη || ταχεινη 394,432,604,1100,1768,2221 {801,1058,1101,1746,1749,2261,2378,2691}

Out of the 88 MSS, 1 is missing and 1 is different, so out of 86 extant MSS (within the family) 14 have the variant, which equals 16.3%. These appear to be alternate spellings of the same word that do not affect the meaning. But in any case, with only 16.3% attestation the variant is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

1:19 – διαυγαση || διαυγασει 328,386,394,1754,2587 {226,664,1058,1247,1482,1737,1749,1752,1763,1766,1856, 2218,2653,2704}

Out of the 88 MSS, 1 is illegible, so out of 87 extant MSS (within the family) 19 have the variant, which equals 21.8%. Is the tense aorist subjunctive, or future indicative? In the context, the translation will be the same. But in any case, with only 21.8% attestation the variant is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

1:21 – ηνεχθη || ηνεγχθη 394,928,986,1249,1548 {1058,1482,1749,1752,2704}

Out of the 88 MSS, 1 is missing, so out of 87 extant MSS (within the family) 10 have the variant, which equals 11.5%. These appear to be alternate spellings of the same form. But in any case, with only 11.5% attestation the variant is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

2:14 – πλεονεξιας || πλεονεξιαν [2%] 394,928,1249,1855,1876,2587,2626 {664,801,1058,1250,1482,1508,1726,1749,1752,1763, 2261,2378,2691,2704}

Out of the 88 MSS, 1 is missing, so out of 87 extant MSS (within the family) 21 have the variant, which equals 24.1%; however, 11 of them are part of a subgroup, which would reduce that percentage by about half. Is the case genitive, or accusative? In the context the genitive is correct. But in any case, with only 24.1% attestation (or less) the variant is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

3:1 – ειλικρινη || ειλικρινη [80%] 149,201,432,604,1548,1761,1768,1876,2221 {226,664,801,1140,1250,1618,1704,1767,2691,2704}

Out of the 88 MSS, 2 are missing, so out of 86 extant MSS (within the family) 19 have the variant, which equals 22.1%. Since aspiration is phonemic in Greek, it should be written, when applicable. In this case, we have alternate spellings of the same word. The first half of the word appears to relate to the word for sunlight, which is aspirated, which could explain why a derivative is also aspirated. But in any case, with only 22.1% attestation the variant is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

3:3 – γινωσκοντες || γινωσκοντας 328,394,928,1249,1855,2587 {664,1058,1247,1482,1508,1618,1749,1752,1856,2080,2704}

Out of the 88 MSS, 2 are missing, so out of 86 extant MSS (within the family) 17 have the variant, which equals 19.8%; however, 13 of them are part of a subgroup, which would disqualify the variant. Is the case nominative, or accusative? The accusative does not fit in this context, so the nominative is correct. But in any case, with only 19.8% attestation (or less) the variant is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the six places where there is a division of at least 10% of the collated MSS. As is typical of variation within the family, the differences are slight. As I have demonstrated, we are able to affirm the precise form of the family archetype for the book of 2 Peter, 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 fully collated, but due consideration needs to be given to the discussion of the divisions, above.¹

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

Chapter 1: No variant has more than six MSS. Of the 43 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 18 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter one.

Chapter 2: No variant has more than seven MSS. Of the 43 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 19 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 11 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter two.

Chapter 3: No variant has more than nine MSS. Of the 43 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 14 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 6 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter three.

