IN DEFENSE OF FAMILY 35

Wilbur N Pickering, ThM PhD

Introduction

For my ThM I majored in New Testament Greek. The ruling paradigm in the area of NT textual criticism was eclecticism, itself an offshoot of the Westcott-Hort critical theory. It became obvious to me that neither approach could offer certainty as to the original wording of the NT; indeed they are openly based on the premise that the original wording was 'lost' during the second century. So I did an exhaustive analysis of the W-H theory (see chapter 4 of my book, *The Identity of the New Testament Text II*) and convinced myself that it was erroneous at every point. With it went the eclectic approach. I became a disciple of J.W. Burgon (in NT textual criticism), having read all his works.

H.C. Hoskier's *Codex B and its Allies* demonstrates objectively that the early parchment Codices are of inferior quality. E.C. Colwell and others have demonstrated the same for the early papyri. It follows that the ascribing of special value or weight to them because of their age cannot be sustained. So we must turn our attention to the later MSS. Not having a copy of von Soden, I never paid much attention to his divisions of **K**, and basically subscribed to Burgon's 'Notes of Truth', wherein a **heavy** majority was usually convincing.

It was the H-F Majority Text's representation of the evidence for the Pericope Adulterae that caught my attention, being based on Soden's supposed collation of over 900 MSS. As stated in their apparatus, there were three main streams: $\mathbf{M^5}$, $\mathbf{M^6}$ and $\mathbf{M^7}$. **7** was always in the majority [except for one four-way split] because it was always accompanied by either **5** or **6** [5 + 6 never go against 7]. This looked to me like three independent streams, where seldom would more than one go astray at any given point. Being the common denominator, **7** was clearly the best of the three. (Appendix G of the version of *Identity* to be found on my website, www.esgm.org, demonstrates the superiority of **7**, based on Soden's figures.)

Then I went to Revelation (in H-F) and noticed three main streams again: $\mathbf{M^{a\text{-}b}}$, $\mathbf{M^c}$ and $\mathbf{M^{d\text{-}e}}$. The picture was analogous to that of the PA. Revelation represents a very much larger corpus than does the PA, but even so, there are only 8 cases where **a-b** and **d-e** join against **c** (+ 6 others where one of the four is split), compared to over 100 each for **a-b** and **c** against **d-e** and for **c** and **d-e** against **a-b**. Again, being the common denominator, **c** was clearly the best of the three (see the apparatus of my Greek Text of the Apocalypse).

Now then, it so happens that $\mathbf{M^7}$ in the PA and $\mathbf{M^c}$ in Revelation equal Soden's $\mathbf{K^r}$, so I began to smell a rat. Then the *Text und Textwert* series proved that $\mathbf{K^r}$ is independent of $\mathbf{K^x}$ throughout the NT. It follows that $\mathbf{K^r}$ cannot be a revision of $\mathbf{K^x}$. Then there are hundreds of places where $\mathbf{K^r}$ has overt early attestation, against $\mathbf{K^x}$, but there is no pattern to that early attestation. There being no pattern then $\mathbf{K^r}$ must be early, as the picture in the PA and in Revelation has already implied. If $\mathbf{K^r}$ is early and independent, then it must be rehabilitated in the practice of NT textual criticism. If it is the best line of transmission in the PA and Revelation, it just might be the best elsewhere as well.

But there is an ingrained disdain/antipathy toward the symbol $\mathbf{K^r}$, so I am proposing a new name for the text-type. Let's substitute $\mathbf{f^{35}}$ for $\mathbf{K^r}$—it is more objective and will get away from the prejudice that attaches to the latter. Minuscule 35 contains the whole NT and reflects $\mathbf{K^r}$ throughout, and it is the MS with the smallest number that meets those qualifications[1] (just as cursives 1 and 13 are the smallest number in their families; and like them, 35 is not always the best representative [it is generally excellent]—but it is 11th century, so the text-type could not have been created in the 12th, Q.E.D.).[2]

---

[1] Minuscule 18 has a smaller number and also contains the whole NT, but it defects from the text-type in Revelation.

[2] This Introduction first appeared as my mailing #6, "My Pilgrimage toward $f^{35} = K^r = M^7$ in the PA and M^c in Revelation", in June, 2003.

The Dating of K^r (alias f^{35}, nee f^{18}) Revisited

When Hermann von Soden identified $\mathbf{K^r}$ and proclaimed it to be a revision of $\mathbf{K^x}$ made in the **XII** century, he rendered a considerable disservice to the Truth and to those with an interest in identifying the original wording of the NT Text. This section argues that if von Soden had really paid attention to the evidence available in his day, he could not have perpetrated such an injustice.

Those familiar with my work know that I began by using $\mathbf{f^{18}}$ instead of $\mathbf{K^r}$ (equals $\mathbf{M^7}$ in the PA and $\mathbf{M^c}$ in Revelation), because minuscule 18 is the family member with the smallest number. I then switched to $\mathbf{f^{35}}$ for the following reasons: 1) although 18 is sometimes a purer representative of the texttype than is minuscule 35, in the Apocalypse 18 defects to another type, while 35 remains true [both MSS contain the whole NT]; 2) while 18 is dated to the **XIV** century, 35 is dated to the **XI**, thus giving the lie, all by itself, to von Soden's dictum that $\mathbf{K^r}$ was created in the **XII** century. Further, if 35 is a copy, not a new creation, then its exemplar had to be older, and so on.

After doing a complete collation of 1,389 MSS that contain the whole *Pericope Adulterae* (there were a few others that certainly contain the pericope but could not be collated because the microfilm was illegible), Maurice Robinson concluded:

> Based upon the collated data, the present writer is forced to reverse his previous assumptions regarding the development and restoration/preservation of the Byzantine Textform in this sense: although textual transmission itself is a process, it appears that, for the most part, the lines of transmission remained separate, with relatively little mixture occurring or becoming perpetuated. . . .
>
> Certainly, all the types of PA text are distinct, and reflect a long line of transmission and preservation in their separate integrities. . . .
>
> . . . . . .
>
> It thus appears that the Byzantine minuscule MSS preserve lines of transmission which are not only independent but which of necessity had their origin at a time well before the 9th century.[1]

Fair enough. If $\mathbf{K^r}$ ($\mathbf{M^7}$) was preserved in its 'separate integrity' during 'a long line of transmission' then it would have to have its origin 'at a time well before the 9th century'. Besides the witness of 35, Robinson's collations demonstrate that minuscule 1166 and lectionary 139, both of the **X** century, reflect $\mathbf{K^r}$. If they are copies, not new creations, then their exemplars had to be older, and so on. Without adducing any further evidence, it seems fair to say that $\mathbf{K^r}$ must have existed already in the **IX** century, if not the **VIII**.

For years, based on the *Text und Textwert* series, I have insisted that $\mathbf{K^r}$ is both ancient and independent. Robinson would seem to agree. "The lack of extensive cross-comparison and correction demonstrated in the extant MSS containing the PA precludes the easy development of any existing form of the PA text from any other form of the PA text during at least the vellum era."[2] "The vellum era"—doesn't that take us back to the **IV** century, at least? As a matter of fact, yes. Consider:

---

[1] "Preliminary Observations regarding the *Pericope Adulterae* based upon Fresh Collations of nearly all Continuous-Text Manuscripts and over One Hundred Lectionaries", presented to the Evangelical Theological Society, Nov., 1998, pp. 12-13. However, I have received the following clarification from Maurice Robinson: "I would request that if my name gets cited in regard to your various K^r or M^7 articles that you make it clear that I do not concur with your assessment of K^r or M^7. This is particularly the case with the "Preliminary Considerations regarding the Pericope Adulterae" article; it should not be used to suggest that I consider the M^7 line or K^r text to be early. This would be quite erroneous, since I hold with virtually all others that K^r/M^7 are indeed late texts that reflect recensional activity beginning generally in the 12th century (perhaps with 11th century base exemplars, but nothing earlier)." [Assuming that he was sincere when he wrote that article, I wonder what new evidence came his way that caused him to change his mind—his language there is certainly plain enough. Further, I had a copy of his collations in my hand for two months, spending much of my time poring over them, and saw no reason to question his conclusions in the Nov., 1998 article.]

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

Acts 4:34— τις ην **K**^{r} ℵA (21 B) [both **K**^{r} and **K**^{x} are **IV** century]
τις υπηρχεν **K**^{x} P^{8}D

Acts 15:7— εν υμιν **K**^{r} ℵABC,it^{pt} [both **K**^{r} and **K**^{x} are ancient]
εν ημιν **K**^{x} (D)lat

Acts 19:3— ειπεν τε **K**^{r} B(D) [both **K**^{r} and **K**^{x} are ancient]
ο δε ειπεν ℵA(P^{38})bo
ειπεν τε προς αυτους **K**^{x} sy^{p},sa

Acts 21:8— ηλθομεν **K**^{r} ℵAC(B)lat,syr,cop [**K**^{r} is older than **K**^{x}, very ancient]
οι περι τον παυλον ηλθον **K**^{x}

Acts 23:20— μελλοντες [33.1%] **K**^{r} lat,syr,sa [**K**^{r} is independent and very ancient; there is no **K**^{x}]
μελλοντα [26.9%] {HF,RP}
μελλοντων [17.6%]
μελλων [9.3%] AB,bo
μελλον [7.5%] {NU} ℵ
μελλοντας [5.4%]

Rom. 5:1— εχωμεν [43%] **K**^{r} **K**$^{x(1/3)}$ ℵABCD,lat,bo [did part of **K**^{x} assimilate to **K**^{r}?]
εχομεν [57%] **K**$^{x(2/3)}$

Rom. 16:6— εις υμας **K**^{r} P^{46} ℵABC [**K**^{r} is independent and very ancient, **II/III** century]
εις ημας **K**^{x}
εν υμιν D

2 Cor. 1:15— προς υμας ελθειν το προτερον **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent!]
προς υμας ελθειν ℵ
προτερον προς υμας ελθειν ABC
προτερον ελθειν προς υμας D,lat
ελθειν προς υμας το προτερον **K**^{x}

2 Cor. 2:17— λοιποι **K**^{r}**K**$^{x(pt)}$ P^{46}D,syr [**K**^{r} is very ancient, **II/III** century]
πολλοι **K**$^{x(pt)}$ ℵABC,lat,cop

James 1:23— νομου **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent][1]
λογου **K**^{x} ℵABC

James 2:3— την λαμπραν εσθητα **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent]
την εσθητα την λαμπραν **K**^{x} ℵABC

James 2:4— — ου **K**^{r} ℵABC [**K**^{r} is independent and ancient]
και ου **K**^{x}

James 2:8— σεαυτον **K**^{r} ℵABC [**K**^{r} is independent and ancient]
εαυτον **K**^{x}

James 2:14— εχει **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent]
εχη **K**^{x} ℵABC

[1] For the examples from James I also consulted *Editio Critica Maior*.

James 3:2— δυναμενος **K**^{r} ℵ [**K**^{r} is independent and ancient]
δυνατος **K**^{x} AB

James 3:4— ιθυνοντος **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent; a rare classical spelling]
ευθυνοντος **K**^{x} ℵ ABC

James 4:11— ο γαρ **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent]
ο –– **K**^{x} ℵ AB

James 4:14— ημων **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent]
υμων **K**^{x} ℵ A(P^{100}B)

James 4:14— επειτα **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent]
επειτα και ℵ AB
επειτα δε και **K**^{x}

1 Pet. 3:16— καταλαλουσιν **K**^{r} ℵ AC,sy^{p},bo [**K**^{r} is independent and ancient]
καταλαλωσιν **K**^{x}
καταλαλεισθε P^{72}B,sa

1 Pet. 4:3— υμιν **K**^{r} ℵ bo [**K**^{r} is independent and ancient]
ημιν **K**^{x} C
(omit) P^{72}AB,lat,syr,sa

2 Pet. 2:17— εις αιωνας **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent]
εις αιωνα **K**^{x} AC
(omit) P^{72} ℵ B,lat,syr,cop

3 John 12— οιδαμεν **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent]
οιδατε **K**^{x}
οιδας ℵ ABC

So what conclusions may we draw from this evidence? **K**^{r} is independent of **K**^{x} and both are ancient, dating at least to the **IV** century.[1] A few of the examples could be interpreted to mean that **K**^{r} is older than **K**^{x}, dating to the **III** and even the **II** century, but let's leave that possibility on the back burner and look at some further evidence. The following examples are based on *Text und Textwert* and the IGNTP *Luke*.

Luke 1:55— εως αιωνος **K**^{r} C [**K**^{r} is independent and **V** century]
εις τον αιωνα **K**^{x} ℵ AB

Luke 1:63— εσται **K**^{r} C [**K**^{r} is independent and **V** century]
εστιν **K**^{x} ℵ AB

Luke 3:12— υπ αυτου και **K**^{r} C [**K**^{r} is independent and **V** century]
— ––– και **K**^{x} ℵ ABD

Luke 4:7— σοι **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent]
σου **K**^{x} ℵ AB

[1] Someone may object that it is the readings that are ancient, not the texttypes; but if a texttype is clearly independent, with constantly shifting alignments among the early witnesses, then it has ancient readings because it itself is ancient. And in the case of **K**^{r} there are many hundreds, if not thousands (I haven't counted them, yet), of variant sets where its reading has overt early attestation. (Recall that Aland's **M** and Soden's **K** include **K**^{r}—the poor texttype itself should not be held responsible for the way modern scholars treat it.) If it can be demonstrated objectively that a texttype has thousands of early readings, but it cannot be demonstrated objectively to have any late ones, on what basis can it be declared to be late?

Luke 4:42— εζητουν **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent]
εпεζητουν **K**^{x} ℵ ABCD

Luke 5:1— περι **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent]
παρα **K**^{x} P^{75} ℵ ABC

Luke 5:19— ευροντες δια **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent]
ευροντες —— **K**^{x} ℵ ABCD

Luke 5:19— πως **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent]
ποιας **K**^{x} ℵ ABC

Luke 6:7— —— τω **K**^{r} D [**K**^{r} is independent and **V** century]
εν τω **K**^{x} ℵ AB

Luke 6:10— ουτως και **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent]
—— και **K**^{x} ℵ ABD

Luke 6:26— καλως ειπωσιν υμας **K**^{r} ℵ A [**K**^{r} is independent and **IV** century]
καλως υμας ειπωσιν **K**^{x} D
υμας καλως ειπωσιν P^{75} B

Luke 6:26— παντες οι **K**^{r} P^{75} AB(ℵ) [**K**^{r} is independent and early **III** century]
—— οι **K**^{x} D,syr

Luke 6:49— την οικιαν **K**^{r} P^{75} [**K**^{r} is independent and early **III** century]
—— οικιαν **K**^{x} ℵ ABC

Luke 8:15— ταυτα λεγων εφωνει ο εχων ωτα ακουειν ακουετω **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent]
(omit) **K**^{x} ℵ ABD

Luke 8:24— και προσελθοντες **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent]
προσελθοντες και **K**^{x} ℵ ABD

Luke 9:27— εστηκοτων **K**^{r} ℵ B [**K**^{r} is independent and **IV** century]
εστωτων **K**^{x} ACD

Luke 9:56— (have verse) **K**^{r} **K**^{x} lat,syr,Diat,Marcion [**K**^{r} and **K**^{x} are **II** century]
(omit verse) P^{45,75} ℵ ABCDW,cop

Luke 10:4— πηραν μη **K**^{r} P^{75} ℵ BD [**K**^{r} is independent and early **III** century]
πηραν μηδε **K**^{x} AC

Luke 10:6— εαν μεν **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent]
εαν —— **K**^{x} P^{75} ℵ ABCD

Luke 10:39— των λογων **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent]
τον λογον **K**^{x} P^{45,75} ℵ ABC

Luke 10:41— ο Ιησους ειπεν αυτη **K**^{r} D [**K**^{r} is independent and **V** century]
ο Κυριος ειπεν αυτη P^{45} [the word order is **III** century]
ειπεν αυτη ο Ιησους **K**^{x} ACW,syr,bo
ειπεν αυτη ο Κυριος P^{75} ℵ B,lat,sa

Luke 11:34— –– ολον **K**^{r} CD [**K**^{r} is independent and **V** century]
και ολον **K**^{x} P^{45,75} ℵ AB

Luke 11:53— συνεχειν **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent!]
ενεχειν **K**^{x} P^{75} ℵ AB
εχειν P^{45}D
επεχειν C

Luke 12:22— λεγω υμιν **K**^{r} P^{75} ℵ BD,lat [**K**^{r} is independent and **II** century]
υμιν λεγω **K**^{x} AW

Luke 12:56— του ουρανου και της γης **K**^{r} P^{45,75}D [**K**^{r} is independent and early **III** century]
της γης και του ουρανου **K**^{x} ℵ AB

Luke 12:58— βαλη σε **K**^{r} (D) [**K**^{r} is independent]
σε βαλη **K**^{x} A(P^{75} ℵ B)

Luke 13:28— οψεσθε **K**^{r} BD [**K**^{r} is independent and **IV** century]
οψησθε **K**^{x} P^{75} AW
ιδητε ℵ

Luke 19:23— επι την **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent]
επι –– **K**^{x} ℵ ABD

Luke 21:6— επι λιθον **K**^{r} [**K**^{r} is independent]
επι λιθω **K**^{x} ℵ AB

Luke 21:15— αντειπειν η αντιστηναι **K**^{r} A [**K**^{r} is independent and **V** century]
αντειπειν ουδε αντιστηναι **K**^{x} W
–––– — αντιστηναι D,it,syr
αντιστηναι η αντειπειν ℵ B,cop

Luke 22:12— αναγαιον **K**^{r} ℵ ABD [**K**^{r} is independent and **IV** century]
αναγεον CW
ανωγεον **K**^{x}

Luke 22:66— απηγαγον **K**^{r} P^{75} ℵ BD [**K**^{r} is independent and early **III** century]
ανηγαγον **K**^{x} AW

Luke 23:51— ος –– **K**^{r} P^{75} ℵ BCD,lat [**K**^{r} is independent and **II** century]
ος και **K**^{x} AW

There are a number of further examples where **K**^{r} is alone against the world, showing its independence, but I 'grew weary in well doing', deciding I had included enough to make the point. Note that N-A^{27} mentions only a third of these examples from Luke—to be despised is to be ignored. This added evidence confirms that **K**^{r} is independent of **K**^{x} and both are ancient, only now they both must date to the **III** century, at least.

