Jac D. Perrin Jr., *Family 13 in St. John's Gospel: A Computer Assisted Phylogenetic Analysis*, NTTSD 58; Leiden: Brill, 2018. Pp. xiv + 378. ISBN: 9789004377561. Hardcover, €138.00 / USD $166.00.

[1]   It has been long recognised that some Greek New Testament minuscules are closely related. One of the well-known groups is "Family 13," named after the primary witness minuscule 13 in the current Gregory-Aland numbering. For New Testament textual scholars, a challenging task is to find proper criteria to distinguish the members in the family. To reply this task, the current volume offers an innovative approach by applying phylogenetic software for analysing the text of the Gospel of John.

[2]   This book is a revised edition of the author's dissertation, supervised by David C. Parker and defended in 2012 at the University of Birmingham.[1] It contains a general introduction and five chapters (the last chapter presenting a critical apparatus of John), followed by three appendices, a bibliography, and four indices.

[3]   In the "Introduction" (pp. 1–6), the author defines the purpose of this study and sets up his plan. According to Perrin, previous scholarship mainly applies a single criterion to define whether one manuscript belongs to Family 13, that is, the relocation of the *Pericope Adulterae* to somewhere after Luke 21. Such a shaky basis is unsatisfactory, the author claims, and thus he proposes to employ "computing tools to evaluate the previously intuitive assertions of both Ferrar and Lake with respect to ten other manuscript candidates which were incorrectly assigned to F13" (p. 4).

[4]   The names of Ferrar and Lake reappear in the first chapter "The History of Family 13" (pp. 7–15). The chapter provides a sketch of the scholarly history on the identification of the family members. Although some eighteenth-century textual critics are briefly mentioned, Perrin pays most of his attention—albeit still not in length—to "the father of F13" William Hugh Ferrar and his colleague Thomas Kingsmill Abbott, their debate with J.-P. Paulin Martin, and the work by Kirsopp and Silva Lake (pp. 7–11). The next section discusses eighteen "nominees" of being a family member (pp. 7–15), including a table on these nominees and their "nominators" ("the first person on record who nominated a particular textual witness for inclusion in F13" [p. 11 n. 26]). It will soon be shown that only ten of them are "real" members of Family 13.

[5]   Chapter 2 (pp. 16–25) proposes to solve the problem of confirming the membership of Family 13 by applying the method initiated by Parker.[2] Based on the 153 test passages selected by the Münster team in their *Text und Textwert* on John, Perrin modifies Parker's model to test all the potential members mentioned in the previous chapter. According to the forty-three distinct Family 13 variant readings, the eighteen nominees are examined and classified. As a result, the following ten manuscripts are confirmed to have family membership: minuscules 13, 69, 124, 346, 543, 788, 826, 828, 983, and 1689.

[6]   After defining the scope, the next chapter ("The Manuscripts Described"; pp. 26–89) describes each of the ten manuscripts under consideration, in particular in the matter of history and palaeography. Take the first witness min. 13 for example. The manuscript description begins with a piece of information concerning library and shelf mark (p. 26). Next comes to a long subsection called "History and Description" (pp. 26–36). On

---

[1]   The dissertation is available online: https://etheses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/4482/. It does not have the subtitle as given in the NTTSD volume, and some chapter and section titles are different.

[2]   David C. Parker, "A Comparison Between the *Text und Textwert* and the Claremont Profile Method Analyses of Manuscripts in the Gospel of Luke," *NTS* 49: pp. 108–138.

the one hand, Perrin describes the historical use of the minuscule. We are told that textual critics already collated it for New Testament editions in the eighteenth century (e.g., Wettstein and Griesbach) and that Gregory examined it personally in 1884. Several notations in the front and last pages written by either librarians or scholars who consulted the manuscript are transcribed, often with English translations. On the other hand, the author offers his observation on the text and also some paratextual elements, for instance the hand and writing of the scribe, the use of accents and breathing marks, and the depiction of some iconic figures.[3] The subscription for each gospel is also transcribed and translated. At the end of the section, Perrin follows Scrivener's opinion of dating the manuscript to the late twelfth century. In short, one can find a mixture of the history of the minuscule and some palaeographical notes on it. All the Family 13 manuscripts are described in a similar way although each section has its particularity. Notably, high-quality colour images are sometimes inserted, which allow the reader to glimpse the beauty of the manuscripts.[4] This chapter ends with a summary of the manuscripts' subscriptions, including the given ῥήματα and στίχοι (pp. 86–89).