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35, for the book of 2 Peter, based on the available evidence. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for 1 John—final form

This section is based on a complete collation of the following 43 representatives of the family for 1 John: 18, 35, 141, 149, 201, 204, 328, 386, 394, 432, 604, 757, 824, 928, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1248, 1249, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1725, 1732, 1754, 1761, 1768, 1855, 1858, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 1897, 2221, 2352, 2431, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2626 and 2723. At the two places where there is a division of at least 10% (of the 43), I spot-checked the following 47 MSS: 209, 226, 368, 634, 664, 801, 1040, 1058, 1101, 1140, 1247, 1250, 1482, 1508, 1617, 1618, 1619, 1628, 1636, 1652, 1656, 1704, 1723, 1726, 1733, 1737, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1763, 1766, 1767, 1856, 1899, 2080, 2218, 2261, 2378, (2501), (2653), 2691, 2704, 2777. Those 90 MSS represent a nearly complete roster of the family representatives that are presently available; I neglected four others that are scrambled, incomplete or hard to read. A few more family representatives may come to light, but not enough to challenge any decisions made here. My ‘presently available’ refers to the images that have been posted by both the INTF and the CSNTM. 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, except for the first one. Those within { } were spot-checked. The percentages within [] refer to the total of known MSS.

1:6 – περιπατούμεν 18,35,141,204,386,824,1100,1725,1732,1754,1761,1858,1865,1876,1897,2221,2466,2554,2626,2723
 {226^c,801,1101,1140,1250,1704,1726,1733^c,1740,1767,2080,2261,2691}
 περιπατωμεν [71%] 149,201,328,394,432,604,757,928,986,1072,1075,1248,1249,1503,1548,1637,1768,1855,
 1892,2352,2431,2587 {209,226,368¹,634,664,1058,1247,1482,1508,1617,1618,1619,1628,1636,
 1652,1656,1723,1733,1737,1740^c,1745,1748,1749,1752,1763,1766,1856,1899,2218,2501,2704,2777}

Out of the 90 MSS, 3 are missing and 2 are illegible, so out of 85 extant MSS (within the family) 53 have the variant, which equals 62.4%; however, we observe a curious circumstance: the roster of MSS that reads the Subjunctive is basically made up of the two subgroups that were clearly identified in 1 and 2 Peter, no fewer than 44 of them. Further, 18 of them come from a single monastery: M Lavras. The Indicative has a better geographical distribution. The verb ‘say’ is properly Subjunctive, being controlled by εαν, but the verbs ‘have’ and ‘walk’ are part of a statement and are properly Indicative: only if we are in fact walking in darkness do we become liars

¹ GA 368 is Family 35, but it only has 1-3 John.

for claiming to be in fellowship. So περιπατούμεν is correct. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

4:20 – μισεῖ || μιση [26%] 328,386,394,604,928,1249,1548,1855,2587 {634,1058^c,1140,1247,1482,1508,1704,1749,1752,1763,1766,1856,2704}

Out of the 90 MSS, none are missing, so out of 90 extant MSS (within the family) 21 have the variant, which equals 23.3%; however, 15 of them are part of a subgroup, which could disqualify that variant. Is it Indicative, or Subjunctive? In the context, you become a liar only if you are actually hating your brother, so the Indicative is correct. In any case, with only 23.3% attestation (or less), the variant is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the two places where there is a division of at least 10% (of the 43). As is typical of variation within the family, the differences are slight. As I have demonstrated, we are able to affirm the precise form of the family archetype for the book of 1 John, 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 fully collated, but due consideration needs to be given to the discussion of the divisions, above.¹

Chapter 1: No variant has more than 22 MSS. Of the 43 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 14 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 6 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter one.

Chapter 2: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 43 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 22 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter two.

Chapter 3: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 43 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 16 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 6 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter three.

Chapter 4: No variant has more than nine MSS. Of the 43 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 28 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 4 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter four.

Chapter 5: No variant has more than twelve MSS. Of the 43 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 17 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter five.

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

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35 for the book of 1 John, based on the available evidence. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for 2 & 3 John & Jude—final form

