

## The Family 35 archetype for Acts—final form

Wilbur N. Pickering, ThM PhD

This article is based on a complete collation of the following 63 representatives of the family for Acts: 18, 35, 141, 149\*, 201, 204, 328, 386, 394, 444, 604\*, 757, 801, 824, 928, 986, 1040\*, 1058\*, 1072, 1075, 1100, 1140, 1247\*, 1248\*, 1249, 1482, 1503, 1508\*, 1548, 1617, 1619\*, 1628, 1636\*, 1637, 1652, 1656\*, 1723, 1732, 1740, 1746\*, 1749\*, 1761, 1855, 1856, 1858<sup>frag</sup>, 1864, 1865, 1876, 1892\*, 1897, 2080, 2218, 2255\*, 2261, 2303<sup>frag</sup>, 2352, 2378, 2431\*, 2441, 2466, 2554, 2587 and 2723.<sup>1</sup> At the twenty-nine places where there is a division of at least 10%, I spot-checked the following 27 MSS: 206<sup>s</sup>, 432, 634, 664, 1101, 1618, 1725<sup>2</sup>, 1733, 1737, 1745, 1748, 1752, 1754<sup>s</sup>, 1763, 1766, 1767, 1768, 2175, 2221, 2289, 2626, 2653, 2691, 2704, 2777, 2778, 2926<sup>s</sup>. Those 90 MSS represent the total of family representatives that are presently available, with the exception of GA 1400 whose microfilm is very 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 (with one exception) are listed.<sup>3</sup> Those within { } were spot-checked. The percentages within [ ] refer to the total of known MSS.

1:11 – ουτος || 1 ο [80%] 18,35,141,204,328,386,444,1100,1732,1876,1897,2255,2466,2554  
{432,634,1101,1733,1766<sup>4</sup>,1768,2221,2653,2926<sup>s,5</sup>}

Out of the 90 MSS, 16 are missing, so out of 74 extant MSS (within the family) 23 have the variant, which equals 31%. A demonstrative pronoun defines, even more than a definite article, so the article is redundant here. To include the article affects neither the meaning nor a translation, so it is unnecessary. The shorter form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

3:1 – ενατην 35<sup>c</sup>,141<sup>c</sup> || εννατην [30%] 35,141,204,328,394,928,1247,1249,1749,1855,1856,1876,2080,2255,  
2261,2431 {1101,1748<sup>6</sup>,2175,2653,2926<sup>s</sup>}

Out of the 90 MSS, 14 are missing, so out of 76 extant MSS (within the family) 21 have the variant, which equals 27.6%. 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 shorter form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

9:7 – εννοι 35<sup>c</sup>,2466<sup>c</sup> || ενννοι [40%] 35,141<sup>c</sup>,328,386,394,801,928,986,1040,1058,1140,1247,1249,1482,1508,1548,  
1723,1746,1749,1761,1855,1856,1892,2218,2255,2431,2466,2587  
{634,664,1101,1725<sup>7</sup>,1748,1752<sup>8</sup>,1763<sup>9</sup>,2175,2653,2704}

Out of the 90 MSS, 11 are missing, so out of 79 extant MSS (within the family) 37 have the variant, which equals 46.8%. But in any case, a mere alternate spelling is not a proper variant, since neither

<sup>1</sup> The MSS marked with an asterisk (\*) were collated by Dr. Eduardo Flores; the rest I collated myself. 1858 contains 23:6 – 28:31 and 2303 contains 8:19 – 15:25.

<sup>2</sup> The first four chapters are not <sup>f</sup>25.

<sup>3</sup> There is a subgroup whose core is composed of MSS 328,394,928,1249,2431 and 2441, with 1247, 1723 and 1856 in a second tier, plus a scattering of others. This subgroup appears in most of the divisions.

<sup>4</sup> 1766 has 1:1 – 2:31; 16:1-29; 19:40 – 20:28.