It will be observed that I have furnished examples from the Gospels (Luke, John), Acts, Paul (Romans, 2 Corinthians), and the Generals (James, 1 Peter, 2 Peter, 3 John), with emphasis on Luke, Acts and James.[1] Throughout the New Testament **K**^{r} is independent and ancient. Dating to the **III** century, it is just as old as any other text-type. Therefore, **it should be treated with the respect that it deserves!!**

[1] I also have a page or more of examples from Revelation that confirm that **K**^{r} (**M**^{c}) is independent and **III** century in that book as well.

I have cited Maurice Robinson twice and shown that the evidence vindicates his claims. Both $\mathbf{K^r}$ and $\mathbf{K^x}$ date to the beginning of the velum era. But he makes a further claim that is even bolder:

> Nor do the uncials or minuscules show any indication of any known line deriving from a parallel known line. The 10 or so "texttype" lines of transmission remain independent and must necessarily extend back to a point long before their separate stabilizations occurred—a point which seems buried (as Colwell and Scrivener suggested) deep within the second century.[1]

Well, well, well, we're getting pretty close to the Autographs! Objective evidence from the **II** century is a little hard to come by. For all that, the examples above taken from Acts 21:8, Acts 23:20, Romans 5:1, Luke 9:56, Luke 12:22 and Luke 23:51 might place $\mathbf{K^r}$ (and $\mathbf{K^x}$) in the **II** century. However, it is not the purpose of this paper to defend that thesis. For the moment I content myself with insisting that $\mathbf{K^r}$ must date to the **III** century and therefore must be rehabilitated in the practice of NT textual criticism.

In conclusion, I claim to have demonstrated that $\mathbf{K^r}$ is independent and ancient, dating to the **III** century (at least). But there is an ingrained disdain/antipathy toward that symbol, so I am proposing a new name for the texttype. Let's substitute $\mathbf{f^{35}}$ for $\mathbf{K^r}$—it is more objective and will get away from the prejudice that attaches to the latter.

Having criticized von Soden's dating of $\mathbf{K^r}$, I now ask: what led him to that conclusion and why has his conclusion been almost universally accepted by the scholarly community? I answer: the number of $\mathbf{K^r}$ type MSS first becomes noticeable precisely in the 12th century, although there are a number from the 11th. That number grows in the 13th and grows some more in the 14th, calling attention to itself.[2]

Those who catalog NT MSS inform us that the 12th and 13th centuries lead the pack, in terms of extant MSS, followed by the 14th, 11th, 15th, 16th and 10th, in that order. There are over four times as many MSS from the 13th as from the 10th, but obviously Koine Greek would have been more of a living language in the 10th than the 13th, and so there would have been more demand and therefore more supply. In other words, many hundreds of really pure MSS from the 10th perished. A higher percentage of the really good MSS produced in the 14th century survived than those produced in the 11th; and so on. That is why there is a progressive level of agreement among the Byzantine MSS, there being a higher percentage of agreement in the 14th than in the 10th. But had we lived in the 10th, and done a wide survey of the MSS, we would have found very nearly the same level of agreement (perhaps 98%). The same obtains if we had lived in the 8th, 6th, 4th or 2nd century. In other words, THE SURVIVING MSS FROM THE FIRST TEN CENTURIES ARE NOT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE TRUE STATE OF AFFAIRS AT THE TIME.[3]

Early Uncial Support for $\mathbf{f^{35}}$ in the General Epistles

I take it that Klaus Wachtel, in his *Der Byzantinische Text der Katholischen Briefe*, recognizes that the Byzantine **text** is early (though often deciding against it on internal grounds), thereby bidding adieu to the prevailing canard. I believe that the evidence presented below demonstrates the same for the **text** of $\mathbf{f^{35}}$.

I proceed to tabulate the performance of the early uncials (5th century and earlier) as they appear in the apparatus of my Greek text of the seven General Epistles. I do not include any variant set where *rell* appears. I use $\mathbf{f^{35}}$ as the point of reference, but only tabulate variant sets where at least one of the extant early uncials (extant at that point) goes against $\mathbf{f^{35}}$ (since most words have unanimous attestation).

---

[1] *Ibid.*

[2] Those who had already bought into Hort's doctrine of a late 'Syrian' text would see no reason to question von Soden's statement, and would have no inclination or motivation to 'waste' time checking it out.

[3] This section first appeared in early 2003 as my mailing #3.

Thirteen early uncials appear in my apparatus: $P^{20,23,72,78,81,100}$,א,A,B,C,048,0173,0232. Only P^{72},א,A,B,C are not fragments (048 is a variety of pieces, here and there). Codex C is missing basically chapters 4 and 5 of James, 1 Peter and 1 John [curiously, the same two chapters for all three books], as well as all of 2 John. Of course, P^{72} has only 1 & 2 Peter and Jude. Four of them never side with $\mathbf{f^{35}}$: P^{78} appears once, P^{23} twice, 0173 thrice and 0232 five times. Of the other fragments, P^{20} shows 1 for, 3 against [25%]; P^{81} shows 3 for, 11 against [21.4%]; P^{100} shows 7 for, 10 against [41%]; 048 shows 10 for, 25 against [28.6%]. Not allowing for lacunae, P^{72} would come in with 23.9%, א with 28.7%, A with 27.7%, B with 21.1%. If we divide C's 117 by 473 (the total of variant sets involved) we get 24.7%, but of course C is missing seven chapters (out of 21), so if we divide 117 by, say, 320, we get 36%—of the four main codices, C is clearly the closest to $\mathbf{f^{35}}$. Out of the total of 473 variant sets, $\mathbf{f^{35}}$ receives overt early attestation 60% of the time (284 ÷ 473).

Before drawing conclusions I present the evidence (only combinations with at least one instance are tabulated).[1]

	James	1Peter	2Peter	1John	2&3John	Jude	**TOTAL**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ alone	56	49	18	32	19	15	**189**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ P^{72}		7				1	**8**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ P^{100}	2						**2**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ א	7	9	7	9	5		**37**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ A	9	8	3	9	2	1	**32**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ B	1	2	1	4	2		**10**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ C	5	8	3	4	1	2	**23**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ 048	1						**1**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ P^{20}א	1						**1**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ P^{72}A		2					**2**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ P^{72}B		2	1				**3**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ P^{72}C		3	1				**4**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ P^{100}A	1						**1**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ אA	7	2	7	5			**21**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ אB	2	3		8		1	**14**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ אC		1	2	5		2	**10**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ א048			1				**1**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ AB	2	1	1	6	2	1	**13**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ AC	6	4	2	1			**13**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ BC			2				**2**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ P^{72}אA		4					**4**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ P^{72}אB		3					**3**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ P^{72}אC		2					**2**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ P^{72}AB		3					**3**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ P^{72}AC		3				1	**4**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ P^{72}BC		1	9			1	**11**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ P^{81}BC		1					**1**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ P^{100}אA	1						**1**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ P^{100}AB	1						**1**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ P^{100}AC	1						**1**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ אAB			1	2			**3**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ אAC	2	4	1	2		1	**10**
$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ אA048			1				**1**

[1] Having neither secretary nor proof-reader, I do not guarantee complete accuracy, but a slip here or there will not alter the big picture, nor invalidate our conclusions.

f^{35} ℵBC	2		1	6			**9**
f^{35} ABC	2	1		2		1	**6**
f^{35} AB048	1						**1**
f^{35} AC048			2				**2**
f^{35} BC048			1				**1**
f^{35} P^{72}ℵAB		1	1				**2**
f^{35} P^{72}ℵAC		2	1				**3**
f^{35} P^{72}ℵBC		1	3				**4**
f^{35} P^{72}ABC		1					**1**
f^{35} P^{81}ℵAB		1					**1**
f^{35} P^{100}ℵBC	1						**1**
f^{35} ℵABC		4	1			1	**6**
f^{35} P^{72}ℵAB048			1				**1**
f^{35} P^{72}ABC048			1				**1**
f^{35} P^{81}ℵABC		1					**1**
f^{35} ℵABC048			1				**1**
Total w/ uncial	55	85	54	65	12	13	**284**
% of variants with uncial support	49.5%	63.7%	75%	67%	38.7%	46.4%	**60%**[1]

involving P^{20} -- **1**
involving P^{72} -- **56**
involving P^{81} -- **3**
involving P^{100} -- **7**
involving ℵ -- **136**
involving A -- **131**
involving B -- **100**
involving C -- **117**
involving 048 -- **10**

Each of these nine uncials is plainly independent of all the others. The total lack of pattern in the attestation that these early uncials give to **f^{35}** shows just as plainly that **f^{35}** is independent of them all as well, quite apart from the 40% without them. But that 60% of the units receive early uncial support, without pattern or dependency, shows that the **f^{35}** **text** is early.

I invite special attention to the first block, where a single uncial sides with **f^{35}**; each of the seven uncials is independent of the rest (and of **f^{35}**) at this point, of necessity, yet together they attest 23.9% of the total (113 ÷ 473). Since there is no pattern or dependency for this 24%, how shall we account for these 113 early readings in **f^{35}**?[2] Will anyone argue that whoever concocted the first **f^{35}** MS had all these uncials in front of him, arbitrarily taking 8 readings from P^{72}, 2 from P^{100}, 37 from ℵ, etc., etc., etc.? Really now, how shall we account for these 113 early readings in **f^{35}**?

Going on to the next block, we have another 85 readings where there is no pattern or dependency; 113 + 85 = 198 = 41.9%. Really now, how shall we account for these 198 early readings in **f^{35}**? Going on to the next block, we have another 63 readings where there is no pattern or dependency; 198 + 63 = 261 = 55.2%. Really now, how shall we account for these 261 early readings in **f^{35}**? And so on.

[1] 2 & 3 John have the lowest percentage (if C had 2 John it would likely come up a bit) and 2 Peter the highest—a whopping 75%! Given all the 'bad press' 2 Peter has received, I find this datum to be interesting.

[2] Should anyone demure that the 5th century MSS included really aren't all that early, I inquire: are they copies, or original creations? If they are copies their exemplars were obviously earlier—all of these 113 readings doubtless existed in the 3rd century.

To allege a dependency in the face of this EVIDENCE I consider to be dishonest. **f**^{35} is clearly independent of all these lines of transmission, themselves independent. If **f**^{35} is independent then it is early, of necessity. **f**^{35} has all those early readings for the sufficient reason that its **text** is early, dating to the 3rd century, at least. But if **f**^{35} is independent of all other lines of transmission (it is demonstrably independent of **K**^{x}, etc.) then it must hark back to the Autographs. What other reasonable explanation is there?[1]

Is f^{35} Ancient?

I have received feedback that goes something like this: "ok, the evidence you have presented indicates that **f**^{35} is independent, but it doesn't prove that it's ancient" [I affirm both]. I consider that the point deserves a bit of 'chewing'. For instance: minuscules 35, 2587 and 2723 are generally dated to the 11th century; although minuscule 1897 is generally dated to the 12th, I have collated it and must say that it looks older to me, just as old as the other three, so I claim it for the 11th as well. What about their provenance? 35 is presently in Paris, but was acquired in the Aegean area [18, also in Paris, was done in Constantinople]; 1897 is in Jerusalem and presumably was produced there; 2587 is in the Vatican and may well have been produced there; 2723 is in Trikala and was doubtless produced there.

I now consider their performance in the seven General Epistles (a corpus of sufficient size and diversity to preclude reasonable challenge). As best I can tell, the exemplars of 35 and 2723 were perfect representatives of the presumed family archetype—not one variant in all seven books. The exemplar of 1897 participates in a splinter group (within the family) at three points, with no further variants. The exemplar of 2587 participates in a splinter group at six points, with no further variants. So the four monks who produced our four 11th century copies were each looking at a perfect (virtually) representative of the family's (**f**^{35}) archetypical text. But how old were the exemplars?

If a MS was not in constant or regular use it would easily last for a century or more, even several. Would Greek MSS in Rome be likely to be much in use at that time? Probably not, so the exemplar of 2587 could easily have been an uncial. How about Jerusalem? The chances of greater use there were probably better than in Rome, and better yet in Constantinople (35?) and Trikala. But do we know to what extent Christians were actually reading Scripture in those years? I think we may reasonably assume that the exemplars were at least a century older than their copies. But 1897 and 2587 join splinter groups, so we are looking at some transmissional history—there must be the parent of the splinter between our exemplar and the archetype.

So, the exemplars were presumably no later than 10th century. If we allow one generation for the creation of splinters, that generation would be no later than the 9th and the archetype no later than the 8th. (I have given an absolute minimum, but obviously there could have been any number of further intervening generations, which would place the archetype much earlier.) But what are the implications of perfect representatives of a family in the tenth century in four diverse locations? How could there be **perfect** copies of *anything* in the 10th century?? That there were four perfect (virtually) representatives of the **f**^{35} archetype in diverse locations in the 10th century is a fact. That they were separated from that archetype by at least one intervening generation is also a fact. So how can we explain them?

Did someone concoct the **f**^{35} archetype in the 8th century? Who? Why? And how could it spread around the Mediterranean world? There are **f**^{35} MSS all over the place—Jerusalem, Sinai, Athens, Constantinople, Trikala, Kalavryta, Ochrida, Patmos, Karditsa, Rome, Sparta, Meteora, Venedig, Lesbos, and most monasteries on Mt. Athos (that represented different 'denominations'), etc. [If there were six monasteries on Cyprus—one Anglican, one Assembly of God, one Baptist, one Church of Christ, one Methodist and one Presbyterian—to what extent would they compare notes? Has human nature changed?] But the Byzantine bulk (**K**^{x}) controlled at least 60% of the transmissional stream (**f**^{35} = a. 18%); how could something concocted in the 8th century spread so far, so fast, and in such purity? How did it inspire such loyalty?

[1] Should anyone wish to claim that **f**^{35} is a recension, I request (and insist) that he specify who did it, when and where, and furnish evidence in support of the claim. Without evidence any such claim is frivolous and irresponsible. This section first appeared in late 2004 as my mailing #23.

However, although $\mathbf{f}^{35}$ has been demonstrated to be independent of $\mathbf{K}^{x}$ (Byzantine bulk), they are really very close and must have a common source. (I would say that $\mathbf{K}^{x}$ represents a departure from $\mathbf{f}^{35}$, that $\mathbf{f}^{35}$ is therefore older.) In the General Epistles $\mathbf{f}^{35}$ does not differ from the H-F Majority Text all that much. For instance, in James $\mathbf{f}^{35}$ differs from H-F nineteen times, only two of which affect the meaning (not seriously). If $\mathbf{f}^{35}$ and $\mathbf{K}^{x}$ have a common source, but $\mathbf{f}^{35}$ is independent of $\mathbf{K}^{x}$, then $\mathbf{f}^{35}$ must be at least as old as $\mathbf{K}^{x}$—Q.E.D. [*quod erat demonstrandum*, for those who read Latin; "which was to be proved", for the rest of us; and in yet plainer English, "the point to be proved has been proved"].

Further, if $\mathbf{f}^{35}$ is independent of all other known lines of transmission, then it must hark back to the Autographs. If it was created out of existing materials at some point down the line, then it is dependent on those materials and it should be possible to demonstrate that dependence. So far as I know, no such dependence has been demonstrated, and to the extent that I have analyzed the evidence, it cannot be demonstrated.[1]

When is a 'Recension'?

"The Syrian text must in fact be the result of a 'recension' in the proper sense of the word, a work of attempted criticism, performed deliberately by editors and not merely by scribes."[2] It is not my wont to appeal to Fenton John Anthony Hort, but his understanding of 'recension' is presumably correct. A recension is produced by a certain somebody (or group) at a certain time in a certain place. If someone wishes to posit or allege a recension, and do so responsibly, he needs to indicate the source and supply some evidence.[3]

Are there any recensions among the MSS that contain the Catholic Epistles? I will base my response on the collations presented in *Text und Textwert* (TuT).[4] They collated about 555 MSS, some 30 of which are fragmentary; this represents around 85% of the total of extant MSS. I will use Colwell's requirement of 70% agreement in order for MSS to be classified in the same text-type (although for myself I require at least 80%). Since TuT presents 98 variant sets, spread over the seven epistles, we have a corpus that presumably is reasonably representative. Although the *Institut* has never divulged the criteria by which they chose the sets, so far as I know, the chosen sets are significant (not trivial).

An Alexandrian Recension?

Is there an Egyptian or Alexandrian recension, or text-type? TuT follows the 'standard' text, which it calls LESART 2. No single MS has this profile. The closest is Codex B, that diverges from it 13 times out of 98, three being sub-variants and four being singulars (including two of the sub-variants)—the agreement is 86.7% [ignoring the sub-variants it is 89.8%]. Next is cursive 1739 that diverges 29 times out of 98, four being sub-variants and no singulars—the agreement is 70.4% [ignoring the sub-variants it is 74.5%]. Next is P^{74} [7th century] that diverges 3 times out of 10, one being a sub-variant and one being a singular—the agreement is 70% [ignoring the sub-variant it is 80%]. Next is Codex A that diverges 34 times out of 98, four being sub-variants and no singulars—the agreement is 65.3% [ignoring the sub-variants it is 69.4%]. Next is Codex C that diverges 24 times out of 66, one being a sub-variant and four being singulars—the agreement is 63.6% [ignoring the sub-variant it is 65.2%]. Next is cursive 1852 that diverges 36 times out of 95, two being sub-variants and no singulars—the agreement is 62.1% [ignoring the sub-variants it is 64.2%]. Next is Codex ℵ that diverges 40 times out of 98, seven being sub-variants and nine being singulars (including four of the sub-variants)—the agreement is 59.2% [ignoring the sub-variants it is 66.3%]. Next is Codex 044 [a. 800] that diverges 40 times out of 97, four being sub-variants and seven being singulars (including three of the sub-variants)—the agreement is 59% [ignoring the sub-variants it is 62.9%]. Next is Codex 048 [5th century]

---

[1] This section first appeared in May, 2006 as my mailing # 37.

[2] B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (2 vols.; London: Macmillan and Co., 1881), *Introduction*, p. 133.

[3] Hort did suggest Lucian of Antioch as the prime mover—a suggestion both gratuitous and frivolous, since he had not really looked at the evidence available at that time. (Were he to repeat the suggestion today, it would be patently ridiculous.)