This section is based on a complete collation of the following 47 representatives of the family for 2 & 3 John and Jude: 18, 35, 141, 149, 201, 204, 328, 386, 394, 432, 444, 604, 757, 824, 928, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1247, 1248, 1249, 1503, 1548, 1628, 1637, 1725, 1732, 1754, 1761, 1768, 1855, 1858, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 1897, 2221, 2352, 2431, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2626 and 2723. There is no division of at least 10% (of the 47) in 2 John or Jude, and just one in 3 John. At that single place I spot-checked the following 43 MSS: 209, 226, 368, 634, 664, 801, 1040, 1058, 1101, 1140, 1250, 1482, 1508, 1617, 1618, 1619, 1636, 1652, 1656, 1704, 1723, 1726, 1733, 1737, 1740, 1745, 1746, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1763, 1766, 1767, 1856, 1899, 2080, 2218, 2261, 2378, (2501), (2653), 2691, 2704, 2777. Those 90 MSS represent a nearly complete roster of the family representatives that are presently available; I neglected four others that are scrambled, incomplete or hard to read. A few more family representatives may come to light, but not enough to challenge any decisions made here. My ‘presently available’ refers to the images that have been posted by both the INTF and the CSNTM. I say a sincere “Thank you” to both organizations.

I now discuss the division that was 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.

3John 10 – εκ || --- [20%] 149,201,432,604,1768,1865,2466 {209,368,1737,1767,2218,2261,2501,2777}

Out of the 90 MSS, two are illegible, so out of 88 extant MSS (within the family) 15 have the variant, which equals 17%. Because of case, the preposition can be understood, but making it overt is better. In any event, with only 17% attestation, the variant is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the single place where there is a division of at least 10% (of the 47). As I have demonstrated, we are able to affirm the precise form of the family archetype for the books of 2 & 3 John and Jude, beyond reasonable doubt. It is reproduced in my Greek Text, *The Greek New Testament according to Family 35*.

I will now consider the force of the evidence for the three ‘chapters’, simply counting the MSS that have been fully collated.¹

2 John: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 47 collated MSS, 31 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this book, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 10 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of 2 John.

3 John: No variant has more than seven MSS. Of the 47 collated MSS, 31 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this book, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 4 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of 3 John.

Jude: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 47 collated MSS, 25 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this book, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we

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

disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 12 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of Jude.

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35 for the books of 2 & 3 John and Jude, based on the available evidence. God has preserved His Text.

The Family 35 archetype for the Apocalypse—final form

This section is based on a complete collation of the following twenty-three representative MSS—(35), 757, 824, 986, 1072, 1075, 1248, 1328, 1503, 1637, 1746, 1768, 1864, 1865, 2041, 2323, 2352, 2431, 2434, 2554, 2669, 2723 and 2821. Besides those 23, I spot-checked the following 22 MSS: 432, 1064, (1384), 1551, 1617, (1732), 1733, 1740, 1745, 1771, (1773), 1774, 1894, 1903, 1957, 2023, 2035, 2061, 2196, 2201, 2656, 2926. So far as I can tell, those 45 MSS represent a complete roster of family representatives that are presently available. 1652 also is a family member, but here it is a fragment containing only the first three verses; however, the first diagnostic family reading is in those verses, and it has that reading—it contains the whole NT besides, and is f^{35} throughout. I will discuss all divisions that involve 15% or more of those 45 MSS, of which there are 29. (Any variant with less than 15% could not possibly represent the archetype.) The MSS within () are marginal members; there are four. My ‘presently available’ refers to the images that have been posted by both the INTF and the CSNTM. I say a sincere “Thank you” to both organizations.

I now discuss the divisions that were spot-checked. With three exceptions, 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.

2:27 – κεραμικα || κεραμεικα 1503,1746,1768,1865,2431 {1384,1732,1773,1957,2196,2201^o}

Out of the 45 MSS, one is missing, so out of 44 extant MSS (within the family) 10 have the variant, which equals 22.7%. We have alternate spellings of the same word, which is not a proper variant, since neither the meaning nor the identity is touched. But in any case, with only 22.7% attestation the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

3:5 – ουτως 1384^c,1732^c || ουτος 2669 {1384,1732,1733,1957,2035,2196,2201,2656,2926}

Out of the 45 MSS, none is missing, so out of 45 extant MSS (within the family) 10 have the variant, which equals 22.2%. Is it an adverb, or a pronoun? The adverb refers back to the immediately prior context, and is presumably correct, although the pronoun also makes good sense. Since the two words were pronounced the same way, confusion was easy. But in any case, with only 22.2% attestation the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