[7]   Chapter 4 (pp. 90–177) finally comes to the innovative part of the volume. It analyses the relationships between the ten manuscripts through computing tools primarily used for phylogenesis (PAUP* and ST).[5] Perrin first offers a brief introduction to the computer programs and then points out some limitations for the application for examining the text of John. The process of how to get the results is also provided. After the introductory material, the data are presented according to the chapter division of the Fourth Gospel. The analysis of each chapter contains two figures, one cladogram from PAUP* and the other from ST. These figures demonstrate how the manuscripts are connected and vividly depict the relationships between them. According to his analysis, Perrin claims that there are three distinct subgroups within Family 13, coloured in blue (min. 13, 346, 543, 826, and 828), green (min. 69, 124, and 788), and black (min. 983 and 1689). Except for the figures and cladograms, he also lists notable variant readings to support the distinction between the subgroups. Generally speaking, such distinction is consistent across the chapters, but on occasion a given manuscript is assigned to another subgroup particularly due to lacunae and notable readings. Instead of having a separate concluding chapter, this book's conclusion is found at the end of the chapter (pp. 170–177). A summary of each subgroup is given, as well as an overview of the classification of each manuscript, followed by two figures based on the software including all the chapters of John. Finally a few concluding remarks are offered. In short, through a phylogenetic analysis this study confirms what was already proposed by Lake and Lake in 1941;[6] in Perrin's words: "It turns out that what Lake discerned in his study of St. Mark's Gospel can be seen to exist in St. John's Gospel as well. Lake was right about the existence of three subgroups which make up F13" (p. 174). The author also suggests some directions for future studies, such as further involvement with the adaption of computing tools for New Testament textual scholarship, the use of this model for testing other manuscripts that could be included as family members, and similar analyses on the three other gospels.

[8]   The 5th and the final chapter (pp. 178–275) is a critical apparatus of every chapter of the Gospel of John, containing all the significant variant readings of the manuscripts in Family 13. The appendices also deserve to be mentioned. Appendix one lists page-

---

[3]   It is unclear whether the author examined the manuscript in person or through other means.

[4]   Five manuscripts have colour images included in the book: min. 69, 124, 543, 788, and 1689.

[5]   "Phylogenetic Analysis Using Parsimony *and other methods" and "SplitsTree"; technical details are described in appendix two (pp. 347–354).

[6]   Kirsopp Lake and Silva Lake, *Family 13 (The Ferrar Group). The Text According to Mark with a Collation of Codex 28 of the Gospels*; SD 11 (London: Christophers, [1]1941).

by-page contents of each manuscript, appendix two offers some notes on the used computer programs, and the last appendix provides a table concerning the added manuscript materials of all the members in the family.

[9] The advantage of the book is obvious, that is, it shows how a long-standing field such as textual criticism can benefit from an interdisciplinary approach. In particular, Perrin makes a strong case for applying digital tools for analysing the Greek text of the New Testament, which perfectly fits the current trend of the rapidly-growing field "Digital Humanities." The topic of this study—minuscules in Family 13—also reflect another development in present-day New Testament textual scholarship: more and more studies have concentrated on minuscule manuscripts, or in Lanier's term, we are now in the "age of the minuscules."[7]

[10] Furthermore, this volume is to be praised by making all its data available. Studies that apply computing programs are often being criticised as coming from the "black box," since more often than not the reader is unable to know the processes but only their results. To the contrary, Perrin generously provides the details of the process of his study and also the data collected, which allow the results to be tested and verified. Such a high standard of "reproducibility" should be modelled by studies of a similar kind.

[11] Another strength of Perrin's work is that there are plenty of figures and tables. By using phylogenetic programs, he is able to demonstrate the relationship between the manuscripts not only through the traditional, text-oriented way of presentation but also via visual help: colour images, useful tables, concrete cladograms, etc. In the light of these, one can—in a literal sense—see the distinction between the Textus Receptus and the Family 13 members as well as each member of different subgroups. This is indeed a blessing to study the transmission of the text in our digital age.

[12] Despite all its merit, nevertheless, there are some weaker points in this book. First of all, it is not precisely enough as one would expect concerning the scholarly history of Family 13. Notably a statement like the following one is found several times: "*Every F13 study to date* has assumed that the location (or relocation) of the PA from John 7:53–8:12 was a secure and satisfactory rubric for designating F13 constituency" (p. 6 [emphasis added]).[8] But already in 2012 did Lafleur propose five criteria to identify the Family 13 manuscripts.[9] It should be noted that Lafleur's name does occur in the volume, but it appears that the author does not consider Lafleur's work while making the aforementioned statement. A more serious drawback is that no place in the book referring to Lafleur's monograph on Family 13 in the Gospel of Mark, perhaps the most comprehensive work on this topic to date.[10] Should Perrin have checked Lafleur's work, many historical details and some pieces of manuscript information were to be more precise.[11] Not only is the history of scholarship not always up-to-date, but on occasion the status of the manuscripts under examination also needs to be modified. For instance in the section concerning min. 788, Perrin states: "The author was unable to consult GA 788 in person, all observations are based on a marginally adequate negative film image of the artefact. Therefore, any references to color should be understood to have come from another source" (p. 64 n. 132). Yet, just a few pages

---

7   See Gregory R. Lanier, "Taking Inventory on the 'Age of the Minuscules': Later Manuscripts and the Byzantine Tradition within the Field of Textual Criticism," *CBR* 16 (2018): pp. 263–308.

