

'Concordia discors' and f³⁵ minority readings in the General Epistles

Wilbur N. Pickering, ThM ThD

Over a century ago, and throughout his works, John William Burgon repeatedly called attention to the *concordia discors*, the prevailing confusion and disagreement, which the early uncials (ⲚABCD—he personally collated each) display between/among themselves. Luke 11:2-4 offers one example.

"The five Old Uncials" (ⲚABCD) falsify the Lord's Prayer as given by St. Luke in no less than forty-five words. But so little do they agree among themselves, that they throw themselves into six different combinations in their departures from the Traditional Text; and yet they are never able to agree among themselves as to one single various reading: while only once are more than two of them observed to stand together, and their grand point of union is no less than an omission of the article. Such is their eccentric tendency, that in respect of thirty-two out of the whole forty-five words they bear in turn solitary evidence.¹

James

Concordia discors

Four of those uncials are extant in James (ⲚABC), to which I add P^{20,100} and 048,² and what Burgon calls their 'eccentric tendency' is plainly visible. Their eccentricity, viewed from the perspective of the normal transmission, is sufficient to warm the cockles of the heart of the most obdurate iconoclast. However, their very eccentricity establishes their independence, which is of special interest in what follows. I proceed to tabulate their performance in the 120 relevant variant sets (excluding 5 with *rell*) included in the critical apparatus of my edition of the Greek Text of James. I do so using f³⁵ as the point of reference.

f³⁵ alone 53 [In these cases the uncials are usually together, but not always.]

f³⁵ P¹⁰⁰ 2
f³⁵ Ⲛ 6
f³⁵ A 9
f³⁵ B 1
f³⁵ C 5
f³⁵ 048 1

f³⁵ P²⁰Ⲛ 1
f³⁵ P¹⁰⁰A 1
f³⁵ ⲚA 7
f³⁵ ⲚB 2
f³⁵ AB 2
f³⁵ AC 6

f³⁵ P¹⁰⁰ⲚA 1
f³⁵ P¹⁰⁰AB 1
f³⁵ P¹⁰⁰AC 1
f³⁵ ⲚAB 6
f³⁵ ⲚAC 2
f³⁵ ⲚBC 2
f³⁵ ABC 2

f³⁵ P¹⁰⁰ⲚAB 1

f³⁵ ⲚABC 6 [Since this combination attests over 90% of the words, it is irrelevant to my present purpose and will not be used in any computations below.]

involving P²⁰ 1
involving P¹⁰⁰ 7

¹ Burgon, *The Traditional Text*, p. 84.

² P²³, 0173 and 0246, all fragmentary, are also cited in my apparatus, but they never agree with f³⁵ against the rest.

involving \aleph	28
involving A	37
involving B	17
involving C	18
involving 048	1

For the 114 relevant variant sets (120 minus 6), f^{35} has overt attestation from these early uncials 52% of the time. Not only are these uncials obviously independent of each other, f^{35} is independent of them as well, but just as early. Here is a further demonstration that f^{35} is both early and independent. As we move to the next section, keep in mind that all by itself f^{35} proves that a variant is early.

f^{35} minority readings

A look at the apparatus of my Greek Text of James will show that I have designated as genuine nine 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 nine readings, beginning with the smallest percentage.

$\alpha\iota\eta\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ 2:13 [20%]

The only f^{35} MSS included in ECM, 18 and 35, are falsely attributed to a different variant, so that this reading is not even mentioned in ECM; nor is it mentioned by von Soden. Beyond any question this is the reading of f^{35} , but only as further MSS are collated will we know if it survived in other lines of transmission. That someone would have introduced an Attic form in the middle ages is scarcely credible, so f^{35} is early, and in my opinion most probably original.

$\iota\theta\upsilon\nu\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ 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 that an ancient classical spelling could, or would, be introduced. This reading is certainly ancient, and in my opinion most probably original.