3:9 – ηξουσιν 1865^c || ηξωσιν 35,1746,1768,1865,2041,2323,2723 {1384,1551,1617,1732^c,1773,1894,1903,1957,2023,2061,2196,2201,2656,2926}

Out of the 45 MSS, none is missing, so out of 45 extant MSS (within the family) 20 have the variant, which equals 44.4%. Is it future Indicative, or aorist Subjunctive? 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 f^{35}] but with some dissent; with ηξωσιν the dissent becomes stronger, including a slight majority of Family 35 [a preponderance of the better representatives read the indicative]. The generalized splitting

suggests that the ‘norm’ of subjunctive with $\iota\nu\alpha$ 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. If the exemplar had the subjunctive, why would a copyist change it to indicative? The pressure would be in the opposite direction. Everything considered, although the 44.4% attestation is certainly significant, it is not enough to warrant a change. I take it that the first form reproduces the archetype, although there may be some doubt.

4:6^a – $\upsilon\alpha\lambda\iota\nu\eta$ || $\upsilon\epsilon\lambda\iota\nu\eta$ 986,1248,2821 {1551,1740,2023,2061,2196,2323^c,2656}

Out of the 45 MSS, one is missing, so out of 44 extant MSS (within the family) 9 have the variant, which equals 20.5%. We have alternate spellings of the same word, which is not a proper variant, since neither the meaning nor the identity is touched. But in any case, with only 20.5% attestation the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

4:6^b – $\kappa\rho\upsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\lambda\omega$ 1864^c || $\kappa\rho\upsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\omega$ 35,1075,1248,1746,1864,1865,2041,2431,2723,2821 {432,1384,1617,1732,1740,1745,1771,1773,1903,2023,2196,2201,2656}

Out of the 45 MSS, one is missing, so out of 44 extant MSS (within the family) 23 have the variant, which equals 52.3%. (The correction gives us an even split.) We have alternate spellings of the same word, which is not a proper variant, since neither the meaning nor the identity is touched. However, this one is interesting, for an unusual reason. Although $\lambda\lambda \rightarrow \lambda$ would presumably be easier as a transcriptional error than the reverse, in 21:11 John apparently invented the verb $\kappa\rho\upsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\lambda\iota\zeta\omega$, spelling it with a single ‘l’ (if you invent a word, you may spell it as you wish)—I take it that he did the same thing with the noun, here and in 22:1, but the unusual spelling led copyists to ‘correct’ him, especially in a matter perceived to be of virtually no consequence, since it did not affect the meaning. Everything considered, although the even split is certainly significant, it is not enough to warrant a change. I take it that the first form reproduces the archetype, although there may be some doubt.

4:8 – $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$ 757^c,2023^c,2323^c || $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ 35,757,1072,1248,1328,2323 {986^{alt},1503^{alt},1617^c,1637^c,1732,1733,1740^{alt},1745^{alt},1746^{alt},1771^{alt},1773,1774,1864^{alt},1865^{mar},1894,1957,2023,2035,2196,2352^{alt},2926}

Out of the 45 MSS, one is missing, so out of 44 extant MSS (within the family) 16 have the variant, which equals 36.4%. Is the participle neuter, or masculine? What is the Subject of the verb? The Subject of the participle is $\tau\alpha \zeta\omega\alpha$, 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. Most of the better representatives of the family attest the first variant. In English the translation is the same, “saying”. With this set, ‘alt’ becomes prominent, and there will be heavy use later, so I need to explain the difference between ‘alt’ and ‘c’. ‘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). In this case, there are six ‘alt’ for the masculine, but none for the neuter, so it looks like the copyists considered the neuter to be better, giving it as the basic form—it is clearly correct in the context. Although the 36.4% attestation is significant, it is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

6:4 – $\pi\upsilon\rho\rho\omicron\varsigma$ 2023^c,2035^c || $\pi\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ 1075,1328,2323,2821 {432,1617,1894,1903,2023,2035,2196,2201,2926}

