The Family 35 archetype for 1 John—final form

Wilbur N. Pickering, ThM PhD

This article is based on a complete collation of the following 43 representatives of the family for 1 John: 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, 2352, 2431, 2466, 2554, 2587, 2626 and 2723. At the two places where there is a division of at least 10% (of the 43), I spot-checked the following 47 MSS: 209,226,368,634,664,801,1040,1058,1101, 1140,1247,1250,1482,1508,1617,1618,1619,1628,1636,1652,1656,1704,1723,1726,1733,1737, 1740,1745,1746,1748,1749,1752,1763,1766,1767,1856,1899,2080,2218,2261,2378,(2501),(2653), 2691,2704,2777. Those 90 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, except for the first one. Those within { } were spot-checked. The percentages within [ ] refer to the total of known MSS.

1:6 – περιπατουμεν 18,35,141,204,386,824,1100,1725,1732,1754,1761,1858,1865,1876,1897,2221,2466,2554,2626,2723
{226ᶜ,801,1101,1140,1250,1704,1726,1733ᶜ,1740,1767,2080,2261,2691}

περιπατωμεν [71%] 149,201,328,394,432,604,757,928,986,1072,1075,1248,1249,1503,1548,1637,1768,1855, 1892,2352,2431,2587 {209,226,368[1],634,664,1058,1247,1482,1508,1617,1618,1619,1628,1636, 1652,1656,1723,1733,1737,1740ᶜ,1745,1748,1749,1752,1763,1766,1856,1899,2218,2501,2704,2777}

Out of the 90 MSS, 3 are missing and 2 are illegible, so out of 85 extant MSS (within the family) 53 have the variant, which equals 62.4%; <u>however</u>, we observe a curious circumstance: the roster of MSS that reads the Subjunctive is basically made up of the two subgroups that were clearly identified in 1 and 2 Peter, no fewer than 44 of them. Further, 18 of them come from a single monastery: M Lavras. The Indicative has a better geographical distribution. The verb 'say' is properly Subjunctive, being controlled by εαν, but the verbs 'have' and 'walk' are part of a statement and are properly Indicative: only if we are in fact walking in darkness do we become liars for claiming to be in fellowship. So περιπατουμεν is correct. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

4:20 – μισει || μιση [26%] 328,386,394,604,928,1249,1548,1855,2587 {634,1058ᶜ,1140,1247,1482,1508,1704,1749, 1752,1763,1766,1856,2704}

Out of the 90 MSS, none are missing, so out of 90 extant MSS (within the family) 21 have the variant, which equals 23.3%; however, 15 of them are part of a subgroup, which could disqualify that variant. Is it Indicative, or Subjunctive? In the context, you become a liar only if you are actually hating your brother, so the Indicative is correct. In any case, with only 23.3% attestation (or less), the variant is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the two places where there is a division of at least 10% (of the 43). As is typical of variation within the family, the differences are slight. As I have demonstrated, we are able to affirm the precise form of the family archetype for the book of 1 John, beyond reasonable doubt. It is reproduced in my Greek Text, *The Greek New Testament according to*

---

[1] GA 368 is Family 35, but it only has 1-3 John.

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 22 MSS. Of the 43 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 14 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 6 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter one.

Chapter 2: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 43 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 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter two.

Chapter 3: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 43 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 6 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter three.

Chapter 4: No variant has more than nine MSS. Of the 43 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 4 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter four.

Chapter 5: No variant has more than twelve MSS. Of the 43 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 five.

Conclusion: I have demonstrated empirically that we know the precise archetypal form of Family 35 for the book of 1 John, based on the available evidence. What I have done for 1 John, 1 & 2 Peter, 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.