[4] *Text und Textwert der Griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Ed. Kurt Aland, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1987), volumes 9 and 11.

that diverges 8 times out of 18, one being a sub-variant and no singulars—the agreement is 55.6% [ignoring the sub-variant it is 61.1%]. Not next is P^{72} that diverges 18 times out of 38, six being sub-variants and nine being singulars (including three of the sub-variants)—the agreement is 52.6% [ignoring the sub-variants it is 68.4%]. Codex B is clearly the most important MS in Aland's scheme of things; and the 'standard' text is a composite.

But is there an Egyptian text-type here? Well, **B** and ℵ disagree in 44 out of 98 sets, so their agreement is 55.1%. **B** and **A** disagree in 43 out of 98 sets, so their agreement is 56.1%. **B** and $\mathbf{P^{72}}$ disagree in 19 out of 38 sets, so their agreement is 50%. **B** and **C** disagree in 27 out of 66 sets, so their agreement is 59.1%. **B** and $\mathbf{P^{74}}$ disagree in 5 out of 10 sets, so their agreement is 50%. **B** and **1739** disagree in 37 out of 98 sets, so their agreement is 62.2%. **A** and ℵ disagree in 35 out of 98 sets, so their agreement is 64.3%. **A** and $\mathbf{P^{72}}$ disagree in 24 out of 38 sets, so their agreement is 36.8%. **A** and **C** disagree in 26 out of 66 sets, so their agreement is 60.6%. **A** and $\mathbf{P^{74}}$ disagree in 4 out of 10 sets, so their agreement is 60%. **A** and **1739** disagree in 36 out of 98 sets, so their agreement is 63.3%. ℵ and $\mathbf{P^{72}}$ disagree in 26 out of 38 sets, so their agreement is 31.6%. ℵ and **C** disagree in 30 out of 66 sets, so their agreement is 54.5%. ℵ and $\mathbf{P^{74}}$ disagree in 5 out of 10 sets, so their agreement is 50%. ℵ and **1739** disagree in 46 out of 98 sets, so their agreement is 53.1%. **C** and $\mathbf{P^{72}}$ disagree in 18 out of 31 sets, so their agreement is 41.9%. **C** and $\mathbf{P^{74}}$ disagree in 3 out of 7 sets, so their agreement is 57.1%. **C** and **1739** disagree in 23 out of 66 sets, so their agreement is 65.2%. **1739** and $\mathbf{P^{72}}$ disagree in 22 out of 38 sets, so their agreement is 42.1%. **1739** and $\mathbf{P^{74}}$ disagree in 3 out of 7 sets, so their agreement is 57.1%. Based on this evidence Colwell would not allow us to claim a text-type. The early MSS evidently suffered a common influence, but each wandered off on a private path. No two sets have the same roster of disagreements. They each are certainly independent in their own generation. The common influence observable in the early MSS must have had a source, but that source is really too shadowy to qualify as a recension.

A Byzantine Recension?

LESART 1 is a majority text in the strictest sense. Aland followed the majority reading in every case, except for two variant sets where there is no majority variant and there he followed the plurality (set 32, 1 Peter 3:16—καταλαλωσιν has 49.8%, against καταλαλουσιν with 44.6%) (set 34, 1 Peter 4:3—ημιν has 47.1%, against υμιν with 41.7%). As a byproduct of that procedure no single MS has that precise profile—I found four MSS that come within two variants (607, 639, 1730, 2423) and five that miss by three. The basic $\mathbf{f^{35}}$ profile diverges by five.

Having analyzed the profiles for the ± 555 MSS, apart from $\mathbf{f^{35}}$ I found precisely one cluster of four MSS (82, 699, 1668, 2484), with a few hangers-on, and one cluster of three MSS (390, 912, 1594), also with a few hangers-on, and nine pairs—<u>all</u> the rest have private profiles (including the 'hangers-on').

Within $\mathbf{f^{35}}$ 31 MSS have the basic profile; there is a sub-group of 6 MSS, another of 4, another of 3, plus two pairs—these 17 MSS, plus another 10, differ from the basic profile in only one variant. There are 15 MSS that differ by two and 7 by three, making a total of 80 MSS (32 of which have private profiles), plus a few others on the fringes.

Setting aside all the MSS with a shared profile, plus about 30 that have less than 11% of the total, we are left with around 450 MSS that have a private profile (based on the 98 variant sets), the heavy majority of which are Byzantine. We are looking at a normal transmission; no mass production of a single exemplar.

Setting aside the fragmentary MSS, there are about 40 that fall below Colwell's 70% threshold; all the rest (± 485) would qualify as members of one text-type, which we may call Byzantine. Using my 80% threshold we lose another 17 MSS, leaving ± 470. But I would really rather have 90%, and with that threshold we lose another 46—call it ± 420 MSS. Setting aside the 30 fragmentaries, dividing 420 by

525 we have 80% of the MSS that are strongly Byzantine[1] (using the 80% threshold gives almost 90%) [using the 70% threshold gives 92%]. 345 of the 420 have private profiles—with the possible exception of **f**^{35} there was no 'stuffing the ballot box'.

Although **f**^{35} obviously falls within the Byzantine stream, I will factor it out and treat it separately. 420 less 80 equals 340 strongly Byzantine MSS, only 25 of which share a profile. We obviously have a text-type, but is it a recension? To posit a recension we need a source—who did it, when and where? And using what? Did he merely edit existing materials or did he invent some of the variants? If he invented, is there an observable pattern to explain his attitude?

We have 315 strongly Byzantine MSS (without **f**^{35}) with private profiles—they are independent in their own generation, presumably representing as many exemplars, also presumably independent in their own generation, etc. Which is at least partly why scholars from Hort to Aland have recognized that any Byzantine 'recension' could not have been created later than the 4th century. I have argued elsewhere, at some length, against any notion of a Byzantine recension, at any time or place.[2]

As a preliminary to taking up the question of **f**^{35} (K^r) as possibly a recension, I wish to consider other aspects of the general evidence presented in TuT. Of the MSS that were collated, 78 are dated. There are nine pairs of MSS with the same date (but no more than two MSS to a year—so 60 have a private year); in eight of them the two MSS are quite different in profile; in the ninth pair both MSS are **f**^{35} but differ in one variant. Both are at Mt. Athos, but in different monasteries—it is highly improbable that they had the same exemplar. There is no evidence here of mass production. But why would a monk on Mt. Athos produce a copy in 1280 AD? <u>If the copy is still there</u>, it was not to fill an order from the city. So why did he do it, as a religious exercise or duty? But what would he copy? It seems to me most likely that he would copy an aged exemplar that was showing signs of wear, to preserve its text. I will demonstrate below that the MSS produced in a single monastery were based on distinct exemplars (as Lake, Blake and New indicated 80 years ago).[3]

Mt. Athos

I have heard it said that the MSS at Mt. Athos are under suspicion of having been mass produced, and of being made to conform to an arbitrary standard. I suspect that the speaker was not aware that there are a number of distinct monasteries in that area. TuT lists a mere twenty. Recall that these monasteries represented different patriarchates, orders, countries and even languages. An average small city in the U.S. will likely have an Assembly of God, a Baptist church, a Bible church, a Congregational church, an Episcopal church, a Methodist church, a Presbyterian church, some kind of neo-pentecostal church, among others. How do they relate to each other? To what extent do they join forces? Even a city-wide evangelistic campaign will not get them all together. Were monks in the Byzantine empire any different than pastors in the U.S.? Has human nature changed? The point I am making is that there was probably very little comparing of notes between monasteries on a subject like copying MSS.

Consider: Grigoriu, Pavlu and Protatu are listed with one MS each (for the Catholic Epistles),[4] none of which are **f**^{35}. Karakallu and Kavsokalyvion are listed with one each that is **f**^{35}. Konstamonitu, Philotheu and Stavronikita are listed with two MSS, one **f**^{35} and one not. Xiropotamu has two MSS, neither being **f**^{35}. Pantokratoros has three, one of which is **f**^{35}. Dochiariu has five MSS, none being **f**^{35}. Esphigmenu also has five, one being **f**^{35}. Panteleimonos is listed with seven MSS, two being **f**^{35}. Dionysiu is listed with nine MSS, three being **f**^{35}. Kutlumusiu is listed with ten MSS, two being **f**^{35}. Iviron is listed with twelve MSS, five being **f**^{35}. Vatopediu is listed with 28 MSS, five being **f**^{35}. M Lavras is listed with 52

[1] For a 95% threshold we lose another 35 MSS; 385 ÷ 525 gives 73%. 75% of the MSS reflect a very strong consensus, and yet most have private profiles.

[2] *The Identity of the New Testament Text II* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, third edition, 2003), pp. 21-28, 32-42, 52-54, 70-80, 86-99, 126-133.

[3] K. Lake, R.P. Blake and Silva New, "The Caesarean Text of the Gospel of Mark," *Harvard Theological Review*, XXI (1928), 348-49.

[4] TuT lists a MS each for Andreas and Dimitriu, but did not collate them. Esphigmenu has an added three MSS that were not collated.

MSS, 22 being **f**[35]. With the possible exception of M Lavras, there was evidently no **f**[35] 'steamroller' at work.

But what about within a single monastery? Although MSS presently located at places like London or Paris were presumably produced elsewhere, those located at places like Mt. Athos, Patmos, Jerusalem and Sinai were probably produced right there. The monastery at Mt. Sinai is sufficiently isolated that we might expect that a good deal of 'inbreeding' took place. So let's take a look at the Sinai MSS listed by TuT.

Mt. Sinai

I will list the MSS in a descending order of 'Alexandrishness', with the proviso that such an ordering is only relevant for the first seven or eight:[1]

1. ℵ,01[2]– IV - eapr (2 = 57 [2 subs],[3] 1/2 = 5 [1 sub], 1 = 19 [3 subs], sing = 9, odd = 8) = 98 variants;
2. 1243 – XI - eap (2 = 51, 1/2 = 6, 1 = 22 [5 subs], sing = 2, odd = 16) = 97;
3. 1241 – XII - eap (2 = 47 [5 subs], 1/2 = 4, 1 = 17 [2 subs], sing = 5, odd = 18) = 91;
4. 1881 – XIV - ap (2 = 42 [3 subs], 1/2 = 3 [1 sub], 1 = 16 [1 sub], sing = 1, odd = 11) = 73;
5. 2495 – XIV - eapr (2 = 37 [2 subs], 1/2 = 4, 1 = 37 [4 subs], sing = 2, odd = 17) = 97;
6. 2492 – XIII - eap (2 = 17 [2 subs], 1/2 = 8, 1 = 58 [2 subs], sing = 1, odd = 9) = 93;
7. 2494 – 1316 - eapr (2 = 11, 1/2 = 4, 1 = 73 [2 subs], odd = 10) = 98;

From here on down all the MSS fall within the Byzantine stream.

8. 1874 – X - ap (2 = 4, 1/2 = 9, 1 = 78 [2 subs], sing = 1, odd = 6) = 98;
9. 1877 – XIV - ap (2 = 2, 1/2 = 9, 1 = 81 [5 subs], sing = 2, odd = 4) = 98;
10. 2086 – XIV - ap (2 = 2, 1/2 = 8, 1 = 82 [2 subs], sing = 1, odd = 5) = 98;
11. 1251 – XIII - eap (2 = 2, 1/2 = 9, 1 = 82 [3 subs], odd = 4) = 97;
12. 1245 – XII - ap (2 = 3, 1/2 = 10 [1 sub], 1 = 83 [6 subs], odd = 2) = 98;
13. 1240 – XII - eap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 7, 1 = 82 [7 subs], odd = 4) = 94;
14. 2356 – XIV - eap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 9, 1 = 76 [2 subs], odd = 4) = 90;
15. 1880 – X - ap (2 = 2, 1/2 = 10, 1 = 84 [5 subs], odd = 2) = 98;
16. 2502 – 1242 - eap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 9, 1 = 73 [6 subs], odd = 2) = 85;
17. 1242 – XIII - eap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 9, 1 = 86 [4 subs], odd = 2) = 98;
18. 1250 – XV - eap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 10, 1 = 77 [3 subs], odd = 3) = 91; [**f**[35] ± 2]
19. 1247 – XV - eap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 10, 1 = 81 [3 subs], odd = 3) = 95; [**f**[35] ± 2]
20. 1876 – XV - apr (2 = 1, 1/2 = 11, 1 = 83 [3 subs], odd = 3) = 98; [**f**[35] ± 2]
21. 1249 – 1324 - ap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 10, 1 = 84 [3 subs], odd = 2) = 97; [**f**[35] ± 1]
22. 1248 – XIV - eap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 11, 1 = 84 [3 subs], sing = 1, odd = 1) = 98; [**f**[35] ± 1]
23. 2501 – XVI - ap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 11, 1 = 83 [5 subs], odd = 1) = 96; [**f**[35] ± 4]
24. 2085 – 1308 - ap (2 = 0, 1/2 = 11, 1 = 84 [3 subs], sing = 1, odd = 2) = 98;
25. 1244 – XI - ap (2 = 0, 1/2 = 10, 1 = 85 [3 subs], odd = 2) = 97;
26. 2799 – XIV - ap (2 = 0, 1/2 = 3, 1 = 28 [2 subs], sing = 1, odd = 1) = 33.[4]

Absolutely no two MSS are identical; even the six **f**[35] MSS all differ by at least one variant. The rest of the Byzantine MSS are all distinct, some really so,[5] yet all clearly fall within the Byzantine tradition.[6]

[1] TuT includes two 6th century uncial fragments: 0285 has one reading (of the 98) and 0296 has two. Such a scant basis only allows us to guess that they are not Byzantine.

[2] Of course Aleph is presently located in London, but it became extant in Sinai; to this day the monks at St. Catharine's refer to Tischendorf as 'the thief'.

[3] 'subs' stands for sub-variants, which are included in the larger number. Where a 'sub' is also a singular I list it only as a singular—each variant is counted only once.

[4] The last three MSS have very different profiles.

[5] Notice that no MS scores a perfect 87 for LESART 1, and only four score a perfect 11 for LESART 1/2.

[6] Remember that we are only looking at 98 variant sets—if we had complete collations for the seven books it is almost certain that no two MSS would be identical (from all sources); perhaps for a single book, the smaller the better, a few might be found. [I wrote this in 2004, when I was just beginning to really pay attention to **f**[35]—in fact, within that family, considering only the MSS that I myself have collated, we can say the following: I have in my possession copies of twenty-three identical MSS for both 2

These 26 MSS represent as many exemplars; there was no 'inbreeding', no stuffing the ballot box; each copyist tried to reproduce what was in front of him, regardless of the type of text. Since the MSS were still there in 1800, they were not made to fill an order from elsewhere. Given its isolation, the ancestors of the 26 extant MSS were probably brought to the monastery before the Islamic conquest.

The profiles of the first five MSS in the above list are **very** different, distinct from each other;[1] none is a copy of ℵ, which I find to be curious. Evidently ℵ was not copied—why?[2]

Majestis Lavras

Well, ok, but what about M Lavras? Isn't the disproportionate percentage of $\mathbf{f^{35}}$ MSS suspicious? To find out we must do for M Lavras what we did for Sinai, which will be twice as much work (52 X 26). Again, I will list the MSS in a descending order of 'Alexandrishness', with the proviso that such an ordering is only relevant for the first nine or ten:

1. 1739 – X - ap (2 = 66 [4 subs], 1/2 = 7, 1 = 12 [2 subs], odd = 13) = 98;
2. 044 – VIII - ap (2 = 52 [1 sub], 1/2 = 7, 1 = 20, sing = 7, odd = 11) = 97;
3. 1735 – XI - ap (2 = 43 [2 subs], 1/2 = 7 [1 sub], 1 = 35 [2 subs], sing = 1, odd = 12) = 98;
4. 1505 – XII - eap (2 = 41 [3 subs], 1/2 = 4, 1 = 35 [3 subs], odd = 18) = 98;
5. 1448 – XI - eap (2 = 23, 1/2 = 7 [1 sub], 1 = 58 [2 subs], sing = 1, odd = 8) = 97;
6. 1490 – XII - eap (2 = 13, 1/2 = 7 [1 sub], 1 = 69 [4 subs], odd = 9) = 98;
7. 1751 – 1479 - ap (2 = 7 [1 sub], 1/2 = 11 [1 sub], 1 = 69 [3 subs], sing = 5, odd = 6) = 98;
8. 1501 – XIII - eap (2 = 8 [1 sub], 1/2 = 8, 1 = 73 [1 sub], sing = 1, odd = 8) = 98;
9. 1661 – XV - eap (2 = 6, 1/2 = 9 [1 sub], 1 = 73 [5 subs], sing = 3, odd = 7) = 98;

From here on down all the MSS fall within the Byzantine stream.

10. 1609 – XIV - eap (2 = 9 [1 sub], 1/2 = 9, 1 = 76 [4 subs], odd = 3) = 97;
11. 1646 – 1172 - eap (2 = 3, 1/2 = 10, 1 = 77 [6 subs], sing = 5, odd = 3) = 98;
12. 1509 – XIII - eap (2 = 3, 1/2 = 9, 1 = 77 [5 subs], sing = 3, odd = 5) = 97;
13. 1744 – XIV - ap (2 = 2, 1/2 = 8, 1 = 81 [2 subs], sing = 2, odd = 5) = 98;
14. 1643 – XIV - eap (2 = 3, 1/2 = 7, 1 = 82 [3 subs], odd = 6) = 98;
15. 1626 – XV - eapr (2 = 2, 1/2 = 9, 1 = 81 [6 subs], sing = 1, odd = 5) = 98;
16. 1743 – XII - ap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 7 [1 sub], 1 = 83 [2 subs], odd = 7) = 98;
17. 1622 – XIV - eap (2 = 4, 1/2 = 10, 1 = 81 [4 subs], odd = 3) = 98;
18. 2194 – 1118 - ap (2 = 2, 1/2 = 8, 1 = 83 [2 subs], odd = 5) = 98;
19. 1495 – XIV - eap (2 = 4, 1/2 = 10, 1 = 82 [5 subs], odd = 2) = 98;
20. 1642 – 1278 - eap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 10, 1 = 82 [6 subs], sing = 1, odd = 3) = 97;
21. 1738 – XI - ap (2 = 2, 1/2 = 10, 1 = 82 [8 subs], odd = 3) = 97;
22. 1649 – XV - eap (2 = 2, 1/2 = 9, 1 = 84 [5 subs], odd = 3) = 98;
23. 1734 – 1015 - apr (2 = 1, 1/2 = 9, 1 = 82 [1 sub], odd = 4) = 96;
24. 049 – IX - ap (2 = 1 [1 sub], 1/2 = 9, 1 = 84 [4 subs], odd = 3) = 97;
25. 1741 – XIV - ap (2 = 0, 1/2 = 7 [1 sub], 1 = 87 [4 subs], odd = 4) = 98;
26. 1456 – XIII - eap (2 = 0, 1/2 = 8 [1 sub], 1 = 69 [2 subs], odd = 4) = 81;
27. 1747 – XIV - ap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 9, 1 = 84 [6 subs], odd = 2) = 96;
28. 1736 – XIII - ap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 10, 1 = 83 [4 subs], odd = 2) = 96;
29. 2511 – XIV - eap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 10 [1 sub], 1 = 76 [I sub], odd = 2) = 89;
30. 1750 – XV - ap (2 = 0, 1/2 = 9, 1 = 87 [3 subs], odd = 2) = 98;
31. 1733 – XIV - apr (2 = 1, 1/2 = 11, 1 = 83 [3 subs], odd = 3) = 98; [$\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 2$] (16, 91)
32. 1732 – 1384 - apr (2 = 2, 1/2 = 11 [1 sub], 1 = 83 [3 subs], odd = 1) = 97; [$\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 2$] (1, 72)
33. 1508 – XV - eap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 10, 1 = 85 [4 subs], odd = 2) = 98; [$\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 2$] (21, 65)

---

and 3 John, fifteen for Jude, fourteen for Philemon, seven for 2 Thessalonians, five for Titus, four for 1 Thessalonians, three each for Galatians and Colossians, and two each for Ephesians, James, 1 Peter, 2 Peter and 1 John.]