Out of the 45 MSS, one is missing, so out of 44 extant MSS (within the family) 13 have the variant, which equals 29.5%. Is it an adjective, or a noun? *πυρρος* is the reading of all the more faithful members of \mathfrak{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 adjective is better. But in any case, the 29.5% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

7:5 – ρουβιμ || ρουβειμ 1072,1075,(1248),1503,1637,1746,2041,2431,2821 {1617,1740,1745,1771,2023}

Out of the 45 MSS, one is different and one is missing, so out of 43 extant MSS (within the family) 14 have the variant, which equals 32.6%. We have alternate spellings of the same word, a proper name, which is not a proper variant, since neither the meaning nor the identity is touched. But in any case, the 32.6% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

7:10 – τω θρονω || του θρονου 1248,2554 {1064,1732,1733,1740,1773,1774,1894,2035,2061,2196,2201,2656,2926}

Out of the 45 MSS, one is missing, so out of 44 extant MSS (within the family) 15 have the variant, which equals 34.1%. Is the phrase dative, or genitive? Since the Father is firmly seated, the dative is correct. However, since the preposition takes three cases, the translation comes out the same. But in any event, the 34.1% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

7:17^a – ποιμαινει || ποιμανει 35,757,824,986,1075,1248,1328,1503,1637,1746,1864,2041,2352,2431,2554,2821 {1732,1733,1740,1745,1771,1773,1894,1903,2023^{alt},2035,2196,2201,2656,2926}

Out of the 45 MSS, one is missing, so out of 44 extant MSS (within the family) 29 have the variant, which equals 64.4%. This one is complicated. 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 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; the pressure of the surrounding verbs is toward the future. The present tense is attested by 15 MSS, plus 15 alternates; but it loses one alternate, so if we follow the alternates, we have 29 to 15 in favor of the present, just the opposite of the result without the alternates. The use of the alternates shows us how seriously the copyists took their task; they were aware of the doubt and conscientiously passed it on to their readers. Everything considered, although the even split (with alternates) is certainly significant, it is not enough to warrant a change. I take it that the first form reproduces the archetype, although there is doubt. The difference is of only one letter, and the point that is being made is not altered.

7:17^b – οδηγει || οδηγησει 35,757,824,986,1075,1248,1328,1503,1637,1864,2041,2352,2431,2554,2821 {1064,(1551),1617,1732,1733,1740,1745,1746,1771,1773,1894,2023,2035,2061,2196,2201,2656,2926}

Out of the 45 MSS, one is missing, so out of 44 extant MSS (within the family) 33 have the variant, which equals 75%. I consider this to be the most difficult puzzle in the book. Present tense, or future? ‘To guide them’ is linked to ‘to shepherd them’ by ‘and’ and should be in the same tense, unless you put a comma between them. However, the attestation for the future is now 75%, which is normally determinative. Also, the number of alternates drops from 15 to 9—with the alternates the present tense has 20, which is less than half. But again, I ask: where did the present tense come from? Here the future tense makes even better sense than in the prior case; so much so that

if the Text had always been future, the present would not have been used (in fact, four MSS switched sides). Also, this verb is still answering the ‘because’ at the beginning of the verse (unless you put a comma between the verb phrases). The ‘thirst’ in verse 16 is presumably physical, and for that you need ordinary water, not ‘waters of life’. Might ‘waters of life’ solve heat and hunger as well? All said and done, we have three options: ‘He shepherds and leads’, ‘He shepherds, and will lead’ or ‘He will shepherd and lead’. Take your choice. I take the first one, but no matter which one we take, the point of the passage remains the same. None of the original wording has been lost.