<sup>5</sup> 2926<sup>s</sup> has 1:1 – 4:21.

<sup>6</sup> 1748 is missing 4:13-22.

<sup>7</sup> 1725 had a different exemplar in the first four chapters.

<sup>8</sup> 1752 begins at 8:11.

<sup>9</sup> 1763 begins at 4:25.

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

10:3 – ενατην 35<sup>c</sup> || εννατην [35%] 35,328,394,928,986,1247,1249,1482,1508,1732,1749,1855,1856,2255,2431  
{1725,1748,2175,2653}

Out of the 90 MSS, 11 are missing, so out of 79 extant MSS (within the family) 19 have the variant, which equals 24.1%. 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 shorter form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

10:30 – ενατην 35<sup>c</sup> || εννατην [35%] 35,328,394,928,986,1247,1249,1482,1508,1732,1749,1855,1856,2255,2431  
{1101,1748,1763,2175,2653}

Out of the 90 MSS, 11 are missing, so out of 79 extant MSS (within the family) 20 have the variant, which equals 25.3%. 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 shorter form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

11:9 – εκ δευτερου φωνη || ~ 312 [80%] 328,394,928,986,1247,1249,1482,1723,1749,1855,1856,2255,2431,2441  
{1748,1752,1763,2175,2704}

Out of the 90 MSS, 10 are missing, so out of 80 extant MSS (within the family) 19 have the variant, which equals 23.8%. Since Greek nouns and adjectives have case endings, that signal grammatical function, changing the order of the words within a phrase rarely makes any difference in the meaning; they are two ways of saying the same thing, as in this case. Either choice affects neither the meaning nor a translation, but with less than 25% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

11:26 – συναχθηνα 35<sup>c</sup>,1508<sup>c</sup>,1652<sup>c</sup>,1746<sup>c</sup> || 1 εν [20%] 35,141,204,328,394,444,604,801,928,986,1058,1247,  
1249,1482,1508,1723,1732,1746,1749,1761,1855,1856,  
1876,1897,2080,2255,2261,2431,2554,2587  
{432,1725,1748,1752,1763,1768,2175,2221,2704}

Out of the 90 MSS, 10 are missing, so out of 80 extant MSS (within the family) 39 have the variant, which equals 48.75% (if we subtract the corrections, it would be 43.75%). Since Greek nouns and adjectives have case endings, that signal grammatical function, a preposition is often implicit in the case ending, as in this case. Making the preposition explicit affects neither the meaning nor a translation, so we have two ways of saying the same thing. If the longer form were original, why would anyone delete the preposition? Adding the preposition to the shorter form would be a 'natural'. Although the variant has the strongest attestation that we have seen so far, it is not enough to warrant replacing the first reading. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

12:4 – αναγαγειν 1723<sup>c</sup> || αγαγειν 328,394,928,986,1249,1508,1723,1749,1855,1856,2255,2431 {1725}

Out of the 90 MSS, 12 are missing, so out of 78 extant MSS (within the family) 13 have the variant, which equals 16.7%. There could be a slight difference in meaning between the verbs, but the attestation for the variant is so low that it is not a serious contender. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

12:25 – εις αντιοχειαν 141,204,328,394,801,928,986,1140,1247,1249,1482,1723,1732,1749,1761,1855,1856,1876,1897,  
2080,2255,2261,2378,2431,2441 {1725}  
απο ιερουσαλημ 18,386,1100,2554 {634,1101,1733,2303}  
απο ιερουσαλημ εις αντιοχειαν 444,1058,1548,2587 {664,1400,1752,1763,2221,2704}  
εξ ιερουσαλημ 1865  
εξ ιερουσαλημ εις αντιοχειαν 604,1865<sup>c</sup> {432,1767,1768}  
εις ιερουσαλημ 35<sup>c</sup>,149,201,757,824,1040,1072,1075,1248,1503,1508,1617,1619,1628,1636,1637,1656,  
1723<sup>c</sup>,1740,1746,1864,1892,2352,2431<sup>c</sup>,2466,2723 {1618,1737,1748,2653,2691}  
εις ιερουσαλημ εις αντιοχειαν 35 (not a conflation, because it is nonsense; the copyist knew both readings  
and recorded them both)  
Lacking: 1652,2218 {206<sup>s.fr</sup>,1745<sup>fr</sup>,1754<sup>s.fr</sup>,1766<sup>fr</sup>,1858<sup>fr</sup>,2175<sup>fr</sup>,2289<sup>fr</sup>,2626<sup>fr</sup>,2777<sup>fr</sup>,2778<sup>fr</sup>,2926<sup>s.fr</sup>}