8   See also the abstract on the back cover, which is even stronger: "To date, the relocation of the *Pericope Adulterae* from its traditional location in John 7:53 has been *the sole criterion* of Family 13 filiality" (emphasis added).

9   Didier Lafleur, "Which Criteria for Family 13 (*f*[13]) Manuscripts?," *NovT* 54 (2012): pp. 105–148.

10 *La Famille 13 dans l'evangile de Marc*, NTTSD 41 (Leiden: Brill, 2013). Although it is listed on the bibliography, somewhat surprisingly, the book is never referred to in Perrin's text. As far as I know, he only refers to Lafleur in pp. 11–12 (on the 2012 article) and pp. 28–29 (a citation from personal correspondence). Interestingly, there is in fact a review by Perrin on this very book in *NovT* 56 (2014), pp. 215–217.

11 E.g., the transcription on min. 13 in p. 32 differs from that of Lafleur's (*La Famille 13*, p. 95).

later three high-quality colour images of the manuscript are to be found. These digital images were produced by the Center for the Study of New Testament Manuscripts in early 2015,[12] so one may wonder why the manuscript was not examined again with the colour images at hand.

[13]   Moreover, it seems that the author is not very much interested in historical details. For instance in the discussion of the precursors of the Family 13 scholars, he mentions that Ferrar accedes that it was Wettstein who first noticed an affinity between min. 13 and min. 69 (p. 8). Then in a footnote on the same page, Perrin admits: "Without a proper bibliography, it is impossible to know for sure, but presumably, the author here refers to Johann Jakob Wetstein (1693–1754)" (n. 10). Whom Ferrar referred to is certainly this eighteenth-century Swiss textual critic, who indeed indicates the similarity of the two manuscripts in the Prolegomena of his Greek New Testament edition.[13] In another place concerning the historical use of min. 69, Perrin mentions that there was a collation prepared for Cesar de Missy, and a piece of biographical information is provided in p. 43 n. 73, where an inaccurate sentence is found: "… and he was also in correspondence with Birch in 1735." This simply cannot be true from a historical perspective, since Andreas Birch was born in 1758, more than twenty years later. In fact, imprecise and inaccurate information of this kind is regrettably found in various places (see further the appendix below). Although it would not prevail the main argument of the volume, this may sometimes disturb the reader.

[14]   There is another remark that concerns the software used and the outcome. The current results show some chapters less coherent than others in the distribution of subgroups (e.g., min. 69 in John 2). As someone who's had little knowledge about programming, I wonder whether there would be any differences if the author does not take chapter division—in a way an artificial construction—as his basis, but for instance by following the paragraphs found in the manuscripts. How would the subgroups look like then?

[15]   In conclusion, this volume fulfils what one would expect from a project based on the Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing in Birmingham: a study with the help of digital tools that shed light on a long-existing text-critical issue. Thanks to Perrin's efforts, our understanding of the Family 13 members in the Gospel of John increases, and now even with many graphic representations available. Future studies can also benefit from the computing model provided and the data collected. Nevertheless, there are some minor drawbacks in the book which make me suggest using it with caution.

[16]   Appendix: Errata

---

[12]   See the "Informational Document" on the CSNTM webpage on min. 788: http://www.csntm.org/manuscript/View/GA_788.

[13]   Johann Jakob Wettstein, Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη. *Novum Testamentum Graecum editionis receptae cum lectionibus variantibus Codicum MSS., Editionum aliarum, Versionum et Patrum nec non commentario pleniore ex Scriptoribus veteribus Hebraeis, Graecis et Latinis historiam et vim verborum illustrante. Tomus I. Continens quatuor Evangelia* (Amsterdam: Dommeriana, 1751), p. 53. This information can also be found in Lafleur, *La Famille 13*, pp. 42–43. Interestingly, later in the volume Perrin seems to become more confident in Wettstein's contribution: "It was while studying Küster's revision that Wetstein noticed an affinity between GA 13 at Paris and GA 69 at Leicester" (p. 43). There he refers to Wettstein's 1730 *Prolegomena*, but unfortunately this reference is incorrect: for in 1730 Wettstein has not yet mentioned his observations on this issue. Besides, although Perrin does mention an article on the spelling of Wettstein's name (J. I. Miller, "Wettstein or Wetstein?," *JTS* ns 28 [1977]: pp. 118–119), apparently Miller's conclusion does not have any influences on him: one can find Wetstein and Wettstein being used interchangeably, even on the same page. A more recent discussion on this issue can be found in Jan Krans, "'Mon cher cousin.' Johann Jakob Wettstein's Letters to His Cousin Caspar," in *Goldene Anfänge und Aufbrüche. Johann Jakob Wettstein und die Exegese der Apostelgeschichte* (ed. Manfred Lang and Joseph Verheyden; ABG 57; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2016), pp. 49–64, here p. 55.