$\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ 3:2 \aleph [23%]

To my surprise, there is absolutely **no** overlap between the eight non- f^{35} MSS that ECM lists for $\iota\theta\upsilon\nu\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ and the 23 non- f^{35} MSS listed for $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$. To my further surprise, the 23 do not include a single Byzantine MS.³ So f^{35} is totally independent of K^x here, and yet is joined by \aleph , 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 $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (much like $\iota\theta\upsilon\nu\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$), but the lines are **totally different** in each case!!! This means that f^{35} is independent of all eleven of those lines (surely—with $\iota\theta\upsilon\nu\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ f^{35} is independent of the six that support $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$, and with $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ it is independent of the five that support $\iota\theta\upsilon\nu\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$; so it is independent of all eleven).

This reading is certainly ancient, owes nothing whatsoever to K^x (the Byzantine bulk), and in my opinion is most probably original.

³ ECM does list two as Byzantine (254, 1827) but comparing them with TuT they do not get above the 80% threshold in James.

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- f³⁵ 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 f³⁵) 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 f³⁵). So this reading is also certainly ancient, owing nothing to K^x, and in my opinion is most probably original.

ου 2:4 NA,C (26.8%)

Since this reading is also supported by NA,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%]

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 f³⁵). 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 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.

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 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: f³⁵ is ancient, and owes nothing to 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 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.] 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 Origen Christian opinion had so changed that it was no longer possible to make changes in the text whether they were harmless or not.⁴

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.)

1 Peter

As I did with James, I take note of what John William Burgon called the *concordia discors*, the prevailing confusion and disagreement, which the early uncials (N^{ABCD} —he personally collated each) display between/among themselves.

Concordia discors

Four of those uncials are extant in 1 Peter (N^{ABC}), to which I add P^{72} (which wasn't extant in Burgon's day), and what Burgon calls their 'eccentric tendency' is plainly visible. That eccentricity establishes their independence, which is of special interest in what follows. I proceed to tabulate their performance in the 141 relevant variant sets (disregarding the 13 with *rell*) included in the critical apparatus of my edition of the Greek Text of 1 Peter. I do so using f^{35} as the point of reference:

f^{35} alone 46 [In these cases the uncials are usually together, but not always.]

f^{35} P^{72}	7
f^{35} N	9
f^{35} A	8
f^{35} B	2
f^{35} C	8

f^{35} P^{72} A	2
f^{35} P^{72} B	2
f^{35} P^{72} C	3
f^{35} N A	2
f^{35} N B	3
f^{35} N C	1
f^{35} AB	2
f^{35} AC	4
f^{35} BC	1

f^{35} P^{72} N A	3
f^{35} P^{72} N B	1
f^{35} P^{72} N C	2
f^{35} P^{72} AB	2
f^{35} P^{72} AC	2

⁴ G.D. Kilpatrick, "Atticism and the Text of the Greek New Testament," *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze* (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1963), pp. 129-30.

f³⁵ ∓AB 1
f³⁵ ∓AC 4
f³⁵ ABC 1

f³⁵ P⁷²∓AB 4
f³⁵ P⁷²∓AC 2
f³⁵ P⁷²∓BC 1
f³⁵ P⁷²ABC 1
f³⁵ ∓ABC 4

f³⁵ P⁷²∓ABC 13 [Since this combination attests over 90% of the words, it is irrelevant to my present purpose and will not be used in any computations below.]

involving P⁷² 32
involving ∓ 37
involving A 42
involving B 25
involving C 34 [C is missing from 4:6 to the end; were it extant several of the figures above would change.]

For the 128 variant sets that are left (141 minus 13), f³⁵ has overt attestation from these early uncials 64% of the time. Not only are these uncials obviously independent of each other, f³⁵ is independent of them as well, but just as early. Here is a further demonstration that f³⁵ is both early and independent. As we move to the next section, keep in mind that all by itself f³⁵ proves that a variant is early.

f³⁵ minority readings

A look at my apparatus will show that I have designated as genuine nine readings with an attestation of 30% or less. In each case the deciding factor is the presence of f³⁵. I will now analyze these nine readings, beginning with the smallest percentage.