[1] I consider a high 'erraticity' quotient to be a defining feature of 'Alexandrishness'.

[2] But over ten people did try to correct it, down through the centuries, so they knew it was there. 1243 and 1241 are almost as bad, and they were produced in the 11th and 12th centuries, respectively.

34. 1482 – 1304 - eap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 10, 1 = 85 [2 subs], odd = 2) = 98;	[$\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 2$]	(45, 65)
35. 1656 – XV - eap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 11, 1 = 84 [2 subs], odd = 2) = 98;	[$\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 2$]	(8, 45)
36. 1748 – 1662 - ap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 11, 1 = 85 [4 subs], odd = 1) = 98;	[$\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 2$]	(32, 62)
37. 1737 – XII - ap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 11, 1 = 85 [3 subs], odd = 1) = 98;	[$\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 2$]	(32, 77)
38. 1749 – XVI - ap (2 = 2, 1/2 = 11, 1 = 78 [3 subs], odd = 1) = 92;	[$\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 1$]	(29)
39. 1637 – 1328 - eapr (2 = 2, 1/2 = 11, 1 = 84 [3 subs], odd = 1) = 98;	[$\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 1$]	(17)
40. 1740 – XIII - apr (2 = 1, 1/2 = 11, 1 = 85 [4 subs], odd = 1) = 98;	[$\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 1$]	(39)
41. 1617 – XV - eapr (2 = 1, 1/2 = 11, 1 = 85 [4 subs], odd = 1) = 98;	[$\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 1$]	(21)
42. 1618 – 1568 - eap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 11, 1 = 85 [2 subs], odd = 1) = 98;	[$\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 1$]	(32)
43. 1072 – XIII - eapr (2 = 1, 1/2 = 11, 1= 85 [3 subs], odd = 1) = 98;	[$\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 0$]	
44. 1075 – XIV - eapr (2 = 1, 1/2 = 11, 1= 85 [3 subs], odd = 1) = 98;	[$\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 0$]	
45. 1503 – 1317 - eapr (2 = 1, 1/2 = 11, 1= 85 [3 subs], odd = 1) = 98;	[$\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 0$]	
46. 1619 – XIV - ea(p) (2 = 1, 1/2 = 11, 1= 85 [3 subs], odd = 1) = 98;	[$\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 0$]	
47. 1628 – 1400 - eap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 11, 1= 85 [3 subs], odd = 1) = 98;	[$\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 0$]	
48. 1636 – XV - eap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 11, 1= 85 [3 subs], odd = 1) = 98;	[$\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 0$]	
49. 1745 – XV - apr (2 = 1, 1/2 = 11, 1= 85 [3 subs], odd = 1) = 98;	[$\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 0$]	
50. 1746 – XIV - apr (2 = 1, 1/2 = 11, 1= 85 [3 subs], odd = 1) = 98;	[$\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 0$]	
51. 1652 – XVI - eap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 3, 1= 21) = 25;	[$\mathbf{f^{35}}$ frag]	
52. 1742 – XIII - ap (2 = 1, 1/2 = 11, 1= 85 [3 subs]) = 97;	[$\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 5$]	

Again, setting aside the $\mathbf{f^{35}}$ MSS for the moment, absolutely no two MSS are identical. The rest of the Byzantine MSS are all distinct, some really so, yet all clearly fall within the Byzantine tradition. These 30 MSS represent as many exemplars; there was no 'inbreeding', no stuffing the ballot box; each copyist tried to reproduce what was in front of him, regardless of the quality of text. Since the MSS were still there in 1800, they were not made to fill an order from elsewhere.

Also, where did the monasteries get the parchment for their ongoing production of MSS? Did they have money to go out and buy from tanneries? It seems to me more probable that they made their own from the skins of the sheep and goats that they ate. In such an event it could easily take several years to get enough for a single New Testament. The problem of finding enough parchment mitigates against the mass production of copies at any time in the vellum era. Three of the dated MSS at Sinai are eight years apart (1308, 1316, 1324)—might it have taken that long to gather enough vellum?

Now let's consider the $\mathbf{f^{35}}$ group. Seven are $\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 2$, but no two of them have an identical profile—I have put the deviant variants within ( ) at the end of the line, so the reader can check that at a glance. Five are $\mathbf{f^{35}} \pm 1$, but no two of them have an identical profile either, as the reader can see at a glance. So these twelve MSS must also have been copied from as many exemplars—we now have 44 MSS that were copied from distinct exemplars. Ah, but there are eight MSS with a perfect $\mathbf{f^{35}}$ profile; what of them? Well, let's start with the contents: three contain **eapr**, three contain **eap**, two contain **apr**—at the very least, these three groups must represent distinct exemplars. So now we are down to a maximum of five MSS that might not represent a distinct exemplar. Setting aside preconceived ideas, what objective basis could anyone have for affirming that these five were not copied on the same principle as the rest, namely to preserve the text of the exemplar? It seems to me only fair to understand that the 52 extant MSS at M Lavras represent as many distinct exemplars.[1]

An $\mathbf{f^{35}}$ ($\mathbf{K^r}$) Recension?

Since $\mathbf{f^{35}}$ is the only group of consequence, with a significant number of MSS, with a perfect profile, we can determine its archetypical text with certainty—we have the most cohesive of all text-types. But is it a 'recension'? Von Soden claimed that it was, assigning it to the 12th century; I am not aware that he named a source, but if he did he was wrong. Minuscule 35, along with other 11th century MSS, belongs to this group—their exemplars were presumably 10th century or earlier. I have demonstrated elsewhere[2]

[1] I remind the reader again that we are only looking at 98 variant sets—if we had complete collations for the seven books it is almost certain that no two MSS would be identical. With full collations these five will doubtless prove to be distinct as well.

[2] "The Dating of K^r (alias $\mathbf{f^{35}}$, nee f^{18}) Revisited". (See also "Concerning the Text of the *Pericope Adulterae*".)

that **f**^{35} (K^{r}) is independent of **K**^{x}, throughout the NT—if it is independent it cannot have been based upon **K**^{x}. Repeatedly **f**^{35} has overt early attestation, against **K**^{x}, but there is no pattern to the alignments, they are hap-hazard. It is supported (against K^{x}) by P^{45,46,47,66,75},א,A,B,C,D,lat,syr,cop—sometimes just by one, sometimes by two, three, four or more of them, but in constantly shifting patterns. If there is no pattern then there is no dependency; **f**^{35} has ancient readings because it itself is ancient.

Returning to TuT and the Catholic Epistles, I will list the present location of **f**^{35} MSS by century:

XI—Paris, Trikala, Vatican;
XII—Athos (Kutlumusiu, Lavra, Panteleimonos, Stavronikita, Vatopediu), Jerusalem;
XIII—Athens, Athos (Iviron, Konstamonitu, Lavra, Pantokratoros, Philotheu), Bologna, Kalavryta, Leiden, Vatican;
XIV—Athens, Athos (Dionysiu, Esphigmenu, Iviron, Karakally, Kavsokalyvion, Lavra, Vatopediu), Grottaferrata, Jerusalem, Karditsa, London, Ochrida, Paris, Patmos, Rome, Sinai, Vatican;
XV—Athens, Athos (Iviron, Lavra), Bucharest, London, Meteora, Sinai, Sparta, Vatican, Venedig, Zittau;
XVI—Athens, Athos (Iviron, Kuthumusiu, Lavra), Lesbos, Sinai;
XVII—Athos (Dionysiu, Lavra).

Manuscripts at Vatican, Jerusalem, Patmos, Athens, Sinai, Athos, at least, are most probably based on a line of ancestors held locally; any importing of exemplars probably took place in the early centuries. If there are **f**^{35} MSS in those places today, it is presumably because there have been **f**^{35} MSS there from the beginning.

I reject as totally unfounded the allegation that **f**^{35} is a recension. If anyone wishes to claim that it is, I request that they state who did it, when and where, and that they furnish evidence in support of the claim. Without evidence any such claim is frivolous and irresponsible.[1]

Archetype in the General Epistles—f^{35} yes, K^{x} no

If you want to be a candidate for the best plumber in town, you need to be a plumber; the best lawyer, you need to be a lawyer; the best oncologist, you need to be an oncologist; and so on. Similarly, if you want to be a candidate for Autograph archetype, you need to be an archetype; a real, honest to goodness, objectively verifiable archetype. This paper addresses the following question: are there any objectively identifiable archetypes in the General Epistles?

I invite attention to the following evidence taken from my critical apparatus of those books. I will take the books one at a time. The reading of **f**^{35} will always be the first one, and the complete roster defines that family's archetype.[2]

James:

1:05 ουκ **f**^{35} (70.3%) || μη א A,B,C (29.7%); ?[no **K**^{x}][3]
1:23 νομου **f**^{35} [30%] || λογου א A,B,C [69%] || λογων [1%];
1:26 αλλ **f**^{35} [35%] || αλλα א A,B,C,0173 [65%];
2:03 λαμπραν εσθητα **f**^{35} [30%] || εσθητα την λαμπραν א A,B,C [70%];
2:04 ου **f**^{35} א A,C (26.8%) || και ου (72.2%) || και (0.6%) || --- B (0.4%);
2:08 σεαυτον **f**^{35} א A(B)C,35^{c} [50%] || εαυτον 35,664 [50%]; [no **K**^{x}]
2:13 ανηλεος **f**^{35} [20%] || ανελεος א A,B,C [30%] || ανιλεως [50%]; [no **K**^{x}]

[1] This section first appeared in January, 2004 as my mailing #11.
[2] Setting aside singular readings, over 50% of the words in the Text will have 100% attestation; 80% of the words will have over 95% attestation; 90% of the words will have over 90% attestation; only for some 2% of the words will the attestation fall below 80%. I regard **f**^{35} as the base from which all other streams of transmission departed, to one extent or another, so in general the Byzantine bulk will have stayed with **f**^{35}. It follows that the roster only includes cases where there is a serious split in the Byzantine bulk, or where **f**^{35} is alone (or almost so) against that bulk.
[3] For the purposes of this paper I use **K**^{x} to represent the Byzantine bulk.

2:14 λεγη τις **f**[35] ℵB [70%] || ~ 21 A,C [1%] || λεγει τις 664 [28%]; ?[no **K**[x]]
2:14 εχει **f**[35] [46%] || εχη ℵA,B,C,328,664 [47%] || εχειν [4.5%] || σχη [2.5%]; [no **K**[x]]
3:02 δυναμενος **f**[35] ℵ [23%] || δυνατος A,B [76.5%];
3:03 ιδε **f**[35] [60%] || ει δε [38.5%] || ιδου [0.5%];[1] [no **K**[x]]
3:04 ανεμων σκληρων **f**[35] ℵB,C [44%] || ~ 21 A [56%]; ?[no **K**[x]]
3:04 ιθυνοντος **f**[35] [21%] || ευθυνοντος ℵA,B,C [79%];
3:18 δε **f**[35] A,B,C [56.6%] || δε της [42%] || δε ο ℵ [0.4%] || --- [1%]; [no **K**[x]]
4:02 ουκ εχετε **f**[35] P[100]A,B [64%] || και 12 ℵ [35%] || 12 δε [1%]; [no **K**[x]]
4:04 ουν **f**[35] ℵA,B [58%] || --- [42%]; [no **K**[x]]
4:07 αντιστητε **f**[35] [47.5%] || 1 δε ℵA,B,664 [50%] || 1 ουν [2.5%]; [no **K**[x]]
4:11 γαρ **f**[35] [26%] || --- ℵA,B [74%];
4:12 και κριτης **f**[35] ℵA,B [62%] || --- [38%]; [no **K**[x]]
4:14 ημων **f**[35] [26%] || υμων (P[100])ℵA(B)664 [74%];
4:14 εστιν **f**[35] [52%] || εσται (A) [41%] || εστε B [7%] || --- ℵ; [no **K**[x]]
4:14 επειτα **f**[35] [29.5%] || 1 δε και [46%] || 1 δε [15%] || 1 και ℵA,B [9.5%]; [no **K**[x]]
5:07 αν **f**[35] ℵ [53%] || --- A,B,048 [45.5%] || ου [1.5%]; [no **K**[x]]
5:10 αδελφοι **f**[35] (A)B [35%] || αδελφοι μου (ℵ) [62%] || --- [3%];
5:10 εν τω **f**[35] B [40%] || τω A [58%] || εν ℵ [0.6%] || επι τω [1.4%];
5:11 ειδετε **f**[35] ℵB [53%] || ιδετε A [45%]; [no **K**[x]]
5:11 πολυσπλαγχνος **f**[35] ℵA,B [65%] || πολυευσπλαγχνος 328,664 [35%]; [no **K**[x]]
5:19 αδελφοι **f**[35] [72%] || αδελφοι μου ℵA,B,048 [28%]. ?[no **K**[x]]

The archetypical profile of **f**[35] in James is defined by the 28 readings above. It is clear and unambiguous, so we have at least one objectively defined archetype in James. In contrast, there are 14 + ?4 variant sets where **K**[x] is seriously divided, placing an objectively defined archetype beyond our present reach.[2] (I did not include a number of lesser splits—25%, 20%, 15%—that conceivably could complicate any attempt to come up with an archetype for **K**[x].) As Colwell observed for Mark's Gospel, there is no objectively definable 'Alexandrian' archetype;[3] the same applies to any 'Western' archetype, unless we follow the Alands and take a single MS as such, their "D text".[4] Let's go on to 1 Peter.

1 Peter:

1:03 ελεος αυτου **f**[35] P[72] [38%] || ~ 21 ℵA,B,C,664 [60%] || 1 [2%]; [no **K**[x]]
1:07 δοξαν και τιμην **f**[35] P[72]ℵA,B,C [35%] || ~ 321 [28%] || ~ 32 εις 1 [37%]; [no **K**[x]]
1:16 γινεσθε **f**[35] [52%] || γενεσθε [36%] || εσεσθε P[72]ℵA,B,C [12%]; [no **K**[x]]
1:23 αλλ **f**[35] C [40%] || αλλα P[72]ℵA,B,201 [60%];
2:02 εις σωτηριαν **f**[35] (P[72])ℵA,B,C [65%] || --- [35%]; [no **K**[x]]
2:03 χρηστος **f**[35] ℵA,B,C [48%] || χριστος P[72] [52%]; [no **K**[x]]
2:06 η **f**[35] C [35%] || εν τη [59%] || εν P[72]ℵA,B [6%]; ?[no **K**[x]]
2:11 απεχεσθαι **f**[35] ℵB [65%] || απεχεσθε P[72]A,C,201,204 [35%]; [no **K**[x]]
2:12 καταλαλουσιν **f**[35] P[72]ℵA,B,C [52%] || καταλαλωσιν [48%]; [no **K**[x]]
2:14 μεν **f**[35] C [52%] || --- P[72]ℵA,B [48%]; [no **K**[x]]
2:17 αγαπησατε **f**[35] [71%] || αγαπατε P[72]ℵA,B,C,664 [24%] || --- [5%]; ?[no **K**[x]]
2:20 τω **f**[35] A [47%] || --- P[72,81v]ℵB,C [53%]; [no **K**[x]]

---

[1] Since **f**[35] (**K**[r]) is distinct from **K**[x], its 20% must be subtracted from the 60%, leaving an even split in **K**[x].

[2] If all the MSS are ever collated, some smaller groups (in the 5% - 10% range) with an objectively defined archetype may emerge, but I very much doubt that there will be a majority of the MSS with a single archetype; as in the Apocalypse, where there simply is no **K**[x].

[3] E.C. Colwell, "The Significance of Grouping of New testament Manuscripts," *New Testament studies*, IV (1957-1958), 86-87. What he actually said was: "These results show convincingly that any attempt to reconstruct an archetype of the Beta Text-type [Alexandrian] on a quantitative basis is doomed to failure. The text thus reconstructed is not reconstructed but constructed; it is an artificial entity that never existed." [Amen!]

[4] K. and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967), pp. 55, 64. They speak of "the phantom 'Western text'".

