

The Family 35 archetype for 1 Peter—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 Peter: 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 nine places where there is a division of at least 10% (of the 43), I spot-checked the following 46 MSS: 209,226,634,664,801,1040,1058,1101,1140,1247,1250,1482,1508,1617,1618,1619,1628,1636,1652,1656,1704,1723,1726,1733,1737,1740,1745,1746,1748,1749,1752,1763,1766,1767,1856,1899,2080,2218,2261,2378,(2501),(2653),2691,2704,2777. Those 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.

1:23 – αλλλ || αλλα [60%] 149,201,432,604,757,824,1072,1075,1248,1503,1548,1637,1754,1768,1864,1892,2352,2431
{209,226,1040,1250,1617,1618,1619,1628,1636,1652,1656,1723,1740,1745,1746,1748,1763,2691^c,2777}

Out of the 89 MSS, 2 are missing, so out of 87 extant MSS (within the family) 36 have the variant, which equals 41.4%; however, 27 of them are part of a subgroup, which would reduce that percentage by well over half. The following word begins with an *alpha*, and it is normal phonology for two identical vowels to reduce to one when juxtaposed. In this case we have alternate spellings that do not affect the meaning. Although a 41.4% attestation for the variant would be significant, if it is reduced by well over half, it is no longer a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

2:9 – εξαγγελιητε 757^c,1503^c,1637^c,1864^{alt} || εξαγγελλητε 604,757,1075,1503,1548,1637,1754,1864,2352
{1619,1628,1652,1656,1740,1745,2691}

Out of the 89 MSS, 1 is missing and 6 are different, so out of 82 extant MSS (within the family) 16 have the variant, which equals 19.5%. Is the tense aorist, or present? In the context, the translation will be the same. But in any case, with only 19.5% attestation the variant is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

2:11 – απεχεσθαι 1072^{alt} || απεχεσθε [35%] 149,201,204,604^c,757^c,824,1072,1248,1503^c,1548,1637^c,1864^{alt},
2352,2431 {209^{alt},1040^{alt},1617,1618,1619^{alt},1628^{alt},1652^{alt},1656^c,
1745^{alt},1746,1748,1899,2704,2777}

Out of the 89 MSS, 2 are missing, so out of 87 extant MSS (within the family) 16 have the variant, which equals 18.4%; however, 13 are part of a subgroup, which would disqualify this variant. It appears that the Infinitive and Imperative were often used interchangeably, with little or no difference in meaning, as here. But in any case, with only 18.4% attestation (or less) the variant is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

2:24 – απογενομενοι || απογεννωμενοι 394,432,928,986,1249,1548,1768,1855,2587
{664,1058,1247,1482,1508,1723,(1749^c),(2704)}

Out of the 89 MSS, 6 are different, so out of 83 extant MSS (within the family) 16 have the variant, which equals 19.3%. The variant appears to be based on a verb not otherwise found in the NT that can mean ‘to destroy’, but it would be awkward in this context. But in any case, with only 19.3% attestation the variant is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

3:6 – εγενηθητε || εγεννηθητε [35%] 604,1637,1732,1876,2431,2587,2626 {209,226,664,801,1058,1247,1250,1618,1748,1752,1763,1899,2653,2704,2777}

Out of the 89 MSS, 2 are different, so out of 87 extant MSS (within the family) 22 have the variant, which equals 25.3%. The extra *nu* changes the verb, making them bear Sarah’s children by doing good, which makes bad sense; the extra *nu* is probably just a mistake. But in any case, with only 25.3% attestation the variant is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

4:2 – του || --- [78%] 149,201,432,604,757,824,1072,1075,1248,1503,1548,1637,1761,1768,1864,1892,2352,2431 {209,226,1040,1101,1508^c,1617,1618,1619,1636,1652,1656,1737,1740,1745,1746,1748,1766,1856,1899,2218,2261,2501,2653,2691,2777}

Out of the 89 MSS, 2 are missing, so out of 87 extant MSS (within the family) 42 have the variant, which equals 48.3%; however, 28 of them are part of a subgroup, which would reduce that percentage by well over half. The genitive case defines: ‘God’s will’ = ‘the will of God’, so the translation will be the same with either variant. The massive attestation for the variant outside the family probably influenced a number of copyists. Although a 48.3% attestation for the variant would be significant, if it is reduced by well over half, it is no longer a serious contender. I take it that the first form reproduces the archetype, even though there may be some doubt.

4:11 – ως || ης [28%] 141^c,149,201,432,604,757,824,1072,1075,1248,1503,1637,1864,1982,2352,2431 {226,1040,1508,1617,1618,1619,1628,1636,1652,1656,1737,1740,1745,1746,1748,1856,2218,2691,2777}

Out of the 89 MSS, 1 is different, so out of 88 extant MSS (within the family) 34 have the variant, which equals 38.6%; however, 24 of them are part of a subgroup, which would reduce that percentage by well over half. Is it ‘as God supplies’, or ‘which God supplies’? Both make good sense, and the change could be made almost without thinking. Although a 38.6% attestation for the variant would be significant, if it is reduced by well over half, it is no longer a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

5:7 – μελει || μελλει [20%] 141,432,604,824,986,1248,1249,1768,1876,1892,2352,2431,2626 {209,226,801,1247,1250,1508,1617,1723,1726,1748,1752,1763,1766,1899,2261,2501,2653,2691}

Out of the 89 MSS, 3 are missing and 1 is different, so out of 85 extant MSS (within the family) 31 have the variant, which equals 36.5%; however, 10 of them are part of a subgroup, which would reduce that percentage by nearly a third. The added letter changes the verb from ‘to care’ to ‘to be about to’. In the context, the variant makes no sense. For some reason, this particular variant set occurs repeatedly in the NT. Although the 36.5% attestation for the variant is significant (if not reduced), it is not enough to warrant a change, the more so since it makes no sense. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

5:8 – καταπειν 394^{alt} || καταπιη [22%] 328,394,604,928,986,1075,1249,1761,1855,1892^c,2431,2587^c {664,1058^c,1247,1482,1508,1628^{alt},1723,1745^m,1748,1749,1752,1763,1766,899,2704}

Out of the 89 MSS, 3 are missing and 1 is different, so out of 85 extant MSS (within the family) 22 have the variant, which equals 25.9%; however, 16 of them are part of a subgroup, which would disqualify this variant. Is it Infinitive, or Subjunctive; 'someone to devour', or someone he may devour'? They are almost two ways of saying the same thing. But in any case, with only 25.9% (or less) attestation the variant is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the nine 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 Peter, 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 17 MSS. Of the 43 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 5 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter one.

Chapter 2: No variant has more than nine 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 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter two.

Chapter 3: No variant has more than seven 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 9 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter three.

Chapter 4: No variant has more than 17 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 5 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 Peter, based on the available evidence. What I have done for 1 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.