τη αγαθη εν Χριστω αναστροφη 3:16 [20%]

ECM lists only cursives 18 and 35 for the dative. To my disappointment, von Soden doesn't mention it, but Tischendorf does, citing his cursives 38 and 93 (Gregory 328 and 205), confirming that the dative is the reading of f³⁵. Tischendorf also cites his 137 (Gregory 614) for the dative, which has an 'independent' profile. So we know that the dative did not survive only in f³⁵. The dative is correct for the object of επηρεαζω, but copyists who were not familiar with this peculiarity would naturally 'correct' to the accusative. ECM lists 15 variations for the 6-word phrase. One of my presuppositions is that the NT books were inspired by the Holy Spirit, and I assume that He knew how to write correct Koine Greek.

During the last 150 years the 'harder reading' canon has been widely used to impute to John, Peter, etc. a variety of linguistic barbarities; after all, they were ignorant fishermen, Galilean rustics, or whatever. But let's stop and think for a minute. After Pentecost, as the Church exploded and it became obvious that the Apostles were going to have to travel widely, to have an 'international' ministry, wouldn't they bone up on Greek (and even Latin)? If I were in Peter's shoes I would certainly have done so. In other words, I maintain that Peter and John and James were perfectly competent to write good or correct Greek. To me it is significant that f³⁵ habitually sides with the grammatically correct reading, as it does in this case.

δοξαζηται Θεος 4:11 [20%]

Again, ECM lists only cursives 18 and 35 for this variant. To my disappointment, neither von Soden nor Tischendorf mention it. However, as illustrated by Tischendorf for the variant above, there will almost certainly be MSS not collated by ECM that side with f³⁵ here (unfortunately TuT doesn't include this set). The lack of the article emphasizes the inherent quality of the noun, which is in accord with the context. Joining context to 'batting average', or credibility quotient, I stick with f³⁵ here.

του 4:2 [22%]

Most of the fourteen non-**f**³⁵ MSS listed by ECM for this variant are shared with **δυναμενος** in James 3:2. The fourteen will reduce to eight independent lines of transmission in the 5th century, or so I imagine, some of which will go back to the 3rd. The choice between the presence or absence of the article here makes little difference in the sense, so because of its credibility quotient I stick with **f**³⁵.

και 2:21 P⁷² [23%]

This variant also is attested by fourteen non-**f**³⁵ MSS (listed by ECM), but only four are shared. There is more diversity this time, with only two pairs, so in the 5th century we still have twelve lines, most of which will go back to the 3rd, as I imagine. P⁷² gives overt 3rd century attestation. The reading of the majority is perfectly normal and makes excellent sense, so if it were original there would be no felt need to change it. On the other hand, the **και** next to the **γαρ** could easily appear to be unnecessary, motivating copyists to delete it. In the context the emphatic use fits nicely. This reading is certainly early and independent, and in my opinion most probably original.

περιερχεται 5:8 [24%]

The twenty-one non-**f**³⁵ MSS listed by ECM for this variant include all but one of those listed for **του** above, plus eight different ones. There are several groups, but there would be at least ten independent lines in the 5th century, at least half of which should go back to the 3rd, as I imagine. The lion isn't out for an afternoon stroll, he's circling the prey, looking for an opening. **Περιερχεται** is early, independent and correct, and in my opinion almost certainly original.

ημερας ιδειν 3:10 C [26%]

The twenty-six non-**f**³⁵ MSS listed by ECM for this variant form several groups, but there would be at least fifteen independent lines in the 5th century—codex C gives overt 5th century attestation—at least half of which should go back to the 3rd, as I imagine. Since this is part of a quote from the Psalms, the LXX could be a factor, but how? Codex B has the same word order in its LXX of Psalms and here in Peter, while codex C agrees with the printed LXX. So who assimilated to whom? The word order attested by **f**³⁵ seems less smooth than that of the majority and may have given rise to it. In any event, **ημερας ιδειν** is early, independent and in my opinion probably original.