8:3 – δώσει || δωση 986^v,1072,2669,2821 {1064,1551,1903,1957,2023,2061,2196,2656}

Out of the 45 MSS, one is missing, so out of 44 extant MSS (within the family) 12 have the variant, which equals 27.3%. Is it future Indicative, or aorist Subjunctive? There is generalized splitting throughout the lines of transmission, which suggests that the ‘norm’ of subjunctive with *λυα* was at work in the minds of the copyists; but the indicative isn’t all that infrequent, and in this case presumably emphasizes certainty. There is no doubt about what the angel is going to do. The better family representatives are on the side of the indicative. In any case, the 27.3% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

9:5 – πληξη || παιση 35,757,824,1075,1248,1503,1637,1746,1864,2041,2352,2431,2554 {1733,1740,1745,1771,1773,1957,2201}

Out of the 45 MSS, two are missing, so out of 43 extant MSS (within the family) 20 have the variant, which equals 46.5%. The verbs are different. It is difficult to imagine medieval monks changing the familiar 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, that we have here, 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. Besides 23 MSS, the first form has 11 alternates and 2 corrections, which puts it well ahead. Everything considered, although the 46.5% attestation is certainly significant, it is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

9:6 – ζητουσιν 1075^e,1551^e || ζητησουσιν 35,1075,1746,2323 {1551,1732,1771,1773,2023,2061,2201}

Out of the 45 MSS, two are missing, so out of 43 extant MSS (within the family) 11 have the variant, which equals 25.6% (the two corrections reduce that by 5%). Is the tense present, or future? The future is expected; so much so that a heavy majority of the MSS outside the family so read, which may have influenced some copyists. That said, the present tense is sometimes used with a future sense, which is required here by the ‘in those days’. If the original were future, who would change it to present? The pressure is heavily in the other direction. The better family representatives are on the side of the present tense. Everything considered, the 25.6% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

9:11 – αββαδων || αββαδων 35,1075,1248,1503,1746,1768,1865,2323,2431,2821 {432,1551,1732,1740,1745,1773,1894,2023,2061,2201,2926}

Out of the 45 MSS, two are missing, so out of 43 extant MSS (within the family) 21 have the variant, which equals 48.8%. We have alternate spellings of the same word, a foreign proper name,

which is not a proper variant, since neither the meaning nor the identity is touched. Although the even split is certainly significant, it is not enough to warrant a change. I take it that the first form reproduces the archetype, although there may be some doubt.

11:18 – διαφθειραντας || διαφθειροντας 1328,2431 {1774,1894,2035,2061,(2196),2201,2656,2926}

Out of the 45 MSS, two are missing, so out of 43 extant MSS (within the family) 10 have the variant, which equals 23.3%. The context calls for the aorist tense, but this verb usually appears in the 2nd aorist, so the unfamiliar 1st aorist was changed to the present, a change of just one letter. The aorist receives some attestation from all nine MS groups, which means that it was not invented in the Middle Ages—if the present were original, why would copyists from all traditions change it to an unfamiliar form? But in any case, with only 23.3% attestation the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

14:14 – καθημενος ομοιος || καθημενον ομοιον 35,757,824,1328,1637,1864,2041,2352,2431,2434,2554, 2669 {1617,1732^{alt},1740,1745,1771,2196}

Out of the 45 MSS, four are missing, so out of 41 extant MSS (within the family) 17 have the variant, which equals 41.5%. Is the phrase nominative, or accusative? I take it that the grammar calls for the nominative, but the translation is the same. Besides 24 MSS, the nominative has 12 alternates, which puts it well ahead. But in any event, the 41.5% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

14:19 – τον μεγαν 2023^c || την μεγαλην 1328,2554 {432,1732,1733,1894,2023,2035,2656,2926}

Out of the 45 MSS, four are missing, so out of 41 extant MSS (within the family) 10 have the variant, which equals 24.4%. Is the gender masculine, or feminine? Is the referent the 'wrath' (m), or the 'winepress' (f)? Because 'the wrath' is modifying 'the winepress', 'winepress' is the expected referent; to change the referent was a marked procedure. I take it that the greatness of the wrath is being emphasized. The unexpectedness led some copyists to make the change. In any case, the 24.4% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

