

The Family 35 archetype for James—final form

Wilbur N. Pickering, ThM PhD

This article is based on a complete collation of the following 44 representatives of the family for James: 18, 35, 141, 149, 201, 204, 328, 386, 394, 432, 604, 757, 824, 928, 986, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1248, 1249, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1725, 1732, 1754, 1761, 1768, 1855, 1858, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 1897, 2221, 2303, 2352, 2431, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2626 and 2723. At the three places where there is a division of at least 10%, I spot-checked the following 45 MSS: 209,226,634,664,801,1040,1058,1101,1140,1247,1250,1482,1508,1617,1618,1619,1628,1636,1652,1656,1704,1726,1733,1737,1740,1745,1746,1748,1749,1752,1763,1766,1767,1856,1899, 2080,2218,2261,2378,(2501),(2653),2691,2704,2777. Those 89 MSS represent a nearly complete roster of the family representatives that are presently available; I neglected four others that are scrambled, incomplete or hard to read. A few more family representatives may come to light, but not enough to challenge any decisions made here. My ‘presently available’ refers to the images that have been posted by both the INTF and the CSNTM. I say a sincere “Thank you” to both organizations.

I now discuss the divisions that were spot-checked. Only the MSS that support the minority variant are listed. Those within { } were spot-checked. The percentages within [] refer to the total of known MSS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

That completes the discussion of the three places where there is a division of at least 10%. As is typical of variation within the family, the change involves a single letter; in the third case the forms had the same pronunciation. As I have demonstrated, we are able to affirm the precise form of the

family archetype for the book of James, beyond reasonable doubt. It is reproduced in my Greek Text, *The Greek New Testament according to Family 35*. Should someone prefer one or more of the alternates, it remains true that none of the text has been lost; it is one or the other. I maintain that the family archetype has been perfectly preserved, but in any case, it has been completely preserved: no wording has been lost.

I will now consider the force of the evidence chapter by chapter, simply counting the MSS that have been fully collated, but due consideration needs to be given to the discussion of the divisions, above.¹

Chapter 1: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 44 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 27 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 13 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter one.

Chapter 2: All three of the divisions discussed above are in this chapter; those discussions come into play here. No variant has more than fifteen MSS. Of the 44 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 11 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 3 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter two.

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

Chapter 4: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 44 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 26 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter four.

Chapter 5: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 44 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 23 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter five.

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

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