χρονος 4:3 P⁷²∖ABC [26%]

The thirty-eight non-**f**³⁵ MSS listed by ECM for this variant include all five early uncials, so there is no question about age. (Just two words later the same five early uncials read **βουλημα** instead of **θελημα**, showing that **f**³⁵ is independent of them.) There will be over twenty independent lines in the 5th century, at least half of which should go back to the 3rd, or so I imagine. I would render verses 2-3^a like this: “. . . so as not to live your remaining time in flesh for human lusts any longer, but for the will of God. Because the time that has passed is plenty for you to have performed the will of the Gentiles . . .” The phrase ‘of life’ gets in the way. **f**³⁵ is early and independent; I consider that its reading here is most probably original.

αιωνας 4:11 P⁷² [27%]

The thirty-one non-**f**³⁵ MSS listed by ECM for this variant include P⁷², so there is no question about age. They will reduce to about twenty independent lines in the 5th century, at least half of which should go back to the 3rd, or so I imagine. That the familiar **των αιωνων** should be added, if the original lacked it, is predictable; that it should be omitted is harder to explain. I would render, “throughout the ages”. **f**³⁵ is early and independent; I consider that its reading here is most probably original.

σθενωσαι θεμελιωσαι 5:10 [30%]

The twenty-four non- f^{35} MSS listed by ECM for this variant will reduce to no less than twelve independent lines of transmission in the fifth century, aside from f^{35} , at least half of which should go back to the 3rd, or so I imagine. Is Peter affirming that God will, future indicative, or asking that God may, aorist optative? How does “after you have suffered a while” affect the equation? Again I will stick with f^{35} . This reading is certainly ancient and in my opinion is most probably original.

Conclusion

Obviously the picture we have seen so far will be true for all other f^{35} minority readings, as we move up to 35%, 40%, etc. As in James, f^{35} is clearly early and independent of K^x . If it is independent of all other lines of transmission as well, as I believe, then it harks back to the Original—what other reasonable explanation is there?

2 Peter

As I did with James and 1 Peter, I take note of what John William Burgon called the *concordia discors*, the prevailing confusion and disagreement, which the early uncials (⋈ABCD—he personally collated each) display between/among themselves.

Concordia discors

Four of those uncials are extant in 2 Peter (⋈ABC), to which I add P⁷² and 048, and what Burgon calls their ‘eccentric tendency’ is plainly visible. That eccentricity establishes their independence, which is of special interest in what follows. I proceed to tabulate their performance in the 67 relevant variant sets included in the critical apparatus of my edition of the Greek Text of 2 Peter (excluding 17 where I use *rell*). I do so using f^{35} as the point of reference:

f^{35} alone 19 [In these cases the uncials are usually together, but not always.]

f^{35} ⋈ 7
 f^{35} A 3
 f^{35} B 1
 f^{35} C 3

f^{35} P⁷²B 1
 f^{35} P⁷²C 1
 f^{35} ⋈A 7
 f^{35} ⋈C 2
 f^{35} ⋈048 1
 f^{35} AC 2

f^{35} P⁷²BC 3
 f^{35} ⋈AB 1
 f^{35} ⋈AC 1
 f^{35} ⋈A048 1
 f^{35} ⋈BC 1
 f^{35} AC048 2
 f^{35} BC048 1

f^{35} P⁷²⋈AB 1
 f^{35} P⁷²⋈AC 1
 f^{35} P⁷²⋈BC 1

f^{35} P⁷²⋈AB048 1

f^{35} P⁷²⋈ABC 6 [Since this combination attests over 90% of the words, it is irrelevant to my present purpose and will not be used in any computations below.]

involving P ⁷²	9
involving ⚡	25
involving A	20
involving B	11
involving C	18
involving 048	6

For the 61 variant sets that are left (67 minus 6), **f³⁵** has overt attestation from these early uncials 69% of the time. Not only are these uncials obviously independent of each other, **f³⁵** is independent of them as well, but just as early. Here is a further demonstration that **f³⁵** is both early and independent. As we move to the next section, keep in mind that all by itself **f³⁵** proves that a variant is early.

***f³⁵** minority readings*

A look at my apparatus will show that I have designated as genuine seven readings with an attestation of 33% or less. In each case the deciding factor is the presence of **f³⁵**. I will now analyze these seven readings, beginning with the smallest percentage.

⚡ 2:2 [20%]

ECM lists only cursive 18 for this reading, but my own collation of 35 convinces me that it agrees with 18; as do 201, 204 and 328. So the family is solid. Von Soden cites one other MS for this reading, while Tischendorf is silent. So the reading survived outside the family, if not very widely. Is the antecedent of the pronoun the debaucheries, or the people involved in them? Either makes sense, but it is really the bad conduct that sullies the reputation of the Way. I take it that **f³⁵** probably preserves the Original reading here.

συνεστῶτα 3:5 ⚡ [23%]

Peter's syntax here is a bit complex, giving rise to eleven variations for the six-word phrase. As I see it, "out of water and through water" is parenthetical, modifying 'land', so the participle works with ησαν as a periphrastic construction whose subject includes both 'heaven' [m] and 'earth' [f]—thus the nominative plural neuter perfect active participle. **f³⁵** is precisely correct here, even if most copyists got lost in Peter's syntax. ⚡ gives overt 4th century attestation, but this reading is also attested by another four independent lines of transmission (as cited by ECM), besides **f³⁵**, all of which probably go back at least to the 4th century. **f³⁵** probably preserves the Original here.

εις αιωνας 2:17 (25.1%)

Here we can rely on the complete collations reflected in TuT. There must be well over twenty independent lines of transmission going back to the 5th century, half of which should go back to the 3rd, besides **f³⁵**. The choice is between singular and plural, one 'age' or many. The absence of the article helped to confuse the picture. If the plural is stronger than the singular, then it fits the context better, since Peter is using violent language. I consider that the plural is probably original.

γεγενημενα φυσικα 2:12 ⚡ [26%]

Again, besides the overt testimony of ⚡, there must be well over twenty independent lines of transmission going back to the 5th century, half of which should go back to the 3rd, besides **f³⁵**. The rest of the early uncials (P⁷² omits the participle) attest this order, while around 85% of the MSS attest the verb. The majority variant, by putting the adjective next to the noun, seems to make a more natural construction, but I take it that φυσικα is acting like a noun in apposition to ζωα, and to help us see this Peter places it after the participle: render, "as unreasoning animals, creatures of instinct made to be caught and destroyed". I do not doubt that **f³⁵** preserves the Original here.

αυξαιητε 3:18 [27%]

Imperative or Subjunctive? I take it that Peter is offering a gentler alternative to falling from their steadfastness; render "rather, may you grow in grace . . ." 5% of the MSS actually move to the

Optative; Subjunctive and Optative make up 35%. This reading is attested by at least ten independent lines of transmission, some of which should go back to the 3rd, besides f³⁵. I take it that the Subjunctive is probably original.

εΙΘΙΥ 3:16 A [33%]

The plural is obviously correct. Besides the overt testimony of A, there must be well over twenty independent lines of transmission going back to the 5th century, half of which should go back to the 3rd, besides f³⁵. Let me repeat a statement in the section for 1 Peter.

During the last 150 years the 'harder reading' canon has been widely used to impute to John, Peter, etc. a variety of linguistic barbarities; after all, they were ignorant fishermen, Galilean rustics, or whatever. But let's stop and think for a minute. After Pentecost, as the Church exploded and it became obvious that the Apostles were going to have to travel widely, to have an 'international' ministry, wouldn't they bone up on Greek (and even Latin)? If I were in Peter's shoes I would certainly have done so. In other words, I maintain that Peter and John and James were perfectly competent to write good or correct Greek. To me it is significant that f³⁵ habitually sides with the grammatically correct reading, as it does in this case.

πετρασμων 2:9 Ϻ [33%]

Singular or plural? I take the plural to be clearly superior in the context. Again, besides the overt testimony of Ϻ, there must be well over twenty independent lines of transmission going back to the 5th century, half of which should go back to the 3rd, besides f³⁵. Again I will stick with f³⁵. This reading is certainly ancient and in my opinion is most probably original.