Regrettably, this book contains some errors, both in the text and the critical apparatus.[14] This is a list of the deficiencies that I spotted in passing:

p. 2 n. 2: the citation's page number is missing (should be on p. 117)

p. 5 on Geerlings' 1962 work: missing of bibliographical information

p. 16 n. 1: the used TuT volume should be more specified (the two volumes on John 1–10 published in 2005)

p. 18 n. 9: missing of bibliographical information

p. 23: the percentage cannot be correct in the column on min. 713

p. 32 n. 23: chapters 37:26] chapter 27:26

p. 40: is the second citation actually from Archer, not Wilson? (also, the year information is missing in n. 58)

p. 44: which James is referred to? (missing of bibliographical information)

p. 98 § 3.1.7: the variant reading at 1:31 in min. 69 is incorrect (OM] ειδειν 69*; ηδειν 69ᶜ)

p. 106 § 3.3.5: which three examples are referred to?

p. 109 § 3.4.6: "Below is a sole example of Green Group affinity"; but there are actually three examples listed

p. 117: απο σκαρυωτου 983, 1689] απο σκαρυωτου 13, 983, 1689

p. 136 § 3.11.5: why the hypothetical antecedents are listed in the variant at 10:22? (also p. 159 § 3.19.4 at 18:9, 25, 33, 34; p. 160 § 3.19.6 at 18:19, 22, 28; p. 162 § 3.20.4 at 19:13, 15, 17, 28; p. 163 § 3.20.6 at 19:23, 28)

p. 179: min. 1689 occurs twice in the apparatus on 1:13

p. 183: what is omitted by min. 13 in 1:49 is συ ει ο υιος του θεου, not θεου συ ει ο βασιλευς του (also see p. 97 § 3.1.5)

p. 201: the text and the apparatus on 5:47 is missing

p. 217 aparatus on 8:12: αυτοις ο ιησους ελαλησεν; 124] αυτοις ο ιησους ελαλησεν 124;

[17] Moreover, sometimes conflicting information is given, especially in the summary sections. For instance: the data in table 3 (p. 23) and table 5 (p. 25) are different in many places; the descriptions in the summary report on the subgroups contrast with what is shown in table 7 (pp. 170–171); min. 543 and 826 seem to be incorrectly coloured in blue instead of green in figure 61 (p. 173). Some further problems are as follows:

p. 81: ͵φ‾ψ‾ν′ in the transcription of John's subscription, but 2750 (i.e. ͵β‾ψ‾ν′) in n. 182 and 1208 in p. 89

p. 86: ͵β‾ψ‾ν′ in the transcription of Luke's subscription in min. 1683, but ͵β‾ψ‾η′ in p. 89

p. 87: 1,703] 3,803 (table of Luke's subscription in min. 124; see p. 56 n. 106)

p. 88: 1,703] 3,803 (table of Luke's subscription in min. 788; see p. 71 n. 146)

p. 88: ͵γ‾ω‾γ′ = 3,803] ͵ϡ‾ω‾ι′ = 1710 (table of Luke's subscription in min. 828; see p. 78 n. 171)

[18] Lastly, there are numerous inconsistencies and errors in the bibliography and the footnotes on it, such as incorrect information,[15] missing of referred titles,[16] inconsistent use of author's name,[17] unnecessary information,[18] duplicate titles,[19] and place being Latinised.[20] If the author had followed *The SBL Handbook of Style* consistently, his

---

[14] Lafleur also points out several errors in his review (*NovT* 61 [2019]: pp. 335–337). Concerning the critical apparatus, I only did some spot checks on John 1.

[15] E.g., NA[27] is wrongly ᵃᵗᵗʳⁱᵇᵘᵗᵉᵈ to the year 1997 (should be 1993).

[16] E.g., both the *Liste* and the *Text und Textwert* volumes are missing in the bibliography.

[17] E.g., Johann Jakob Griesbach and Johann Griesbach; John D. D. Mill, John Mill, and Mill.

[18] E.g., the entry on Chris Keith's NTTSD monograph on p. 364; the entry on Souter's work in p. 369.

[19] E.g., The title of Mill's *Novum Testamentum Graecum* (²1710) in p. 364 and p. 366.

[20] This is almost always found in every title in Latin, e.g., Hauniae (Copenhagen), Oxoniae (Oxford), Halae (Halle), Roterpdami (Rotterdam).

task would have been much easier.

An-Ting Yi
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam