

The Family 35 archetype for Romans—final form

Wilbur N. Pickering, ThM PhD

This article is based on a complete collation of the following thirty-nine representative MSS—18, 35, 141, 201, 204, 386, 394, 757, 824, 928, 986, 1040, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1249, 1482, 1503, 1548, 1637, 1652, 1704, 1725, 1732, 1733, 1761, 1855, 1856, 1858, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892, 1897, 2080, 2466, 2554, 2587 and 2723. At the twelve places where there is a division of at least 10%, I spot-checked the following 60 MSS: 110, 149, 328, 432, 522, 604, 634, 664, 801, 913, 959, 986, 1058, 1247, 1248, 1508, 1610, 1617, 1618, 1628, 1636, 1656, 1726, 1737, 1740, 1743, 1745, 1746, 1748, 1749, 1752, 1754, 1763, 1767, 1768, 1830, 1867, 1929, 1948, 1950, 1958, 2009, 2102, 2194, 2218, 2221, 2255, 2261, 2288, 2289, 2352, 2374, 2378, 2431, 2501, 2626, 2691, 2704, 2774, 2777. Those 99 MSS represent the total of family representatives that are presently available. I neglected a further six that were hard to read.¹ A few more family representatives may come to light, but not enough to challenge any decisions made here. Notice that the picture based on the 39 fully collated MSS remains the same after adding the 60 spot-checked MSS, with the exception of the last variant set. My ‘presently available’ refers to the images that have been posted by both the INTF and the CSNTM. I say a sincere “Thank you” to both organizations.

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

1:32 – $\pi\rho\alpha\sigma\sigma\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ || $\pi\rho\alpha\tau\tau\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ [2%] 201,757,824,986,1040,1072,1075,1503,1637,1652,1864,1892
(1950 illegible) {149,432,522,604,986,1248,1617,1618,1628,1636,1656,1737,1740,1743,
1745,1746,1748,1756,1768,1948,1958,2009,2102,2218,2352,2431,2777}

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

2:5 – $\tau\upsilon\upsilon$ || --- [1%] 201,757,824,986,1072,1075,1503,1548,1637,1652,1864,1892
{149,432,522,604,913,986,1508^c,1610,1617,1618,1628,1636,1656,1740,1745,1746,1748,1754,
1768,1830,1929,1948,1958,2288,2352,2431,2777} [- $\tau\upsilon\upsilon$ $\theta\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$ 1248]

Out of the 99 extant MSS (within the family) 39 have the variant, which equals 39.4%. Within the context, omitting the article does not affect the meaning. This omission is almost the exclusive property of Family 35; outside the family, almost all MSS have the article.² The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

4:7 – $\alpha\phi\epsilon\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ || $\alpha\phi\epsilon\iota\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ [10%] 201,394,928,986,1040,1249,1482,1548,1704^c,1855,1856,2587
{149,328,432,522,604,664,959^c,986,1058,1247,1508,1617^{alt},1743,1746^c,1749,
1752,1763,1768,1929,1948,1950,1958,2009,2255,2261,2288,2289,2374,
2704,2777} (1610 missing)

Out of the 99 MSS, one is missing, so out of 98 extant MSS (within the family) 38 have the variant, which equals 38.8%. But in any case, a mere alternate spelling is not a proper variant, since neither

¹ 228, 1161, 1400, 1899, 1913, 2675.

² Notice that the lists for these first two sets of variants are almost identical; we evidently have a subgroup of some size. Since the better representatives are generally on the other side, the subgroup remains a subgroup.

the identity nor the meaning of the word is affected.¹ The first form, attested by the better representatives, reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

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

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

7:13 – αλλα || αλλ [30%] 204,394,1249,1482,1725,1732,1761,1855,1856,1858,1876,1897,2080,2554,2587
{110,328,664,801,913,959,1058,1247,1508,1636,1726,1749,1752,1830,1929,1950,2102,2221,2255,2261,2288,2289,2378,2501,2626,2691,2704,2774} (1704 missing)

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

9:3 – ευχομην || ευχομιν 1704 || ηυχομην [60%] 201,757,824,986,1040,1072,1075,1503,1637,1652,1864,1892
{149,522,664,913,986,1248,1610,1617,1618,1628,1636,1656,1737,1740,1745,1746,1748^v,1754,1830,1929,1948,1950,1958,2009,2102,2218,2352,2431,2777}

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

11:10 – συγκαμψον 141^c,1892^c || συγκαψον [20%] 141,1072,1856,1876,1892,2466 (1508 missing)
{328,432,522,604,801,913,1247,1610,1628,1656,1746,1749,1763,1768,1830,1950,1958,2009,2194,2218,2261,2289,2352,2374,2378,2431,2501,2626,2691,2774}

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

¹ There is some overlap with the first two cases, but the mix is different.

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

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

15:28 – σπανιον || ισπανιον [25%] 394,928,1249,1482,1548,1855^c,1856,1892^c,2587 (2378 missing)
 {328,432,522,604,664,(913),959,1058,(1610),1749,1752,1754,1763,1767,1768,
 1830,1929,1950,1958^c,2102,2194,2255,2288,2289,2704}

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

16:6 – υμας || ημας (75.5%) 394,1732,1761,1892 (2378 missing)
 {110,328,432,604,664,913,1248,1508,1610,1617,1618,1726,1740,1743,1745,1754,1763,
 1768,1830,1929,2102^c,2194,2218,2261,2288,2289,2352,2374^c,2501,2774,2777}

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

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

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

16:24 – ημων || υμων [82%] 18,386,757,824,986,1040,1072,1075,1100,1503,1637,1652,1856,1864,1892,2554^c
 {110,328,432,522,604,634,664,801,986,1058,1247,1248,1508,1617,1618,1628,1636,
 1656,1737,1740,1743,1745,1746,1748,1754,1763,1768,1867,2218,2221,2288,2352,2374,
 2431,2626,2691,2777} (1897 missing)

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

no difference. All in all, it seems to me that the only way to explain the first person is to take it as the archetypal form. The first form, attested by the better representatives, reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the twelve places where there is a division of at least 10%. As is typical of variation within the family, there is very little difference in meaning between the options. As I have demonstrated, we are able to affirm the precise form of the family archetype for the whole book of Romans, beyond reasonable doubt. It is reproduced in my Greek Text, *The Greek New Testament according to Family 35*. Should someone prefer one or more of the alternates, it remains true that none of the text has been lost; it is one or the other. I maintain that the family archetype has been perfectly preserved, but in any case, it has been completely preserved: no wording has been lost.

I will now consider the force of the evidence chapter by chapter, simply counting the collated MSS, but due consideration needs to be given to the discussion of the divisions, above. Mere alternate spellings should be discounted (seven of the twelve), and so on.¹

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

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

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

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

Chapter 5: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 30 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter five.

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

Chapter 7: No variant has more than 14 MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 17 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will

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

probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 4 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter seven.

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

Chapter 9: No variant has more than twelve MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 16 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter nine.

Chapter 10: No variant has more than one MS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 32 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter ten.

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

Chapter 12: No variant has more than one MS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 30 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twelve.

Chapter 13: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 30 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter thirteen.

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

Chapter 15: No variant has more than eight MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 18 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 10 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter fifteen.

Chapter 16: No variant has more than 15 MSS. Of the 39 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 14 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 3 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter sixteen.

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