Conclusion

Obviously the picture we have seen so far will be true for all other f³⁵ minority readings, as we move up to 40%, etc. As in James, 1 Peter and 1 John, f³⁵ is clearly early and independent of K^x. If it is independent of all other lines of transmission as well, as I believe, then it harks back to the Original—what other reasonable explanation is there?

1 John

As I did with James and 1 & 2 Peter, I take note of what John William Burgon called the *concordia discors*, the prevailing confusion and disagreement, which the early uncials (ϺABCD—he personally collated each) display between/among themselves.

Concordia discors

Four of those uncials are extant in 1 John (ϺABC), to which I have added 048, and what Burgon calls their 'eccentric tendency' is plainly visible. That eccentricity establishes their independence, which is of special interest in what follows. I proceed to tabulate their performance in the 87 relevant variant sets (excluding 31 with *re//*) included in the critical apparatus of my edition of the Greek Text of 1 John. I do so using f³⁵ as the point of reference.

f³⁵ alone 32 [In these cases the uncials are usually together, but not always.]

f ³⁵ Ϻ	10
f ³⁵ A	7
f ³⁵ B	4
f ³⁵ C	3

f ³⁵ ϺA	4
f ³⁵ ϺB	1
f ³⁵ ϺC	5
f ³⁵ AB	4
f ³⁵ AC	1
f ³⁵ A048	2
f ³⁵ BC	1

f³⁵ ∓AB 4
 f³⁵ ∓AC 1
 f³⁵ ∓A048 1
 f³⁵ ∓BC 2
 f³⁵ ABC 2

f³⁵ ∓ABC 3 [Since this combination attests over 90% of the words, it is irrelevant to my present purpose and will not be used in any computations below.]

involving ∓ 28
 involving A 24
 involving B 18
 involving C 15 [C is missing from 4:3 to the end.]
 involving 048 3

For the 84 variant sets that are left (87 minus 3), f³⁵ has overt attestation from these early uncials 62% of the time. Not only are these uncials obviously independent of each other, f³⁵ is independent of them as well, but just as early. Here is a further demonstration that f³⁵ is both early and independent. As we move to the next section, keep in mind that all by itself f³⁵ proves that a variant is early.

f³⁵ minority readings

A look at my apparatus will show that I have designated as genuine four readings with an attestation of 30% or less. In each case the deciding factor is the presence of f³⁵. I will now analyze these four readings, beginning with the smallest percentage. First, here is a roster of the non-f³⁵ MSS (as per ECM) that attest each variant.

3:6 [20%] καλ	5:11 [24%] ο θεος ημων	1:6 [29%] περιπατουμεν	3:24 [30%] --- εν
---	---	---	01
---	03	---	---
---	---	0142	---
---	0296	---	---
---	---	33	---
---	---	61	---
---	69	---	---
---	---	---	94
---	---	180	180
254	---	---	---
---	323	---	---
---	---	378	---
---	---	607	607
---	614	---	614
---	630	---	---
915	---	---	---
---	1292	---	---
---	---	1501	---
---	1505	1505	---
1523	---	---	---
1524	---	---	---
---	1611	---	---
---	1739	---	---
1827	---	---	---
---	---	---	1836
---	---	1842	---
1844	---	---	---
1852	---	---	---

---	1881	---	---
---	---	1890	1890
---	2138	---	---
---	---	2147	---
---	2200	---	---
---	2298	---	---
2374	---	---	---
---	2412	---	2412
---	---	---	2423
---	2492	---	---
---	---	2544	---
---	---	2652	---
---	---	---	2805

As with James, there is no overlap between the first two columns, and only one MS in common between the 2nd and 3rd! It follows that **f**³⁵ is independent of all the lines of transmission represented by the MSS in those columns. There are no Byzantine MSS in the 1st column and only one (not very strong—69) in the 2nd. In contrast, the 3rd column has one very strong Byzantine MS (607), one strong one (180), two fair ones (0142, 1890), and two weak ones (1501, 1842); for all that, they obviously do not represent the bulk of the Byzantine tradition. As in James, **f**³⁵ is clearly early and independent of **K**^x. If it is independent of all other lines of transmission as well, as I believe, then it harks back to the Original—what other reasonable explanation is there?