Totals:

εις αντιοχειαν = 26  
απο ιερουσαλημ = 8  
απο ιερουσαλημ εις αντιοχειαν = 10  
εξ ιερουσαλημ = 1  
εξ ιερουσαλημ εις αντιοχειαν = 4  
εις ιερουσαλημ = 28  
Lacking = 13

Comment: The first five readings are votes against the sixth, so the vote is 49:28. However, 15 of the 28 are from the M. Lavras monastery (Mt. Athos), which probably indicates a common influence. The vote for the sixth reading should probably be reduced, making the advantage of the first reading all the stronger (if the 15 represent 5 exemplars, the vote would be 49:18). The reading of the archetype is the first, εις αντιοχειαν. Within the context, 'to Jerusalem' is nonsense. For a complete discussion, please see my article, "Where to Place a 'Comma'—Acts 12:45".

14:10 – ηλλατο 35<sup>c</sup> || ηλατο [15%] 35,328,386,394,444,801,928,986,1058,1247,1249,1482,1508,1548,1746,1749,  
1855<sup>c</sup>,1856,2255,2431,2441,2587 {634,1748,1752,2704}

Out of the 90 MSS, 11 are missing, so out of 79 extant MSS (within the family) 25 have the variant, which equals 31.6%. The first reading is presumably an unusual form of the 1<sup>st</sup> aorist that some 'corrected' by making it imperfect (as in HF, RP, and TR), while others deleted the 'extra' λ, producing the normal 1<sup>st</sup> aorist form (as in OC and NU). If we have alternate spellings of the 1<sup>st</sup> aorist, then there is no difference in the meaning or a translation. That some copyists would change an unusual form to the expected one is predictable, but who would change the expected form to an unusual one? Why? In any case, 31.6% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. I conclude that the first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

14:17 – υμιν || ημιν [15%] 328,386,394,604,801,928,986,1140,1247,1249,1482,1508,1652,1723,1732,1746,1749,  
1855,1856,1892,1897,2080,2218,2255,2441  
{432,634,1101,1737,1763,1768,2653}

Out of the 90 MSS, 10 are missing, so out of 80 extant MSS (within the family) 32 have the variant, which equals 40%. Is it 'giving you rain from heaven', or 'giving us rain from heaven'? Within the context, the extemporaneous 'sermon' in Lystra, it makes no difference; the 'us' would be inclusive, including the hearers. That said, the 40% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. I conclude that the first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

16:26 – ανεθη || ανειθη [15%] 328,394,928,986,1058,1249,1482,1723,1746,1749,1855,1856,2255,2352,2431,  
2441,2587 {664,1752,1763,1768,2289<sup>1</sup>,2704}

Out of the 90 MSS, 9 are missing, so out of 81 extant MSS (within the family) 23 have the variant, which equals 28.4%. We have alternate spellings for the aorist passive, so they are two ways of saying the same thing. Either choice affects neither the meaning nor a translation, but with less than 30% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

17:4 – εξ αυτων επεισθησαν || ~ 312 328,394,928,1247,1249,1508,1723,1749,1856,2431  
{664,1748,2289}