2:21 και **f**[35] P^{72} [23%] || --- ℵA,B,C [77%];
2:24 αυτου **f**[35] ℵ [71%] || --- $P^{72,81v}$A,B,C [29%]; [no **K**[x]]
2:25 ημων **f**[35] [50%] || υμων P^{72}ℵA,B,C [50%]; [no **K**[x]]
3:06 εγενηθητε **f**[35] P^{81v}ℵA,B,C [63%] || εγεννηθητε P^{72},664 [35%] || εγεννηθη [2%]; [no **K**[x]]
3:07 χαριτος ζωης **f**[35] P^{81v}B,C [58%] || 1 ζωσης [35%] || ποικιλης 12 ℵA [7%] || 12 αιωνιου P^{72}; [no **K**[x]]
3:07 εγκοπτεσθαι **f**[35] P^{81}(ℵ)A,B [70%] || εκκοπτεσθαι P^{72}C,201 [30%]; ?[no **K**[x]]
3:10 ημερας ιδειν **f**[35] C [26%] || ~ 21 $P^{72,81v}$ℵA,B [74%];
3:16 καταλαλουσιν **f**[35] ℵA,C (44.4%) || καταλαλωσιν (50%) || καταλαλεισθε P^{72}B (5%); [no **K**[x]]
3:16 τη αγαθη εν χριστω αναστροφη **f**[35] [20%] || την αγαθην εν χριστω αναστροφην (ℵ)A,B [50%] || την εν χριστω αγαθην αναστροφην P^{72} [24%] || την εν χριστω αγνην αναστροφην C [1%] || την καλην εν χριστω αναστροφην [4%] || --- [1%]; [no **K**[x]]
3:18 ημας **f**[35] A,C [64%] || υμας P^{72}B [36%] || --- ℵ; [no **K**[x]]
4:02 του **f**[35] [22%] || --- P^{72}ℵA,B,C,201 [78%];
4:03 υμιν **f**[35] ℵ (41.7%) || ημιν C (47.1%) || --- P^{72}A,B (11.2%); [no **K**[x]]
4:03 χρονος **f**[35] P^{72}ℵA,B,C [26%] || χρονος του βιου [74%];
4:03 ειδωλολατριαις **f**[35] ℵA,C [70%] || ειδωλολατρειαις B,664 [30%]; ?[no **K**[x]]
4:07 τας **f**[35] 35[c] [70%] || --- P^{72}ℵA,B,35 [30%]; ?[no **K**[x]]
4:08 η **f**[35] [49%] || --- P^{72}ℵA,B [51%]; [no **K**[x]]
4:08 καλυπτει **f**[35] A,B [60%] || καλυψει P^{72}ℵ [40%]; [no **K**[x]]
4:11 ως **f**[35] [69%] || ης P^{72}ℵA,B,201 [28%] || --- [3%]; [no **K**[x]]
4:11 δοξαζηται Θεος **f**[35] [20%] || 1 ο 2 P^{72}ℵA,B [73%] || ~ο 21 [6%];
4:11 αιωνας **f**[35] P^{72} [27%] || αιωνας των αιωνων ℵA,B [73%];
4:14 αναπεπαυται **f**[35] [39%] || επαναπαυεται A [6%] || επαναπεπαυται P^{72} [2%] || αναπαυεται ℵB [52%] || αναπεμπεται [1%]; ?[no **K**[x]]
5:03 μηδε **f**[35] P^{72} [49%] || μηδ ℵA [50%]; [no **K**[x]]
5:07 υπερ **f**[35] [35%] || περι P^{72}ℵA,B [65%];
5:08 οτι **f**[35] P^{72} [50%] || --- ℵA,B [50%]; [no **K**[x]]
5:08 περιερχεται **f**[35] [24%] || περιπατει P^{72}ℵA,B [76%];
5:08 καταπιειν **f**[35] (ℵ)B [53%] || καταπιει [25%] || καταπιη P^{72}A,328,664 [22%]; [no **K**[x]]
5:10 στηριξαι **f**[35] [33%] || στηριξει P^{72}ℵA,B [66%] || στηριξοι [1%];
5:10 σθενωσαι **f**[35] [30%] || σθενωσει ℵA,B [66%] || σθενωσοι [1%] || --- P^{72} [3%];
5:10 θεμελιωσαι **f**[35] [30%] || θεμελιωσει P^{72}ℵ [66%] || θεμελιωσοι [1%] || --- A,B [3%];
5:11 η δοξα και το κρατος **f**[35] ℵ (59.6%) || 125 (31.3%) || ~ 45312 (7%) || το (-το P^{72}) κρατος P^{72}A,B (0.8%). [no **K**[x]]

The archetypical profile of **f**[35] in 1 Peter is defined by the 42 readings above. It is clear and unambiguous, so we have at least one objectively defined archetype in 1 Peter. In contrast, there are 24 + ?6 variant sets where **K**[x] is seriously divided, placing an objectively defined archetype beyond our present reach. (I did not include a number of lesser splits—25%, 20%, 15%—that conceivably could complicate any attempt to come up with an archetype for **K**[x]. Go back to James for other comments.) Let's go on to 2 Peter.

2 Peter:

1:02 ιησου του κυριου ημων **f**[35] (P^{72})B,C [68%] [234 1.4%] || ιησου χριστου του κυριου ημων ℵA [15%] || χριστου ιησου του κυριου ημων [8%] || σωτηρος ιησου χριστου του κυριου ημων [1.2%] || του κυριου ημων ιησου χριστου [6%]; [no **K**[x]]
1:05 δε τουτο **f**[35] ℵ [66%] || ~ 21 P^{72}B,C [32%] || 1 A [1%] || 2 [0.8%]; [no **K**[x]]
2:02 ας **f**[35] [20%] || ους P^{72}ℵA,B,C [80%];
2:09 πειρασμων **f**[35] ℵ [33%] || πειρασμου (P^{72})A,B,C [67%];
2:12 γεγενημενα φυσικα **f**[35] ℵ [26%] || ~ 21 [54%] || γεγεννημενα φυσικα A,B,C [3%] || φυσικα γεγεννημενα [12%] || γεγενημενα [4.2%] || φυσικα P^{72} [0.4%]; ?[no **K**[x]]

2:17 εις αιωνας **f**^{35} (25.1%) || εις αιωνα A,C (70.3%) || εις τον αιωνα (2.4%) || --- P^{72}ℵB (2.2%);
2:18 ασελγειας **f**^{35} [40%] || ασελγειαις P^{72}ℵA,B,C [60%];
3:02 υμων **f**^{35} P^{72}ℵA,B,C [70%] || ημων [28.8%] || --- [1.2%]; ?[no **K**^{x}]
3:05 συνεστωτα **f**^{35} ℵ [23%] || συνεστωσα P^{72}A,C(048) [76%];
3:10 η **f**^{35} ℵ,048 [67%] || η οι P^{72}A,B,C [33%]; [no **K**^{x}]
3:15 αυτω δοθεισαν **f**^{35} [60%] || ~ 21 P^{72}(ℵ)A,B,C,048 [40%]; [no **K**^{x}]
3:16 εισιν **f**^{35} A [33%] || εστιν P^{72}ℵB,C [67%];
3:18 αυξανητε **f**^{35} [27%] || αυξανετε ℵA,B [60%] || αυξανεσθε P^{72}C [5%] || αυξανησθε [3%] || αυξανοιτε [5%].

The archetypical profile of **f**^{35} in 2 Peter is defined by the 13 readings above. It is clear and unambiguous, so we have at least one objectively defined archetype in 2 Peter. **K**^{x} is in unusually good shape here, so the diagnostic readings are comparatively fewer. The 4 + ?2 variant sets where **K**^{x} is seriously divided are sufficiently few in number that it might be possible to posit an archetype. (I did not include a number of lesser splits—25%, 20%, 15%—that conceivably could complicate any such attempt. Go back to James for other comments.) Let's go on to 1 John.

1 John:

1:04 ημων **f**^{35} ℵB [59%] || υμων A,C,664 [41%]; [no **K**^{x}]
1:06 περιπατουμεν **f**^{35} [29%] || περιπατωμεν **f**$^{351/4}$ ℵA,B,C,201,328(664) [71%];
2:16 αλαζονεια **f**^{35} C [72%] || αλαζονια ℵA,B,664 [28%]; ?[no **K**^{x}]
2:24 πατρι και εν τω υιω **f**^{35} ℵ [35%] || ~ 52341 A(B)C [65%];
2:27 διδασκη **f**^{35} ℵA,B [71%] || διδασκει C,664 [28%]; ?[no **K**^{x}]
2:29 ειδητε **f**^{35} ℵB,C [37%] || ιδητε A [59%] || οιδατε [4%];
2:29 γεγεννηται **f**^{35} ℵA,B,C,328^{c} [70%] || γεγενηται 328 [30%]; [no **K**^{x}]
3:01 ημας **f**^{35} A,B [36%] || υμας ℵC [63.5%] || --- [0.5%];
3:06 και **f**^{35} 35^{c} [20%] || --- ℵA,B,C,35 [80%];
3:15 εαυτω **f**^{35} ℵA,C [70%] || αυτω B,18 [30%]; [no **K**^{x}]
3:17 θεωρη **f**^{35} ℵA,B,C [47%] || θεωρει 328,664 [53%]; ?[no **K**^{x}]
3:18 εν **f**^{35} ℵA,B,C [65%] || --- [35%]; [no **K**^{x}]
3:19 πεισωμεν **f**^{35} [43%] || πεισομεν ℵA,B,C [56%];
3:21 καταγινωσκη **f**^{35} ℵB,C [71%] || καταγινωσκει A,664 [29%]; ?[no **K**^{x}]
3:23 πιστευσωμεν **f**^{35} B,35^{c} (66.9%) || πιστευωμεν ℵA,C,35,664 (26.5%) || πιστευομεν (5.4%) || πιστευσομεν (1.2%); [no **K**^{x}]
3:24 εν **f**^{35} ℵ [30%] || και εν A,B,C^{v} [70%];
4:02 γινωσκεται **f**^{35} [67%] || γινωσκετε A,B,C [25%] || γινωσκομεν ℵ [8%]; [no **K**^{x}]
4:03 ομολογει **f**^{35} ℵ (73.5%) || ομολογει τον A,B (24.2%); ?[no **K**^{x}]
4:03 εκ **f**^{35} ℵA,B [70%] || --- [30%]; [no **K**^{x}]
4:16 αυτω **f**^{35} A [37%] || αυτω μενει ℵB [63%];
5:04 ημων **f**^{35} ℵ,A,B (56.4%) || υμων (43.2%) || --- (0.4%); [no **K**^{x}]
5:06 και **f**^{35} ℵ [70%] || και εν (A)B [30%]; [no **K**^{x}]
5:10 εαυτω **f**^{35} ℵ [48%] || αυτω A,B [52%]; ?[no **K**^{x}]
5:11 ο θεος ημιν **f**^{35} B [24%] || ~ 312 ℵA [76%];
5:20 γινωσκωμεν **f**^{35} [66%] || γινωσκομεν ℵA,B [34%]; [no **K**^{x}]
5:20 η ζωη η **f**^{35} [60%] || 2 ℵA,B [26%] || 12 [6%] || 23 [4%] || --- [4%]. [no **K**^{x}]

The archetypical profile of **f**^{35} in 1 John is defined by the 26 readings above. It is clear and unambiguous, so we have at least one objectively defined archetype in 1 John. In contrast, there are 11 + ?6 variant sets where **K**^{x} is seriously divided, placing an objectively defined archetype beyond our present reach. (I did not include a number of lesser splits—25%, 20%, 15%—that conceivably could complicate any attempt to come up with an archetype for **K**^{x}. Go back to James for other comments.) Let's go on to 2 & 3 John.

2 John:

02 εσται μεθ υμων **f**[35] [58%] || εσται μεθ ημων ℵB,0232,201 [40%] || --- A [2%]; [no **K**[x]]
05 αλλ **f**[35] A [35%] || αλλα ℵB,201 [65%];
05 εχομεν **f**[35] [30%] || ειχομεν ℵA,B [70%];
09 δε **f**[35] [20%] || --- ℵA,B [80%];
12 αλλ **f**[35] [30%] || αλλα ℵA,B [70%].

3 John:

11 δε **f**[35] [25%] || --- ℵA,B,C [75%];
12 οιδαμεν **f**[35] (23%) || οιδατε (61.5%) || οιδας ℵA,B,C,048 (15.1%) || οιδα (0.4%).

The archetypical profile of **f**[35] in 2 & 3 John is defined by the 7 readings above. It is clear and unambiguous, so we have at least one objectively defined archetype in these books. **K**[x] is in unusually good shape here, so the diagnostic readings are comparatively fewer. With only one variant set where **K**[x] is seriously divided it may be possible to posit an archetype. Let's go on to Jude.

Jude:

06 αλλ **f**[35] C [30%] || αλλα P[72]ℵA,B [70%];
16 εαυτων **f**[35] C [35%] || αυτων ℵA,B,328 [65%];
24 αυτους **f**[35] (68.8%) || υμας ℵB,C (29.2%) || ημας A (1%). ?[no **K**[x]]

The archetypical profile of **f**[35] in Jude is defined by the 3 readings above. It is clear and unambiguous, so we have at least one objectively defined archetype in this book. **K**[x] is in unusually good shape here, so the diagnostic readings are comparatively fewer. With only one variant set where **K**[x] is seriously divided it may be possible to posit an archetype.

Conclusion: Taking the seven epistles as a block or group, the evidence presented furnishes an answer to the opening question: there is only one objectively identifiable archetype in the General Epistles—precisely **f**[35]. Its distinctive profile is defined by the 119 readings listed above. In contrast, there are 54 + ?18 variant sets where **K**[x] is seriously divided, making it highly doubtful that a single **K**[x] archetype exists for these books. (I did not include a number of lesser splits—28 around 25%, 53 around 20%, 57 around 15%—that conceivably could complicate any attempt to establish an archetype for **K**[x], especially if the membership in the splits is not constant or predictable.) I am not aware of any other possible contenders. Granting the present state of our ignorance, in the General Epistles there is only one qualified candidate for Autograph archetype: **f**[35].[1]

f[35] Minority Readings in James

A look at the apparatus of my Greek Text of James will show that I have designated as genuine eight readings with an attestation of 30% or less. In each case the deciding factor is the presence of **f**[35]. I will now analyze these eight readings, beginning with the smallest percentage.

ιθυνοντος 3:4 [21%]

All eight non-**f**[35] MSS, as listed by ECM, have a distinct profile, some radically so. However, three of them (1270, 1297, 1598) are obviously related and presumably had a common ancestor not too far back. So we have six independent lines of transmission (outside of **f**[35]) that probably go back to the early centuries. Oops, cursive 1595, though fairly different from the three, would likely join them by the fifth century, leaving five lines. Also, as the distance in time increases it becomes increasingly unlikely

[1] This section first appeared in February, 2006 as my mailing #34.

that an ancient classical spelling could, or would, be introduced. This reading is certainly ancient, and in my opinion most probably original.

δυναμενος 3:2 [23%]

To my surprise, there is absolutely **no** overlap between the eight non-**f**[35] MSS that ECM lists for ιθυνοντος and the 23 non-**f**[35] MSS listed for δυναμενος. To my further surprise, the 23 do not include a single Byzantine MS.[1] So **f**[35] is totally independent of **K**[x] here, and yet is joined by ℵ, so we already know that the reading is early. But let's analyze the cursives.

Since no two have an identical profile, the 23 are presumably independent in their own generation. However, there are several pairs with a common ancestor not too far back, presumably—I put 206-429, 254-1524 and 630-2200 in this category. But the first two pairs are themselves related, with a common grand-ancestor. The ancestor of 630-2200 is joined by 2138 and their grand-ancestor by 2495. 621 and 2412 meet several generations back. So back in the fifth century, I would imagine, we have sixteen independent lines of transmission (outside of **f**[35]). By the time we get back to the third century we should still have at least six independent lines that vouch for δυναμενος (much like ιθυνοντος), but the lines are **totally different** in each case!!! This means that **f**[35] is independent of all eleven of those lines (surely—with ιθυνοντος **f**[35] is independent of the six that support δυναμενος, and with δυναμενος it is independent of the five that support ιθυνοντος; so it is independent of all eleven).

This reading is certainly ancient, owes nothing whatsoever to **K**[x], and in my opinion is most probably original.

ημων 4:14 [26%]

This variant shares 206-429, 254-1524 and 630-2200 with δυναμενος, and they represent just two lines of transmission; it also shares 1490 and 1831, that are independent. That leaves 10 further non- **f**[35] MSS listed for this variant, six of which are Byzantine (but all quite different). Of the ten only two would join by the fifth century, which leaves us with thirteen independent lines of transmission (outside of **f**[35]) back in the fifth century, or so I imagine. By the time we get back to the third century we should still, again, have at least six independent lines of transmission for ημων. The six Byzantine MSS obviously do not represent **K**[x], so again we have a reading that is certainly ancient while owing nothing to **K**[x]. In my opinion it is most probably original.

γαρ 4:11 [26%]

The roster of MSS here is similar to that for δυναμενος—it shares 13 of the 16 independent lines and picks up seven new ones (one is shared with ιθυνοντος), which makes 20 (outside of **f**[35]). So this reading is also certainly ancient, owing nothing to **K**[x], and in my opinion is most probably original.

ου 2:4 (26.8%)

Since this reading is also supported by ℵA,C there is no question about age. The roster of MSS here reproduces all but seven MSS in the γαρ roster, but has some twenty further MSS. Since this is one of the sets included in TuT, the percentage is precise. Here again, this reading is certainly ancient, owing nothing to **K**[x], and in my opinion is most probably original.

επειτα 4:14 [29.5%]

The roster of MSS here is quite similar to that of γαρ, but there are fewer. For all that, there are about 15 independent lines of transmission. Here again, this reading is certainly ancient, owing nothing to **K**[x], and in my opinion is most probably original.

νομου 1:23 [30%]

[1] ECM does list two as Byzantine (254, 1827) but comparing them with TuT they do not get above the 80% threshold in James.

The roster here is a bit different. One independent line is shared with ιθυνοντος, three with δυναμενος, two with ημων and two with γαρ, which makes eight independent lines already. But there are six new lines of independent transmission added here that none of the others have. So in the fifth century, as I imagine, we have 14 independent lines (outside of $\mathbf{f}^{35}$). By the time we get to the third century we should still, again, have at least six independent lines of transmission for νομου, not necessarily a perfect overlap with any of the others. There are some Byzantine MSS that obviously do not represent $\mathbf{K}^{x}$, so again we have a reading that is certainly ancient while owing nothing to $\mathbf{K}^{x}$. In my opinion it is most probably original.

λαμπραν εσθητα 2:3 [30%]

The roster here is quite similar to that of γαρ, etc., sharing one line with ιθυνοντος that none of the others have. It adds three new independent lines, so the evidence here is much like the others. Here again, this reading is certainly ancient, owing nothing to $\mathbf{K}^{x}$, and in my opinion is most probably original.

Obviously the picture we have seen so far will be true for all other minority readings, as we move up to 35%, 40%, etc.

Conclusion: $\mathbf{f}^{35}$ is ancient, and owes nothing to $\mathbf{K}^{x}$. Q.E.D.

(Well, of course, not quite. I wasn't alive in the fifth century, nor the third, so I can't prove that the picture I have painted, as to time, is correct. However, adding the evidence presented here to that presented in "When is a 'recension'?", I affirm with a clear conscience that most of the independent lines mentioned—ιθυνοντος 5, δυναμενος 16, ημων 9, γαρ 6, νομου 6, λαμπραν εσθητα 3, which equals **45**—most probably go back to the fifth century at least. It is highly unlikely that the 45 would reduce to fewer than 15 in the third century. [And these 15 all support $\mathbf{f}^{35}$ against $\mathbf{K}^{x}$, at one point or another—by the same token at other points they go with $\mathbf{K}^{x}$ against $\mathbf{f}^{35}$, so $\mathbf{K}^{x}$ is also ancient.] I invite attention to a word from Kilpatrick.

> Origen's treatment of Matt. 19:19 is significant in two other ways. First he was probably the most influential commentator of the Ancient Church and yet his conjecture at this point seems to have influenced only one manuscript of a local version of the New Testament. The Greek tradition is apparently quite unaffected by it. From the third century onward even an Origen could not effectively alter the text.
>
> This brings us to the second significant point—his date. From the early third century onward the freedom to alter the text which had obtained earlier can no longer be practiced. Tatian is the last author to make deliberate changes in the text of whom we have explicit information. Between Tatian and Origin Christian opinion had so changed that it was no longer possible to make changes in the text whether they were harmless or not.[1]

The point made by Kilpatrick seems to me to be obvious. Evidently there would be occasional exceptions, especially in remote areas like Egypt where Greek was no longer spoken. After Diocletian's campaign [303] most monks simply copied what was in front of them. Most of the 45 lines of transmission mentioned above probably already existed in the year 300.)[2]

Concerning the Text of the *Pericope Adulterae*

The information offered below is based on Maurice A. Robinson's complete collation of 1,389 MSS that contain the Pericope, John 7:53 - 8:11.[3] I attempted to establish a profile of readings for each of the

[1] G.D. Kilpatrick, "Atticism and the Text of the Greek New Testament," *Neutestamentliche Aufsatze* (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1963), pp. 129-30.

[2] This section first appeared in early 2004 as my mailing #12.

[3] 240 MSS omit the PA, 64 of which are based on Theophylact's commentary. Fourteen others have lacunae, but are not witnesses for total omission. A few others certainly contain the passage but the microfilm is illegible. So, 1389 + 240 + 14 + 7(?) = about 1650 MSS checked by Robinson.

three main groups of MSS, **M**[5,6,7] (as in the apparatus of the H-F Majority Text). I take it that the smaller groups are all mixtures based on the big three. This paper presents the results, along with my interpretation of their significance.

M[7] Profile

7:53	01	απηλθεν
8:1	02	Ιησους δε
8:2	03	**(**βαθεως**)** = omit
8:2	04	παρεγενετο
8:2	05	προς αυτον
8:3	06	προς αυτον
8:3	07	επι
8:3	08	κατειλημμενην
8:3	09	εν μεσω
8:4	10	λεγουσιν
8:4	11	**(**πειραζοντες**)**
8:4	12	ταυτην ευρομεν
8:4	13	επαυτοφωρω
8:4	14	μοιχευομενην
8:5	15	ημων Μωσης
8:5	16	λιθοβολεισθαι
8:5	17	**(**περι αυτης**)**
8:6	18	κατηγοριαν κατ
8:6	19	μη προσποιουμενος
8:7	20	ερωτωντες
8:7	21	ανακυψας
8:7	22	προς αυτους
8:7	23	τον λιθον επ αυτη βαλετω
8:9	24	και υπο της συνειδησεως ελεγχομενοι
8:9	25	εως των εσχατων
8:9	26	μονος ο Ιησους
8:10	27	και μηδενα θεασαμενος πλην της γυναικος
8:10	28	αυτη
8:10	29	εκεινοι οι κατηγοροι σου
8:11	30	ειπεν δε αυτη ο Ιησους
8:11	31	κατακρινω
8:11	32	και απο του νυν

Comment: This is a single, clear-cut, unambiguous profile/mosaic, as defined by 127 MSS—there is no internal variation among them. This contrasts dramatically with **M**[6] and **M**[5], and I suppose with the lesser groups (though I haven't checked them). As given below, it is possible to come up with a profile for both **5** and **6**, for purposes of distinguishing them from each other and from **7**, but they have so much internal variation that I see no way to come up with an archetype that is objectively defined. The profile above defines the archetypical text of **M**[7].

M[6] Profile

7:53	01	απηλθεν / απηλθον
8:1	02	**και ο Ιησους δε / και ο Ιησους
8:2	03	**βαθεως / βαθεος
8:2	04	**ηλθεν ο Ιησους
8:2	05	προς αυτον
8:3	06	**(**προς αυτον**)** / προς αυτον

8:3	07	επι
8:3	08	κατειλημμενην
8:3	09	εν τω μεσω / εν μεσω
8:4	10	**ειπον
8:4	11	(πειραζοντες) = omit
8:4	12	ταυτην ευρομεν
8:4	13	επαυτοφωρω / –φορω / –φορως
8:4	14	μοιχευομενην / –νη
8:5	15	ημων Μωσης / υμων Μωσης / Μ. ενετ. ημιν / Μωσης
8:5	16	**λιθαζειν
8:5	17	(περι αυτης) / περι αυτης
8:6	18	κατηγοριαν κατ
8:6	19	(μη προσποιουμενος) / μη προσποιουμενος
8:7	20	ερωτωντες / επερωτωντες
8:7	21	αναβλεψας / ανακυψας
8:7	22	**αυτοις
8:7	23	**λιθον βαλετω επ αυτην
8:9	24	(και υπο της συνειδησεως ελεγχομενοι) /και υπο της συνειδησεως ελεγχομενοι
8:9	25	εως των εσχατων
8:9	26	ο Ιησους μονος / μονος
8:10	27	**(και μηδενα θεασαμενος πλην της γυναικος)
8:10	28	**ειδεν αυτην και ειπεν
8:10	29	**(αυτη) γυναι
8:10	30	(εκεινοι) / (εκεινοι οι κατηγοροι σου) / (που εκεινοι οι κατηγοροι σου)
8:11	31	ειπεν δε αυτη ο Ιησους
8:11	32	κατακρινω
8:11	33	πορευου και απο του νυν / πορευου απο του νυν και

Comment: I checked the **M**^{6} MSS from the **XI** century (over 80) and to my surprise no two of them had an identical mosaic of variants. No matter what contrastive set one uses as a basis (e.g. βαθεως X βαθεος), as soon as you look down the roster of other variants the MSS wander back and forth, producing a bewildering array of variation, shifting alliances, or whatever. If all the centuries are checked, there will presumably be a few small groups wherein the member MSS share identical mosaics, but no single definitive profile for **M**^{6} will emerge (in contrast to **M**^{7}). If there is no single profile, then there is no objective way to define / establish / reconstruct an archetype for **M**^{6}. Without a definable archetype, **M**^{6} is not a viable candidate for the original form of the Text. However, the ten variants marked by ** do distinguish **M**^{6} from both **M**^{5} and **M**^{7}, forming its 'backbone'. But two of the ten, plus another fourteen, have internal variation (besides a variety of further variation not recorded in this list). The individual MSS meander around the plethora of internal (within the group) variation in a bewildering manner, all of which diminishes the credibility of the group. I take it that **M**^{6} reflects Alexandrian influence.

M^{5} Profile

7:53	01	**επορευθη / επορευθησαν
8:1	02	Ιησους δε
8:2	03	(βαθεως) = omit
8:2	04	παρεγενετο
8:2	05	**(προς αυτον)
8:3	06	προς αυτον
8:3	07	**εν
8:3	08	**καταληφθεισαν
8:3	09	εν μεσω
8:4	10	λεγουσιν

8:4	11	**πειραζοντες
8:4	12	**αυτη η γυνη
8:4	13	**κατεληφθη / ειληπται / κατειληπται
8:4	14	επαυτοφωρω / –φορω
8:4	15	**μοιχευομενη
8:5	16	**Μωσης ημιν
8:5	17	λιθοβολεισθαι
8:5	18	**(**περι αυτης**)**
8:6	19	**κατηγορειν
8:6	20	μη προσποιουμενος
8:7	21	ερωτωντες
8:7	22	ανακυψας
8:7	23	προς αυτους
8:7	24	**επ αυτην τον λιθον βαλετω
8:9	25	και υπο της συνειδησεως ελεγχομενοι
8:9	26	**(**εως των εσχατων**)**
8:9	27	μονος ο Ιησους
8:10	28	και μηδενα θεασαμενος πλην της γυναικος
8:10	29	αυτη / αυτη γυναι
8:10	30	εκεινοι οι κατηγοροι σου
8:11	31	**ειπεν δε ο Ιησους
8:11	32	**κρινω / κατακρινω
8:11	33	και

Comment: Setting aside the splits in #1,13,14,29,32 there is a group of MSS with this profile. There is an equally large group that changes εγραφεν to κατεγραφεν in verse 6 and changes πρωτος to πρωτον in verse 7. Both of these groups have a core of MSS that have a 'perfect' profile, except that both groups split on -φωρω/-φορω. Both groups have 'fuzzy' edges with numerous MSS showing various degrees of variation. There is a large number of mixed MSS, clustering around several roughly defined mosaics. Also there is a three-way split in variant #24, plus a fourth lesser variant (205 MSS x 191 x 104 x 21). However, the variants with ** do distinguish **M**^{5} from both **M**^{6} and **M**^{7}, forming its 'backbone', although there is internal variation in three of them, besides #24. There is further internal variation not recorded in this list. **M**^{5} is not as 'squishy' as **M**^{6}, but not as solid as **M**^{7}. I take it that **M**^{5} reflects Latin influence. In any event, it looks to be scarcely possible to establish a single archetype for **M**^{5}, which it must have to be a viable candidate for the original form of the Text. Evidently the original form is the ultimate archetype.

Unambiguous M^{7} (f^{35}) representatives = 245 MSS

a) Perfect match (core representatives)—**XI**: 35,83,547,1435; **XII**: 510,768,1046,1323,1329,1489,1490, 2296,2367,2382; **XIII**: 128,141,147,154,167,170,204,361,553,676,685,696,757,825,897,1072, 1251,1339,1400,1461,1496,1499,1550,1551,1576,1694,2284,2479,2510; **XIV**: 18,55,66,201,246, 363,386,402,415,480,586,645,758,763,769,781,789,797,824,845,867,928,932,938,960,986,1023, 1075,1092,1111,1117,1119,1133,1146,1189,1236,1328,1390,1482,1488,1492,1493,1548,1560, 1572,1584,1600,1619,1620,1628,1633,1637,1650,1659,1667,1688,1698,1703,2261,2355,2407, 2454,2503,2765,2767; **XV**: 955,958,962,1003,1180,1250,1508,1625,1636,1648,1686,1713,2131, 2554; **XVI**: 1596,1652,2496,2636,2806 = 127 MSS

b) Major subgroup: in 8:4 it has επαυτοφορω (only change)—**XII**: 660,1145,1224; **XIII**: 479,689,691,940, 1334,1487,1501,1601,2584,2598; **XIV**: 189,290,394,521,890,959,1025,1165,1234,1445,1462, 1476,1543,1559,1614,1618,1622,1634,1657,1658,2309,2399,2466,2621,2689; **XV**: 285,961,1017, 1059,1132,1158,1247,1649,1656,2204,2221,2352,2692; **XVI**: 1680,1702,2255; **XVII**: 1700 = 55 MSS

c) Minor subgroup: in 8:9 it has κατεληφθη (only change)—**XIII**: 155,2520; **XIV**: 588,1185; **XV**: 1617; **XVI**: 1088 = 6 MSS

d) Minor subgroup: in 8:7 it has τον λιθον βαλετω επ αυτην (only change)—**XII**: 1199; **XIV**: 953,1020, 1147; **XV**: 1389 = 5 MSS

e) Other MSS with a single change—**XII**: 520,1401,2122,2322; **XIII**: 2647; **XIV**: 1095,1503,2273,2508; **XV**: 575,2673; **XVI**: 1030; **XVII**: 2136,2137,2497 = 15 MSS

+2) MSS with two changes: b) + c)—**XII**: 1453,2559; **XV**: 1131; **XVIII**: 1325
b) + d)—**XII**: 387,1813; **XIII**: 1552
b) + e)—**XII**: 2260; **XIV**: 1599,1638,1544
b) + odd—**X**: 1166; **XIV**: 952,978,1062; **XVI**: 1591,2714
d) + e)—**XIII**: 1477,1497; **XIV**: 1181,1248; **XVI**: 2635
2 odd—**XI**: 1314,1384; **XIV**: 2265; **XV**: 1116,1348
⟩ = 27 MSS

+3) MSS with three changes: b) + c) + odd—**XII**: 105; **XVI**: 2715
b) + d) + e)—**XIV**: 806
b) + d) + odd—**XII**: 353; **XIII**: 966
b) + e) + odd—**XV**: 664
b) + 2 odd—**XII**: 2632; **XV**: 56; **XVI**: 61
+ 3 odd—**XV**: 58
⟩ = 10 MSS

Comment: b) and c) differ from a) only in a similar sounding vowel, while variants 8 and 14 involve a single letter. There is a small sub-group (with fuzzy edges) based on variants 17,20,29. There is a larger, fuzzier group that has variants 1,16,17,28,29 as sort of a basis, with 9,19 on the fringes, and then further variation. There are 40-50 MSS with varying amounts of mixture added to an $\mathbf{M}^7$ base (adding these to the unambiguous ones and dividing by 1650 we come out with about 18%). Actually, I believe that $\mathbf{M}^7$ was the base from which the creators of $\mathbf{M}^5$ and $\mathbf{M}^6$ (and all other groups) departed.

Interpretative comment: The progressive 'purification' of the stream of transmission through the centuries (from a Byzantine priority perspective) has been recognized by all and sundry, their attempts at explaining the phenomenon generally reflecting their presuppositions. From my point of view the evident explanation is this: All camps recognize that the heaviest attacks against the purity of the Text took place during the second century. But "the heartland of the Church", the Aegean area, by far the best qualified in every way to watch over the faithful transmission, simply refused to copy the aberrant forms. MSS containing such forms were not used (nor copied), so many survived physically for over a millennium. Less bad forms were used but progressively were not copied. Thus the surviving IX century uncials are fair, over 80% Byzantine, but not good enough to be copied (when the better MSS were put into cursive form). Until the advent of a printed text, MSS were made to be used. Progressively only the best were used, and thus worn out, and copied. This process culminated in the XIV century, when the Ottoman shadow was advancing over Asia Minor, but the Byzantine empire still stood. But by the beginning of the XV century, even though Constantinople didn't actually fall for 45 years, the future was dark and people became preoccupied with survival. It appears to me that the greatest purity is found in the XIV century, and then begins to fall off in the XV, falling more in the XVI and into the XVII. So, in my view special attention should be given to the **XIV** century MSS, for by then only the best tradition was being copied, in the main.

Righting a Century-old Wrong

When Hermann von Soden identified $\mathbf{K}^r$ and proclaimed it to be a revision of $\mathbf{K}^x$ made in the **XII** century, he rendered a considerable disservice to the Truth and to those with an interest in identifying the original wording of the NT Text. Within the Majority Text vineyard, both Zane Hodges and Maurice Robinson have been adversely affected by that idea.

Maurice Robinson, in 2002, gave me the opportunity to work with his collation of 1,389 MSS that contain the Pericope—this work of his is a highly significant contribution to the field of NT textual criticism; it totally supercedes von Soden's work on these verses, giving us a virtually complete picture of the facts of the case (the picture Soden painted was seriously misleading). Of the three major groups, $\mathbf{M}^{5,6,7}$, only $\mathbf{M}^{7}$ (alias $\mathbf{K}^{r}$, but that I now call $\mathbf{f}^{35}$, throughout the NT) has an unambiguous profile, making it possible to posit its exact original or archetypical form (which in my view makes it the only viable candidate for preserving the Original Text).

Upon consulting the list of MSS that make up $\mathbf{M}^{7}$, we find four 'perfect' representatives plus two more from the **XI** century, and one from the **X**, and even a lectionary (139) from the **X**! It follows that $\mathbf{K}^{r}$ existed already in the **X** century and thus could not have been created in the **XII**. Consider what Robinson himself concluded as a result of collating all those MSS:

> However, contrary to this writer's earlier speculations, the extensive collation of the PA MSS has conclusively demonstrated that cross-comparison and correction of MSS occurred only *rarely* and *sporadically*, with little or no perpetuation of the corrective changes across the diversity of types represented [italics his, also below].
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Since this is the case, the phenomenon of the relatively unified Byzantine Textform *cannot* be explained by a "process" methodology, whether "modified" or not. . . .
>
> Based upon the collated data, the present writer is forced to reverse his previous assumptions regarding the development and restoration/preservation of the Byzantine Textform in this sense: although textual transmission itself is a process, it appears that, for the most part, the lines of transmission remained separate, with relatively little mixture occurring or becoming perpetuated. . . .
>
> Certainly, all the types of PA text are distinct, and reflect a long line of transmission and preservation in their separate integrities. . . .
>
> . . . . . .
>
> It thus appears that the Byzantine minuscule MSS preserve lines of transmission which are not only independent but which of necessity had their origin at a time well before the 9th century. . . . The lack of extensive cross-comparison and correction demonstrated in the extant MSS containing the PA precludes the easy development of any existing form of the PA text from any other form of the PA text during at least the vellum era. The early uncials which contain the PA demonstrate widely-differing lines of transmission, but not all of the known lines. Nor do the uncials or minuscules show any indication of any known line deriving from a parallel known line. The 10 or so "texttype" lines of transmission remain independent and must necessarily extend back to a point long before their separate stabilizations occurred—a point which seems buried (as Colwell and Scrivener suggested) deep within the second century.[1]

If "the 10 or so 'texttype' lines of transmission remain independent and must necessarily extend back to a point . . . which seems buried . . .deep within the second century," then $\mathbf{M}^{7}$ (K^{r}/f^{35}) must date to the second century. I agree. Dating to the second century, and being the only group with an unambiguously defined profile, I have no hesitation in declaring that $\mathbf{M}^{7}$ preserves the original wording. After over a millennium of copying by hand there are well over a hundred perfect copies (for the PA)—surely an eloquent testimony to the divine preservation of the Text![2]

---

[1] "Preliminary Observations regarding the *Pericope Adulterae* based upon Fresh Collations of nearly all Continuous-Text Manuscripts and over One Hundred Lectionaries", presented to the Evangelical Theological Society, Nov., 1998, pp. 11-13. However, I have received the following clarification from Maurice Robinson: "I would request that if my name gets cited in regard to your various K^{r} or M^{7} articles that you make it clear that I do not concur with your assessment of K^{r} or M^{7}. This is particularly the case with the "Preliminary Considerations regarding the Pericope Adulterae" article; it should not be used to suggest that I consider the M^{7} line or K^{r} text to be early. This would be quite erroneous, since I hold with virtually all others that K^{r}/M^{7} are indeed late texts that reflect recensional activity beginning generally in the 12th century (perhaps with 11th century base exemplars, but nothing earlier)." [Assuming that he was sincere when he wrote that article, I wonder what new evidence came his way that caused him to change his mind—his language there is certainly plain enough. Further, I had a copy of his collations in my hand for two months, spending much of my time poring over them, and saw no reason to question his conclusions in the Nov., 1998 article.]