καλ 3:6 [20%]

Of the eight non-**f**³⁵ MSS listed by ECM for this variant, none is Byzantine. Cursives 1523 and 1524 probably join one generation back; they are joined by 1844 perhaps two generations back; they are joined by 254 perhaps three generations back; so these four MSS reduce to one line of transmission. In the fifth century, or so I imagine, **καλ** is attested by five independent lines of transmission besides **f**³⁵. Since their mosaics/profiles are very different, most of them probably go back to the third. This variant is certainly ancient and owes nothing at all to **K**^x. I take the conjunction to be emphatic, and probably original. Comparing this with **ιθυνοντος** in James (3:4 [21%]), there is no overlap with the eight non-**f**³⁵ MSS listed by ECM there; so between the two we have ten independent lines of transmission in the fifth century, besides **f**³⁵.

ο θεος ημιν 5:11 B [24%]

Of the sixteen non-**f**³⁵ MSS listed by ECM for this variant, only one is Byzantine (69, fair). There is no overlap with the eight above. Codex B gives overt 4th century attestation. 0296 is a 6th century fragment too small to classify. Cursives 630, 1292, 1611, 2138 and 2200 will meet by the 5th century and thus represent one line of transmission. Cursives 614 and 2412 form a pair. In the fifth century, as I imagine, this variant is attested by eleven independent lines of transmission, besides **f**³⁵. Their profiles are sufficiently distinct that I wouldn't be surprised to find eight of them in the 3rd century. This reading is certainly ancient, owes nothing whatsoever to **K**^x, and in my opinion is most probably original. Comparing this with **δυναμενος** in James (3:2 [23%]), they share three lines of transmission but that leaves thirteen to add to the eleven here—11 + 13 = 24! The surviving MSS from the first five centuries absolutely do not represent the true state of affairs at the time.

περιπατουμεν 1:6 [29%]

Of the thirteen non-**f**³⁵ MSS listed by ECM for this variant, cursives 2147 and 2652 are very close and will be joined by 378 by the 5th century. The six Byzantine MSS all have rather distinct profiles, sufficiently so that in the 5th century they would still represent six lines.⁵ So in the fifth century this variant has eleven independent lines of transmission, besides **f**³⁵, only one of which is shared with the second column. So for these first three readings **f**³⁵ finds support from 26 independent lines of transmission (5 + 11 + 10) back in the 5th century, as I suppose, being itself independent of all of them. In the apparatus I have already argued from the grammar and the context that **περιπατουμεν**

⁵ I remind the reader that I determine the Byzantine MSS book by book, comparing ECM with TuT, but I take the profile from all seven general epistles, based on TuT.

is correct and therefore original—it is certainly ancient. If every word in an independent text-type is ancient it follows necessarily that the text-type itself is ancient.

--- **ε**^v 3:24 **ς** [30%]

Of the ten non-**f**³⁵ MSS listed by ECM, cursives 614 and 2412 represent one line. Cursive 1836 has only a third of the total, so I discount it. Codex **ς** gives overt 4th century attestation. Of the five Byzantine MSS, 607 and 2423 represent one line. So we are left with seven independent lines of transmission in the fifth century, aside from **f**³⁵, three of which are shared with column three and another with column two. This reading is certainly ancient and in my opinion is most probably original.

Conclusion

Obviously the picture we have seen so far will be true for all other **f**³⁵ minority readings, as we move up to 35%, 40%, etc. Allow me to repeat some salient points:

- 1) **f**³⁵ is early and independent—independent of all other known lines of transmission;
- 2) if it is independent of all other lines of transmission it must hark back to the Autographs, of necessity;
- 3) if every word in an independent text-type is ancient it follows necessarily that the text-type itself is ancient;
- 4) the surviving MSS from the first five centuries absolutely do not represent the true state of affairs at the time.