Out of the 90 MSS, 10 are missing, so out of 80 extant MSS (within the family) 13 have the variant, which equals 16.25%. Since Greek nouns and adjectives have case endings, that signal grammatical function, changing the order of the words within a phrase rarely makes any difference in the meaning; they are two ways of saying the same thing, as in this case. Either choice affects neither the meaning nor a translation, but with only 16.25% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

17:25 – διδους πασιν ζωνη και πνοην || ~ 21543 394,928,1247,1249,1508,1723,1749,1856,2431  
{1748,2289}

Out of the 90 MSS, 11 are missing, so out of 79 extant MSS (within the family) 11 have the variant, which equals 13.9%. Since Greek nouns and adjectives have case endings, that signal grammatical function, changing the order of the words within a phrase rarely makes any difference in the meaning; they are two ways of saying the same thing, as in this case. Either choice affects neither the meaning nor a translation, but with only 13.9% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

18:17 – εμελλεν 1652<sup>c</sup> || εμελεν [14%] 18,141<sup>c</sup>,149,201,386,394,444,604,757,928,1040,1058,1072,1075<sup>c</sup>,1100,  
1247,1248,1249<sup>c</sup>,1482,1503,1548,1619,1628,1636,1652,1656<sup>c</sup>,1723,1740,  
1761,1855,1864,2218,2255,2352,2554<sup>c</sup>,2587  
{634,1101,1737,1754<sup>s</sup>,2221}

Out of the 90 MSS, 11 are missing, so out of 79 extant MSS (within the family) 36 have the variant, which equals 45.6%. Here we have different verbs, although the difference is of only one letter. Is the verb μελλω or μελω? If the former, the meaning is not common and could easily give rise to the latter; the reverse change would be unlikely. Render: 'None of this was a delay to Gallio'; Gallio is in the dative case. His name should be in the nominative case, if he is taken to be the subject of the verb. Gallio presumably considered himself to be a busy man and did not appreciate the interruption; he was not about to allow himself to be further delayed. In Acts 22:16 the same verb has the sense of 'delay'. Taking all relevant considerations into account, the 45.6% attestation is not enough to warrant a change. I conclude that the first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

19:34 – επιγνοντες 35<sup>c</sup>,1249<sup>c</sup> || επιγνοντων [5%] 35,328,394,604,928,986,1247,1249,1482,1723,1749,1855,1856,  
2080,2255 {432,2289}

Out of the 90 MSS, 11 are missing, so out of 79 extant MSS (within the family) 17 have the variant, which equals 21.5%. Is the case nominative, or genitive? In the context, the nominative is

---

<sup>1</sup> 2289 has 15:36 – 28:31.

grammatically correct. In any case, with only 21.5% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

20:3 – γνωμη || γνωμης [7%] 328,394,928,986,1058,1247,1249,1482,1749,1856,2255  
{1752,1763,1766,2704}

Out of the 90 MSS, 10 are missing, so out of 80 extant MSS (within the family) 15 have the variant, which equals 18.75%. Is the case nominative, or genitive? Being the subject of the verb, the nominative is correct. In any case, with only 18.75% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

20:9 – απο || υπο [30%] 328,394,1140,1247,1249<sup>c</sup>,1732,1749,1761,1856,1897 {432,1725,1766,2289}

Out of the 90 MSS, 10 are missing, so out of 80 extant MSS (within the family) 13 have the variant, which equals 16.3%. Both prepositions work with the genitive case, and both can mean ‘by’. The second is more common in that function, which probably accounts for the change. In any case, with only 16.3% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

22:20 – στεφανου του μαρτυρος σου || ~ 2341 328,394,928,1247,1249,1508,1723,1749,2441  
{664,2289,2653}

Out of the 90 MSS, 10 are missing, so out of 80 extant MSS (within the family) 12 have the variant, which equals 13.3%. Since Greek nouns and adjectives have case endings, that signal grammatical function, changing the order of the words within a phrase rarely makes any difference in the meaning; they are two ways of saying the same thing, as in this case. Either choice affects neither the meaning nor a translation, but with only 13.3% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