[2] This section first appeared in early 2003 as my mailing #2.

Majority Text Theory in Acts

The publication of *Text und Textwert der Griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*[1] (TuT) for Acts gives us access to a collation of most MSS for the 104 variant sets chosen.[2] In general the results are much as defenders of the Majority Text would expect. However, there are a number of cases where the choice may not be so obvious. They need to be evaluated in their own right, but we should also consider the implications for Majority Text theory. Is there a ceiling above which a reading may be considered 'safe' or secure; that is, beyond reasonable challenge? Personally, I have tended to regard 80% as such a ceiling; I believe others would settle for 70%. But what do we do if the attestation falls below 70% of the MSS, or below 60%, or below 50%? I believe we must agree with Burgon that 'majority' cannot be the only criterion.

Using 70% as a ceiling I will present the sets that fall below it in ascending order of attestation, with a discussion of the theoretical implications, making use of Burgon's 'notes of truth'. One set that is barely over that ceiling is also included.

Acts 23:20

The evidence looks like this (I arbitrarily neglect margins and correctors):

1) μελλοντες **f**[35] (33.1%) lat,syr,sa TR,CP[3]
2) μελλοντα (27.2%) RP,HF
3) μελλοντων (17.4%) OC
4) μελλων A,B (9.2%) bo
5) μελλον א (7.5%) NU
6) μελλοντας (5.4%)
(one other) (0.2%)

Rather a dismaying picture—what to do? To begin, the variants are all participial forms of the same verb. The key seems to be the perceived referent or antecedent of the participle. Is it "the Jews", "the Sanhedrin" or "the commander"? The best answer from the point of view of the grammar is evidently "the Jews", which would require a masc., nom., plural form—the only candidate is variant 1). However, there were those who took the referent to be "the Sanhedrin"—the Alexandrian MSS have συνεδριον next to the participle, separated only by ως. The grammar requires a neuter, acc., sg. form—variant 5). But, the Sanhedrin was made up of men, so perhaps some decided it would be more appropriate to make it plural—variant 2); and maybe even masc. besides—variant 6). Variant 3), being genitive, is really strange, unless somehow someone thought that the commander intended to inquire of the Sanhedrin, viewed as plural. Variant 4) presumably takes "the commander" as the referent, but puts the form in the nom., sort of *ad sensum* since σε is acc. But variant 2) could also be referring to the commander, precisely masc., acc., singular.

What are the requirements of the context? "The commander" as referent does not fit. Not only was it not his idea, he sent Paul away that very night to forestall the possibility. (That the Jews should attempt to tell the commander what was in **his** mind is scarcely credible.) "The Sanhedrin" as referent really doesn't fit either. το συνεδριον appears in the text as the <u>object of a preposition</u>, not as an initiating agent. It is "the Jews" that is the Subject of the main verb, and therefore of the two infinitives, and our participle is working with the second infinitive, "as ones intending to inquire".

---

[1] *Text und Textwert der Griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Ed. Kurt Aland, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1993), volumes 20 and 21.

[2] A comparison of *The Text of the New Testament* (K. & B. Aland) with TuT makes clear that the list of MSS in TuT is not complete, and a significant number of the MSS listed were not included in the collation. I gather that about 85% of the extant MSS were actually cited. In all fairness, it is probably safe to assume that the other 15% would contribute little. We are grateful for the 104 variant sets, but we need complete collations, covering all significant variants.

[3] Among the 550 MSS and fragments cited by TuT, 83 belong to **f**[35]. Of these, one is vacant (at this point), one has variant 5) and the rest have variant 1). Thus **f**[35] is all but unanimous. In contrast there simply is no **K**[x].

Conclusion: variant 1) is the only one that really fits the context; it is also the best attested. Although it only musters 33.1% of the vote (including **f**[35]), it is also attested by the three ancient versions—always weighty testimony. I conclude that the Autograph read μελλοντες.

Implications: although the Majority Text is usually attested by over 95% of the MSS, every so often we get an unpleasant surprise where there is no majority reading at all. This case is as badly split as any I have seen. And yet, our "notes of truth" permit us to reach a convincing conclusion. "Number" fails us, but "Antiquity", "Variety" and "Continuity" do not. Although variants 4) and 5) are both ancient, so is 1), and it wins in "Variety" and "Continuity"; it also wins in "Reasonableness". So, I am cheerfully satisfied that μελλοντες is the original reading.

Acts 21:8

The evidence looks like this:

1) οι περι τον παυλον ηλθον	(46.4%) RP,HF,TR
2) -- -- -- -- ηλθομεν	**f**[35] ℵA(B)C (38.8%) lat,syr,cop OC,CP,NU[1]
3) οι περι τον παυλον ηλθομεν	(13.3%)
4) οι αποστολοι (απο τυρου) ηλθον	(1.1%)
(one other reading)	(0.4%)

Variant 3) would appear to be a not very felicitous conflation. Variant 2) best fits the context—since the beginning of the chapter, and before, the main participants have been presented in the first person plural. The closest finite verb on each side of the variant in question is εμειναμεν, 1st plural. The information in variant 1) is unnecessary but not objectionable; if variant 1) were original there would be no need to change it. Of course, if variant 2) were original there would be no need to change it either, unless some felt it was time to remind the reader who "we" was referring to. More likely it was the influence of the Lectionaries, since they have precisely variant 1). Since the MSS are quite evenly divided, the agreement of all three of the ancient versions makes variant 2) the better attested. (Again **f**[35] agrees with an ancient tradition, but in the prior example the early uncials went their own way.)

Implications: once again we do not have a majority reading, though the split is not quite so bad as in the prior case. "Antiquity" and "Variety" are clearly with variant 2), and so "Continuity" is presumably more with 2) than with 1), also. I conclude that variant 2) has the best claim to be printed in the text.

Acts 24:6[b]-8[a]

The evidence looks like this:

1) (without the long addition) **f**[35] ℵA,B (58.9%) lat[pt],cop RP,HF,NU[2]
2) - 36): και κατα τον ημετερον νομον ηθελησαμεν κριναι παρελθων δε λυσιας ο χιλιαρχος μετα πολλης βιας εκ των χειρων ημων απηγαγεν κελευσας τους κατηγορους αυτου ερχεσθαι επι σε. The five principle variations hinge on the three underlined words; they are:

2) κριναι . . . επι σε	(9.7%) lat[pt],syr	[6 variants]
8) κριναι . . . επι σου	(10.5%)	[14 variants]
22) κριναι . . . προς σε	(5.3%)	[8 variants]
30) κρινειν . . . επι σου	(4.4%)	[4 variants]
34) κρινειν . . . επι σε	(1.7%) OC,TR	[3 variants] [OC is in small print]
37) replaces απηγαγεν with five words, plus two other changes:		
κριναι . . . επι σου	(3.2%)	[2 variants]

[1] Of the 83 **f**[35] MSS three are vacant, two have the conflation and the rest have variant 2). Once again **f**[35] is solid, all but unanimous. If **K**[x] exists here, it is represented by variant 1).
[2] Of the 83 **f**[35] MSS one is vacant, seven are scattered around the addition and the rest have variant 1). Once again **f**[35] is solid. Subtracting the 17% representing **f**[35] from 58.9% leaves a precarious **K**[x], at best.

39) completely rewrites the material:

κριναι . . . προς σε	(3.4%) CP	[6 variants]
(eight further variants)	(2.9%)	[8 variants].

Variant 2) presumably has the best claim to be the standard form of the addition: κριναι clearly beats κρινειν, επι clearly beats προς, σε barely beats σου.[1] It is also attested by syr and lat^{pt}. However, although some form of the addition commands 41.1% of the MSS, there are no less than 51 variants!

What about the context? The addition makes good sense, and it fits nicely. But, it is not really necessary; that information Felix already knew. The text reads quite well without the addition also. I conclude that the short form was judged to be abrupt or incomplete, giving rise to the addition; presumably the Autograph did not contain it. Since Tertullus was an orator he may well have actually said what is in the addition, plus a good deal more besides, but did Luke write it?[2]

Implications: the external evidence, though divided, is adequate to resolve this case: 58.9% against a severely fragmented 41.1%. The ancient versions, being divided, do not help us much this time. Although 59% is not a strong majority, by any means, still, the severe fragmentation of the 41% sort of leaves variant 1) without a worthy opponent. Variant 1) wins in "Antiquity", "Number", "Variety" and "Continuity", so I have no doubt that it is original. [The reading of the TR, variant 34), really has little to commend it.]

Acts 12:25

The evidence looks like this:

1) εις ιερουσαλημ	(**f**^{35}=38.7%) B (59.5%) RP,HF,NU
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	
2) απο ιερουσαλημ	(**f**^{35}=8%) D (10.9%) lat(sy^{h})
3) εξ ιερουσαλημ	ℵA (3.4%) bo(sy^{h}) OC,TR
4) εξ ιερουσαλημ εις αντιοχειαν	(**f**^{35}=9.3%) (12.4%) sa(sy^{p}) CP
5) απο ιερουσαλημ εις αντιοχειαν	(**f**^{35}=14.7%) (7.5%) it^{pt}(sy^{p})
6) εις αντιοχειαν	(**f**^{35}=29.3%) (5.1%)
7) εις ιερουσαλημ εις αντιοχειαν	(0.4%)
(three other readings)	(0.9%)

There is indeed a majority reading, albeit a weak one, but within the context it can scarcely be correct.[3] Consider:

a) Acts 11:30, ο και εποιησαν αποστειλαντες, "which they also did, having sent . . . by B. & S." An aorist participle is prior in time to its main verb, in this case also aorist—their purpose is stated to have been realized. The author clearly implies that the offering did arrive, or had arrived, in Judea/ Jerusalem.[4] Note that the next verse (12:1) places us in Jerusalem.

b) Acts 12:25 (12:1-24 is unrelated, except that verses 1-19 take place in Jerusalem), βαρναβας και σαυλος—the action includes **both**.

c) Acts 12:25, υπεστρεψαν . . . πληρωσαντες την διακονιαν, "they returned . . . having fulfilled the mission". Again, both the participle and the main verb are aorist, and both plural. "Having fulfilled the

[1] Although variant 8) appears to be slightly stronger than 2) numerically, the 14 internal variants, compared to 6, effectively diminish its credibility. The main variant in 2) is far stronger than that of 8).

[2] The incidents recorded in Acts were well known by many contemporaries, and there were many written accounts in circulation (Luke 1:1), so it was entirely predictable that a variety of historically correct material would be added, here and there, to Luke's account.

[3] Note that scholars with presuppositions so diverse as Alford, Burgon, Hort or Metzger have reached the same conclusion.

[4] In Acts the author seems almost to use "Jerusalem" and "Judea" interchangeably, perhaps to avoid repetition. E.g.: 11:1 Judea, 11:2 Jerusalem (were the apostles not in Jerusalem, or immediate environs?); 11:27 Jerusalem, 11:29 Judea, 11:30 the elders (would not the ruling elders be in Jerusalem?); 12:1-19 took place in Jerusalem, but v. 19 says Herod went down from Judea to Caesaria; 15:1 Judea, 15:2 Jerusalem; 28:21 letters from "Judea" probably means Jerusalem.

mission" defines the main verb. Since the mission was to Judea, which of necessity includes Jerusalem as its capital city, the 'returning' must be to the place where the mission originated.

d) Acts 12:25, συμπαραλαβοντες και ιωαννην, "having taken John also along with them". Again, both the participle and main verb are aorist. Cf. Acts 13:13 where John returns εις ιεροσολυμα.

Barnabas could be viewed as returning to Jerusalem, having completed his mission to Antioch, but this could not be said of Saul. There is no basis for supposing that Mark was in Antioch (cf. Acts 12:12) so he could return to Jerusalem with Barnabas and Saul. I conclude that "to Jerusalem" cannot be correct here even though attested by 60% of the MSS. We observe that the other 40% of the MSS, plus the three ancient versions, are agreed that the motion was away from Jerusalem, not toward it. **However**, they are divided into five main variants, plus four isolated ones, so how shall we choose the original wording? I suppose that in a case like this we must indeed appeal to the basic 'canon' of textual criticism, prefer the variant that best accounts for the origin of the others.

We must begin with presuppositions. Those who presuppose that the original text was not inspired, was not inerrant, will presumably choose variant 1).[1] It is the 'harder' reading, being at odds with the context. Many copyists noticed the problem and attempted remedial action, producing variants 2), 3) and 6) [on that hypothesis]. Variants 4) and 5) would appear to be conflations and thus subsequent developments. Variant 7) is an obvious conflation. It is none the less curious that although "to Jerusalem" is evidently ancient, none of the early versions follows it.

I am among those who presuppose that the original text was indeed inspired and therefore inerrant; it follows that I am predisposed against variant 1), it evidently being in error.[2] What then? If 4) and 5) are conflations, then 2), 3) and 6) are earlier. Variants 2) and 3) would appear to be independent attempts to 'fix up' variant 1).[3] Forced to choose between 1) and 6), my presuppositions guide me to variant 6); but how did 6) give rise to 1)?

Well, a superficial reader could have focused on Barnabas and assumed that he was returning to Jerusalem, having finished his ministry in Antioch. Since 12:25 is the first mention of Barnabas (and Saul) after 11:30, and since 11:30 does not overtly say that they 'went', 'returned' or whatever, a superficial reader could easily decide that he had to get Barnabas back to Jerusalem. If the original of 12:25 read "to Antioch" this would be perceived as a problem, since to the superficial reader they would still be there, having never left. This 'correction' evidently happened quite early, and possibly more than once, independently—if a number of separate copyists misunderstood the text in the way suggested, and felt constrained to 'correct' it, presumably most of them would simply change "Antioch" to "Jerusalem".

Although 25.4% of the MSS, plus sy^p and sa, read εις αντιοχειαν, only 5.1% do so without conflation. But then, variant 3) has only 3.4% alone and 15.8% with the conflation. Variant 2) has 10.9% alone and 18.4% with the conflation. So, variant 6) beats 3) both alone and with conflations; variant 6) loses to 2) alone, but with conflations comes in ahead. I submit that variant 6) best explains the origin of all the others, and given the complexities of this case has the best claim upon our confidence. I conclude that the Autograph of Acts 12:25 read εις αντιοχειαν, which is presumably precisely what happened (they returned to Antioch); it also leads nicely into 13:1—comparing Acts 1:1 with Luke 1:3 we may reasonably conclude that Acts also is designed to be an orderly account.

It seems to me that there is only one way to 'save' the majority variant here: place a comma between υπεστρεψαν and εις, thereby making "to Jerusalem" modify "the ministry". But such a construction is

---

[1] Please note that I am not saying that they are the only ones who might make such a choice, nor even that they will necessarily do so.

[2] Please note again that I am speaking only of myself. I am making the point that presuppositions must always be taken into account since they heavily influence the interpretation of the data. This is true of all practitioners in any discipline. (Consider Luke 11:23, John 7:17 and Ephesians 2:2.)

[3] υποστρεφω εκ is unprecedented (in the NT), υποστρεφω απο occurs four times, υποστρεφω εις occurs 17 times. The reading of the TR is highly improbable, statistically speaking. If we had to choose between απο and εκ, απο would win on all counts.

unnatural to the point of being unacceptable—had that been the author's purpose we should expect την εις ιερουσαλημ διακονιαν or την διακονιαν εις ιερουσαλημ. The other sixteen times that Luke uses υποστρεφω εις we find the normal, expected meaning, "return to". As a linguist (PhD) I would say that the norms of language require us to use the same meaning in Acts 12:25. Which to my mind leaves εις αντιοχειαν as the only viable candidate for the Original reading in this place.

Implications: the whole contour of the evidence is troubling. It is evident that all the variants were created deliberately; the copyists were reacting to the meaning of the whole phrase within the context (in this situation it will not do to consider the name of each city in isolation; the accompanying preposition must also be taken into account). Variants 2) through 6) are all votes against 1), but we must choose one of them to stand against 1)—the clear choice is 6). "To Jerusalem" has "Number", "Antiquity" and "Continuity". "To Antioch" has "Antiquity", "Variety", "Continuity" and "Reasonableness". As Burgon would say, this is one of those places where "Reasonableness" just cannot be ignored, but it is not alone; "to Antioch" also wins in "Variety" while "to Jerusalem" wins only in "Number" (not strong; "Antiquity" and "Continuity" are shared). So, the "notes of truth" confirm our conclusion that εις αντιοχειαν is the original reading in this place.

It will have been observed that not only have I espoused a minority reading with reference to the total attestation, I follow a minority within **f**^{35} as well. The difficulty is precisely the five-way split within the family. In Revelation there are several places where **f**^{35} divides more or less evenly between two readings, but this is the only case I have seen where it splinters. We have already noted that variants 2) – 6) are all votes against 1); this continues to be the case as we narrow our focus to **f**^{35}. Of the 83 member MSS, 8 are vacant here, so the following percentages are based on the remaining 75. For 1) we have 38.7%, so against it we have 61.3% [variants 3) and 7) have no **f**^{35} votes]. As I have already argued above, we must chose one candidate from the 'opposition' to go against 1), and the clear choice is 6) [its 29.3% is second only to the 38.7% of 1), and with the conflations 53.3% have 'to Antioch'—I have no doubt that εις αντιοχειαν is the archetypical reading of the family].