15:8 – ηδυνατο || εδυνατο 35,1248,1328,1637,2352 {2196,2201}

Out of the 45 MSS, four are missing, so out of 41 extant MSS (within the family) 7 have the variant, which equals 17.1%. We have alternate spellings of the same word, which is not a proper variant, since neither the meaning nor the identity is touched. Both spellings are known since classical times and apparently don't affect the sense. But in any case, with only 17.1% attestation the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

16:19 – επεσον || επεσαν 35,757,824,1075,1503,1637,1864,2431,2821 {1617,1740,1745,1771,1773,2023,2041^{alt}, 2196,2201}

Out of the 45 MSS, two are missing, so out of 43 extant MSS (within the family) 17 have the variant, which equals 38.5%. We have alternate spellings of the same word, which is not a proper variant, since neither the meaning nor the identity is touched. Besides 26 MSS, the first form has 11 alternates, which moves it well ahead. But in any event, the 38.5% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

17:10 – επεσον || επεσαν 35,757,824,1075,1503,1637,1746,1864,2041,2431,2821 {1617,1740,1745,1771^{alt},1773, 2023,2196,2201}

Out of the 45 MSS, two are missing, so out of 43 extant MSS (within the family) 18 have the variant, which equals 41.9%. We have alternate spellings of the same word, which is not a proper variant, since neither the meaning nor the identity is touched. Besides 25 MSS, the first form has 11 alternates, which moves it well ahead. But in any event, the 41.9% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

17:16^a – ηρημωμενην || ερημωμενην 35,757,824,1075,1503,1637,1864,2821 {986^{alt},1617,1740,1745,1894,1903,2041^{alt},2926}

Out of the 45 MSS, two are missing, so out of 43 extant MSS (within the family) 14 have the variant, which equals 32.6%. These are evidently alternate spellings of the same form. But in any event, the 32.6% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

17:16^b – φαγονται || φαγωνται 1248,1503,1637,1746,2041,2431,2821 {1617,1740,1745,1771}

Out of the 45 MSS, two are missing, so out of 43 extant MSS (within the family) 11 have the variant, which equals 25.6%. These are evidently alternate spellings of the same form. But in any event, the 25.6% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

19:4 – επεσαν || επεσον 35,1248,1328,1768,1865,2554,2723 {432,1384,1732,1733,1740^{alt},1894,1957,2656,2926}

Out of the 45 MSS, two are missing, so out of 43 extant MSS (within the family) 15 have the variant, which equals 34.9%. These are evidently alternate spellings of the same form. But in any event, the 34.9% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

19:10 – επεσον || επεσα 35,757,824,1075,1248,1503,1637,1864,2041,2323,2352,2431,2821 {1551,1617,1740,1745,1771,1773,2023,2196,2201}

Out of the 45 MSS, two are missing, and three are different, so out of 40 extant MSS (within the family) 22 have the variant, which equals 55%. These are evidently alternate forms of the first person, so there is no difference in meaning. Besides 18 MSS, the first form has 12 alternates, which moves it well ahead. Since there is no difference in meaning, we can use either spelling, but for a printed text we must choose one of them. Everything considered, I take it that the first form reproduces the archetype, although there may be doubt.

20:2 – εστιν || 1 ο 1328,1503 {1384,1732,1733,1773,1894,1903,2035,2201,2926}

Out of the 45 MSS, two are missing, so out of 43 extant MSS (within the family) 11 have the variant, which equals 25.6%. Is it 'a devil', or 'the devil'? Either makes good sense, but with only 25.6% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

21:20^a – σαρδωνυξ || σαρδονυξ 35,986,1072,1637,2041,2323,2352,2434,2669 {1551,1617,2023,2061,2196,2656}

Out of the 45 MSS, two are missing, so out of 43 extant MSS (within the family) 15 have the variant, which equals 34.9%. We have alternate spellings of the same word, which is not a proper variant, since neither the meaning nor the identity is touched. Although the 34.9% attestation is significant, it is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

21:20^b – ενατος 35^c || εννατος 35,757^s {1551,1617,1903,2023,2061}

Out of the 45 MSS, two are missing, so out of 43 extant MSS (within the family) 7 have the variant, which equals 16.3%. These are evidently alternate spellings of the same form. But in any event, the 16.3% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