Acts 13:42

The evidence looks like this:

1) δε εκ της συναγωγης των ιουδαιων	**f**^{35} (60.2%) RP,HF,TR[1]
2) δε αυτων	ℵA,B,C,D (16.2%) lat,syr,cop NU
3) δε αυτων εκ της συναγωγης των ιουδαιων	(20.8%) OC,CP
4) δε αυτων εκ της συναγωγης	(2.3%)
(two other readings)	(0.4%)

I believe this variant set must be considered along with the presence of τα εθνη after παρεκαλουν, but Aland's group did not include the second set. However, from UBS^3 it appears that virtually the same roster of witnesses, including the three ancient versions (!), read variant 2) and omit "the Gentiles". Where then is the Subject of the main verb παρεκαλουν? Presumably for those witnesses it would be the Jews and proselytes who had just heard Paul and wanted to hear it all over again the next Sabbath. So why are they (Jews and proselytes) mentioned overtly again in verse 43? And on what basis would the whole city show up the next week (v. 44)? But to go back to verse 42, why would the first hearers want to hear the same thing (τα ρηματα ταυτα) again anyway? The really interested ones stuck with Paul and Barnabas to learn more (v. 43), just as we would expect.
The witnesses to variants 1) and 3) join in support of "the Gentiles", giving us a strong majority (over 80%). So the Subject of παρεκαλουν is τα εθνη—**they** want a chance to hear the Gospel too, and the whole city turns out. It fits the context perfectly. So, variant 3) appears to be a conflation and the basic reading is variant 1). [If variant 3) is viewed as the original, variant 2) could be the result of homoioteleuton, but not variant 1).] The witnesses to variant 3), because they have "the Gentiles", are really on the side of variant 1), not 2), so presumably 1) may be viewed as having 80% attestation. For

[1] Of the 83 **f**^{35} MSS five are vacant, five have other readings and the rest have variant 1). Once again **f**^{35} is solid. Subtracting the 17% representing **f**^{35} from 60.2% leaves a precarious **K**^{x}, at best.

the witnesses to variant 1) the antecedent or referent of εξιοντων must be Paul's group, since the Gentiles would presumably address their request to the teacher.

In variant 2) αυτων presumably serves as Subject of both the participle and the main verb, but in that event the main verb should take precedence and the pronoun should be nom., not genitive. However one might explain the motivation for such a change—from 1) to 2) and deleting "the Gentiles"—variant 2) is evidently wrong, even though attested by the three ancient versions. Perhaps someone faced with variant 1) took "of the Jews" to be the referent of the participle instead of modifying "synagogue" (like NKJV), and thought it should be Subject of the main verb as well—then, of course, "the Gentiles" were in the way and were deleted. Then 1) might have been shortened to 2) for 'clarity'.

Implications: again we have a majority reading, although not as strong as we could wish. "Antiquity" and "Variety" are with variant 2), although **f**^{35} confers "Antiquity" on variant 1) as well and therefore 1) wins in "Continuity". But, "Context" (the performance of the MSS in the near context) comes into play this time—it clearly favors variant 1), as does "Reasonableness"—it enables us to say that the attestation for 3) really goes with 1), not 2), so 1) comes out with over 80%. In short, variant 1) has "Number", "Continuity", "Context", "Reasonableness" and "Antiquity"; variant 2) has "Antiquity" and "Variety". I take it that the original text had: εξιοντων δε εκ της συναγωγης των ιουδαιων παρεκαλουν τα εθνη etc.

Acts 19:3

The evidence looks like this:

1) ειπεν τε προς αυτους	(61.6%) sy^{p},sa RP,HF,OC,TR,CP
2) ειπεν δε προς αυτους	(5.1%)
3) ειπεν --- προς αυτους	(1.1%)
- - - - - - - - - - - -	
4) ειπεν τε	**f**^{35} B (18.3%) NU[1]
5) ειπεν δε	D (4.5%)
6) ειπεν ουν	(1.7%) sy^{h}
- - - - - - - - - - - -	
7) ο δε ειπεν	(P^{41}) ℵA (3.6%) bo
8) ο δε ειπεν αυτοις	(4%)
9) ο δε παυλος προς αυτους	P^{38}

At issue is a minor question of taste or style. The first set gives the complete formula, the second gives a shortened form. We observe that in verse 2 there is a complete exchange between Paul and the group of disciples, and the full introductory formula is used for both. In verse 3 there is a second complete exchange, wherein the second introductory formula is short—should not the first introductory formula also be short, to match it? That would seem to make for better style. But the attestation for the long form is fairly strong, 67.8% X 24.5%. Presumably the contenders are variants 1) and 4), so τε wins over δε. I consider that variant 4) really is the better reading, which is also attested by **f**^{35}, but the total semantic effect is the same in either case. From the fluctuating alignments in the examples given above it appears that **f**^{35} represents an independent line of transmission which is also ancient.

Implications: all three groups, headed by 1), 4) and 7), are ancient. The first two share "Variety" and "Continuity". Variant 1) wins in "Number" and variant 4) perhaps in "Reasonableness". Is variant 7) derived from 4) or 1)? If 7) derives from 4), then 4) would win in "Antiquity" and "Variety" as well. I consider that cases like this reinforce the need for a basic principle and procedure that needs to come to the fore in our practice of NT textual criticism. Where collations exist, making possible an empiric grouping of the MSS on the basis of shared mosaics of readings, the MSS must be so grouped. Such groups must be evaluated on the basis of their performance and be assigned a credibility quotient (in close calls that credibility needs to be taken into account). A putative history of the transmission of the

[1] Of the 83 **f**^{35} MSS four are vacant, four have other readings and the rest have variant 4). Once again **f**^{35} is solid.

Text needs to be developed on the basis of the interrelationships of such groups. **Demonstrated groupings and relationships supersede the counting of MSS.**[1]

Acts 15:7

The evidence looks like this:

1) εν ημιν (61.5%) lat,sy^{h} RP,HF,OC,TR,CP
2) --- ημιν (D) (2.7%)
3) εν υμιν **f^{35}** ℵA,B,C (34.3%) (bo) NU[2]
4) --- --- (1.5%) sy^{p},sa

We have a weak majority reading that makes excellent sense. Why did sy^{p} and sa omit? Were they looking at variant 3) and felt it to be too dramatic or awkward? Peter had listened to a lot of discussion, some of it probably intemperate and arrogant, and maybe he was getting a bit irritated (note verse 10). Variant 3) would create a contrast or distinction between himself and the others, and he did make a strong statement—to such good effect that they shut up (verse 12). If variant 1) were original, why would anyone change it to 3)? If variant 3) were original presumably there would be those who would prefer a more natural reading. I am influenced by the vote of **f^{35}**, but variant 3) seems to best account for the rise of the others. Though unexpected, at first glance, variant 3) does make good sense within the context. I incline toward υμιν as being the original reading.

Implications: here again the 'notes' are rather divided. All the variants are ancient. If 4) derives from 3) then 3) gains in "Variety". As noted in the prior example, we need a history of the transmission of the Text.

Acts 15:34

The evidence looks like this:

1) --- -- -- --- --- ---	**f^{35}** ℵA,B (70.8%) sy^{p},bo RP,HF,NU[3]
2) εδοξεν δε τω σιλα επιμειναι αυτου	(20.3%) (it^{pt})sy$^{h?}$,sa OC,TR [OC is in small print]
3) εδοξεν δε τω σιλα επιμειναι αυτοθι	(7.5%) CP
4) εδοξεν δε τω σιλα επιμειναι αυτους	C(D) (1%) (lat^{pt})
(two other readings)	(0.4%)

RP,HF,NU agree that variant 1) is correct, and indeed verse 33 seems to require that Silas returned to Jerusalem; "they were sent back . . . to the apostles", and "they" refers to Judas and Silas. The 'problem' is that in verse 40 Paul chooses Silas to accompany him, so he had to be in Antioch, not Jerusalem. Accordingly the longer reading was created to solve the 'problem'. The "some days" of verse 36 could well have been a month or two. From Antioch to Jerusalem would be a trip of some 400 miles. Silas had time to go to Jerusalem and get back to Antioch.

Implications: "Reasonableness" makes itself felt here; variant 2) introduces a contradiction, which the TR unfortunately perpetuates. Variant 1) also wins in "Number" and "Continuity". "Antiquity" and "Variety" are divided. Thus, with a majority of 70.8% variant 1) is the best candidate for the original reading.

In order to complete the theoretical discussion I include an example from **Luke 6:1**. Shall we read σαββατω δευτεροπρωτω (variant 1) or σαββατω (variant 2)? Variant 1) is attested by A,C,D and some

[1] Please note that I am not referring to any attempt at reconstructing a genealogy of MSS—I agree with those scholars who have declared such an enterprise to be virtually impossible (there are altogether too many missing links). I am indeed referring to the reconstruction of a genealogy of **readings**, and thus of the history of the transmission of the Text.
[2] Of the 83 **f^{35}** MSS four are vacant, ten have variant 1) and the rest (69) have variant 3). Once again **f^{35}** is solid.
[3] Of the 83 **f^{35}** MSS four are vacant, two have other readings and the rest have variant 1). Once again **f^{35}** is solid, all but unanimous.

1,700 other Greek MSS, lat,sy^{h},goth,arm,geo and a number of early Fathers. Variant 2) is attested by P^{4} א B,W, some dozen other Greek MSS, it^{pt},sy^{p,pal},cop,eth,Diat. The attestation for variant 2) is certainly early and varied, but it scarcely has 1% of the vote! The parallel passages in Mathew 12:1 and Mark 2:23 both have "the Sabbaths" (plural). Although δευτεροπρωτω doubtless made excellent sense in the first century, we have since lost the relevant cultural information. So variant 1) is definitely the 'harder' reading and the offending word could easily have been deleted, here and there, especially in places like Egypt and Ethiopia where the niceties of Jewish culture would probably not be known. Here we have an eloquent illustration of the faithfulness that characterized the vast majority of copyists down through the centuries of copying by hand. Even though they presumably did not understand the word δευτεροπρωτω, they none the less reproduced it verbatim in their copies. We owe them a debt of gratitude.

Implications: variant 2) has "Antiquity" and "Variety". Variant 1) also has "Antiquity" and "Variety", plus "Continuity" and "Number" (overwhelming). "Reasonableness" may not be urged against variant 1), in this case, because the difficulty arises from our ignorance, not from the context or demonstrable facts of history, science or whatever. The 'note' of "Respectability" enters in this case: the specific MSS listed for variant 2) are all of demonstrably inferior quality. I have not the slightest doubt that variant 1) is the original reading.

I will now discuss the implications of overwhelming number. At the beginning of this paper reference was made to a 'ceiling' of attestation, and I suggested 80%. Where a reading commands 80% (not to mention 90% or 95%) attestation it evidently dominated the stream of transmission, or genealogical tree, and the chances of an error doing so are minute. (Of course an error could have done so, here and there, but each time we 'cash that check' it increases the odds against any subsequent use of that expedient—a dozen bad checks are enough to close the account.) I personally would not grant even the theoretical possibility that an error could command so much as 95% of the attestation, and probably not even 90%. (My hypothetical 'bad checks' would therefore fall between 80% and 90%. Please note the term **hypothetical**; I have yet to encounter an actual example.) Thus, "Jeremiah" in Matthew 27:9 must be original since it is attested by over 98% of the Greek MSS. In 1 John 5:7-8 fully 99% of the Greek MSS do <u>not</u> have the 'three heavenly witnesses'. Mark 16:9-20 is attested by no less than 99.8% of the extant MSS!

But why put the ceiling at 80% rather than 70%, or even 60%? Well, the choice is arbitrary. Anything with over 2/3 attestation is most likely to be correct, but there is a significant difference between 70% and 80%—a 70/30 split gives a 2.33:1 ratio, but an 80/20 split gives a 4:1 ratio, almost twice as strong (90% gives a 9:1 ratio while 95% gives a 19:1 ratio and 98% gives a 49:1 ratio!). The accidents of history could easily result in an uneven transmission such that an unworthy reading might come out with 60% attestation, or even more. I have seen several readings with up to 80% support that I suspect will prove to be in error. Where the attestation is badly split (or splintered) we must indeed 'weigh' the witnesses, not just count them. On the basis of complete collations we must establish MS families or groupings and determine the 'batting average' or credibility quotient of each one—special attention should be given to the groups that score the highest.

I am sure that if Burgon were alive today he would agree that the discoveries and research of the last hundred years make possible, even necessary, some refinements on his theory. I proceed to outline what I consider to be the correct approach to NT textual criticism. I venture to call it Original Text Theory.[1]

1) First, OTT is concerned to identify the precise original wording of the NT writings.
2) Second, the criteria must be biblical, objective and reasonable.

[1]I have thought of resurrecting the term 'traditional', but since Burgon and Miller are not here to protest, I hesitate; besides, that term is no longer descriptive. Terms like 'antiochian' or 'byzantine' carry an extraneous burden of antipathy, or have been preempted. So here's to **Original Text Theory**. Since I really do believe that God has preserved the original wording to our day, and that we can know what it is on the basis of a defensible procedure, I do not fear the charge of arrogance, or presumption, or whatever because I use the term 'original'. All textual criticism worthy the name is in search of original wording.

3) Third, a 90% attestation will be considered unassailable, and 80% virtually so, but see point 5) below.
4) Fourth, Burgon's 'notes of truth' will come into play, especially where the attestation falls below 80%.
5) Fifth, where collations exist, making possible an empiric grouping of the MSS on the basis of shared mosaics of readings, this must be done. Such groups must be evaluated on the basis of their performance and be assigned a credibility quotient. A putative history of the transmission of the Text needs to be developed on the basis of the interrelationships of such groups. **Demonstrated groupings and relationships supersede the counting of MSS.**[1,2]
6) Sixth, it presupposes that the Creator exists and that He has spoken to our race. It accepts the implied divine purpose to preserve His revelation for the use of subsequent generations, including ours. It understands that both God and Satan have an ongoing active interest in the fate of the NT Text—to approach NT textual criticism without taking due account of that interest is to act irresponsibly.
7) Seventh, it insists that presuppositions and motives must always be addressed and evaluated. A rigorous distinction needs to be made between fact/evidence, interpretation and presupposition/ model. The evidence should be the same for everybody, but the interpretation of that evidence is always heavily influenced by the presuppositions or model that one brings to the evidence.[3]

Conclusion

If you want to be a candidate for the best plumber in town, you need to be a plumber; the best lawyer, you need to be a lawyer; the best oncologist, you need to be an oncologist; and so on. Similarly, if you want to be a candidate for Autograph archetype, you need to be an archetype; a real, honest to goodness, objectively verifiable archetype. Based on the evidence that has so far come to my attention, I affirm that there is only one candidate that has an objectively verifiable, unambiguous profile/ archetype that extends from Matthew 1:1 to Revelation 22:21—precisely Family 35.

The discipline really needs to rid itself of the myth that 'old equals good'. Consider:
1) I have worn out several Bibles all by myself (India paper, leather cover), but my copy of the RSV could easily last for thousands of years—I never touch it.
2) Something like P^{66} with its two errors per verse is psychologically impossible to use for devotional purposes—if you revere a text as being God's Word, such sloppiness is intolerable.
3) Both papyrus and parchment were prepared by skilled labor, and were therefore expensive; the percentage of the populace that could read and write was not large, and scribe was a profession; all copies were made by hand, that takes time; it follows that the demand for copies of the NT writings would exceed the supply, and any copy of tolerable quality would certainly be worn out by use.
4) The extant MSS from the first eight or nine centuries survived physically because they were too poor to be used; the good copies were worn out by use, but their text continues in their descendents.
5) It is precisely to the minuscule MSS that we must look in our quest for the original wording of the New Testament.

---

[1] Please note that I am not referring to any attempt at reconstructing a genealogy of MSS—I agree with those scholars who have declared such an enterprise to be virtually impossible (there are altogether too many missing links). I am indeed referring to the reconstruction of a genealogy of **readings**, and thus of the history of the transmission of the Text. The work of Hoskier and Wisse shows us that it is possible to group the MSS empirically, on the basis of a shared mosaic or profile of readings. (The collations published in the *Text und Textwert* series edited by K. Aland represent an important contribution with reference to the variant sets treated.) Once this is done we are dealing with independent groups, not individual MSS. Thus, Wisse's study in Luke reduces 1,386 MSS to 37 groups (plus 89 "mavericks"). Please note that I am here concerned with the **principle** involved. Of course different scholars may argue for different alignments, assign individual MSS to different groups, etc., but none of this alters the principle that the MSS can be grouped, empirically. These groups must be evaluated for independence and credibility. The independent, credible witnesses must then be heard and their testimony analyzed.

[2] It can be observed that in Revelation I deal only with established groups in the apparatus; I do not count manuscripts, and the only ones I mention are the early uncials. Based on an analysis of the evidence presented in the *Text und Textwert* series (it covers the whole NT except John 11-21 and Revelation) and the emerging *Editio Critica Maior* series (so far James through Jude are available) I become increasingly convinced that the text-type I call $\mathbf{f}^{35}$ (Soden's $\mathbf{K}^{r}$, and in Revelation Hoskier's 'Complutensian') is both ancient and independent of all other lines of transmission. In such an event the only logical explanation is that it harks back to the Autographs. This conclusion is reflected throughout my entire Greek New Testament.

[3] This section first appeared, in this series, in March, 2006 as my mailing #35, being in its turn a revision of an article circulated to the Majority Text Society in 1997.

Returning to the section "**f**^{35} Minority Readings in James" (pp. 21-23), I affirm with a clear conscience that most of the independent lines mentioned—ιθυνοντος 5, δυναμενος 16, ημων 9, γαρ 6, νομου 6, λαμπραν εσθητα 3, which equals **45**—most probably go back to the fifth century at least. It is highly unlikely that the 45 would reduce to fewer than 15 in the third century. And these 15 all support **f**^{35} against **K**^{x}, at one point or another—by the same token at other points they go with **K**^{x} against **f**^{35}, so **K**^{x} is also ancient. Adding this to all the other evidence I have marshaled, to my mind the conclusion is incontrovertible: **f**^{35} is independent of all other lines of transmission and is ancient, dating back to the 3rd century, at least. **Moreover**, it is the only candidate that has an objectively verifiable, unambiguous profile/archetype that extends from Matthew 1:1 to Revelation 22:21. It follows that it has the best claim to be regarded as the most faithful representation of the original wording of the New Testament Text that is presently available to us (pending more evidence and better arguments).