22:1 – κρυσταλω 1864^c || κρυσταλλω 35,757^s,1075,1248,1637,1864,2041,2323,2821 {1384,1617,1732^c,1740,1745^c,1771,1903,2023,2201,2656}

Out of the 45 MSS, three are missing, so out of 42 extant MSS (within the family) 17 have the variant, which equals 40.5%. We have alternate spellings of the same word, which is not a proper variant, since neither the meaning nor the identity is touched. Please see the discussion of the same set of variants at 4:6. Everything considered, although the 40.5% attestation is certainly significant, it is not enough to warrant a change. I take it that the first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the twenty-nine places where there is a division of at least 15%. 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 Revelation, with perhaps an occasional 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 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 I need to say something about Herman C. Hoskier. He did a complete collation of some 220 MSS for the Apocalypse, of which only 29 are Family 35 (his Complutensian). Of the 41 family representatives that I have identified, excluding four marginal members (35,1384,1732,1773), I have collated 22 and Hoskier collated a further 14² (he did not have access to the other five; also, I collated some MSS that he did not). Even his opponents conceded that Hoskier's collations are almost supernaturally accurate, but to extract his collation of those 14 MSS would be very tedious and time consuming, and I decided to forego the exercise. So what follows is based on my own collation of 22 out of 41 MSS.

Chapter 1: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 22 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 12 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 3 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter one.

Chapter 2: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 22 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 8 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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 six MS. Of the 22 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 8 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.

² For anyone who may be interested, I list the GA numbers for those 14: 432, 1617, 1733, 1740, 1745, 1771, 1774, 1894, 1903, 1957, 2023, 2035, 2061, 2196.

probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 6 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter three.

Chapter 4: No variant has more than eight MSS. Of the 22 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 5 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. There are three divisions in this chapter, but no single word will have fewer than 14 MSS. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 4 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter four.

Chapter 5: No variant has more than one MS. Of the 22 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 13 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 9 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter five.

Chapter 6: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 22 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 12 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 6 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter six.

Chapter 7: No variant has more than fifteen MSS. Of the 22 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 5 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. There are three big divisions in this chapter, but no single word will have fewer than 7 MSS. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter seven.

Chapter 8: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 22 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 12 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter eight.

Chapter 9: No variant has more than twelve MSS. Of the 22 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 2 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. There are two divisions in this chapter, but no single word will have fewer than 10 MSS. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 1 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter nine.

Chapter 10: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 22 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 15 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter ten.

Chapter 11: No variant has more than one MS. Of the 22 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 12 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 10 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter eleven.

Chapter 12: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 22 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 13 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twelve.

Chapter 13: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 22 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 9 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will

probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter thirteen.

Chapter 14: No variant has more than eleven MSS. Of the 22 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 4 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. There is one big division in this chapter, but no single word will have fewer than 11 MSS. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter fourteen.

Chapter 15: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 21 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 12 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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 eight MSS. Of the 22 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 7 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter sixteen.

Chapter 17: No variant has more than nine MSS. Of the 21 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 7 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. There are two divisions in this chapter, but no single word will have fewer than 12 MSS. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 3 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter seventeen.

Chapter 18: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 22 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 10 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter eighteen.

Chapter 19: No variant has more than twelve MSS. Of the 22 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 2 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. There are two divisions in this chapter, but no single word will have fewer than 10 MSS. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter nineteen.

Chapter 20: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 22 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 14 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few 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.

Chapter 21: No variant has more than eight MSS. Of the 21 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 3 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. There is one big division in this chapter, but no single word will have fewer than 13 MSS. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 4 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty-one.

Chapter 22: No variant has more than seven MSS. Of the 20 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 8 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 3 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty-two.

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35 for the book of Revelation, based on the available evidence. I have now discussed and resolved the divisions within Family 35 for all twenty-seven books of the NT.

God has preserved His Text!