23:24 – φιλικα 35<sup>c</sup> || φιληκα [25%] 35,328,394,604,757,928,1040,1058,1072,1247,1248,1249,1482,1503,1508,  
1548,1617,1619,1636,1637,1652,1723,1740,1746,1749,1761,1855<sup>c</sup>,1892,2218,2255,2352,2431,  
2441,2587 {432,664,1618,1737,1745<sup>1</sup>,1748,1752,1754<sup>s</sup>,1763,1768,2289,2653,2704,2777<sup>2</sup>}

Out of the 90 MSS, 7 are missing, so out of 83 extant MSS (within the family) 47 have the variant, which equals 56.6%. We are dealing with alternate spellings of a proper name, a name that occurs nine times with division in chapters 23-25. This discussion will serve for all nine. The attestation ranges between 47 and 41. The first reading is attested by codices B and Aleph, and P<sup>48</sup>, which indicates that the spelling is not a late invention. 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. That said, however, we must choose one to print in the Text. Almost all Greek texts and translations have ‘Felix’, so that is the accepted spelling. Most of the better family representatives attest the first spelling. I see no adequate reason for innovating a new spelling. I conclude that the first spelling reproduces the archetype.

23:27 – των || --- 328,394,1247,1249,1508,1723,1749,2441 {664,2289}

Out of the 90 MSS, 7 are missing, so out of 83 extant MSS (within the family) 10 have the variant, which equals 12%. In the context, the omission of the article would not make much difference, but with only 12% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

<sup>1</sup> 1745 has 23:8 – 24:22, 25:18 – 28:31.

<sup>2</sup> 2777 has 20:19 – 21:21, 23:6 – 25:22, 26:7 – 28:31.

25:11 – το 141<sup>c</sup> || του [35%] 141,801,1617,1723,1876,2255,2261,2441 {1752,1767,2626,2704}

Out of the 90 MSS, 10 are missing, so out of 80 extant MSS (within the family) 12 have the variant, which equals 15%. Both forms are possible, and the translation will be the same in either case, but with only 15% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

26:3 – ζητηματων || 1 επισταμενος [20%] 328,394,928,986,1247,1249,1482,1508,1723,1749,1855<sup>c</sup>,2255,2441 {664,2289}

Out of the 90 MSS, 8 are missing, so out of 82 extant MSS (within the family) 14 have the variant, which equals 17%. The addition of the participle is harmless, but with only 17% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

26:29 – ευξαιμην || ευξαμην [40%] 18,35,386,1058,1100,1247,1865,2466,2587,2723 {634,1101,1733,1752,2691,2704}

Out of the 90 MSS, 6 are missing, so out of 84 extant MSS (within the family) 16 have the variant, which equals 19%. Is the mode optative, or indicative? Within the context, the optative is better, but in any case, with only 19% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

27:2 – ατραμυτινω || ατραμμυτινω 328,394,928,986,1058,1247,1249,1482,1508,1548,1749,1855,1856,2255,2587 {664,1752}

Out of the 90 MSS, 6 are missing, so out of 84 extant MSS (within the family) 17 have the variant, which equals 20.2%. We are dealing with alternate spellings of a proper name (there are several further spellings). 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. With only 20.2% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

28:14 – εις την ρωμην ηλθομεν || ~ 4123 328,394,928,1247,1249,1508,1723,1749,1856,2441 {664,2289,(2626),2777}

Out of the 90 MSS, 6 are missing, so out of 84 extant MSS (within the family) 14 have the variant, which equals 16.7%. Since Greek nouns and adjectives have case endings, that signal grammatical function, changing the order of the words within a phrase rarely makes any difference in the meaning; they are two ways of saying the same thing, as in this case. Either choice affects neither the meaning nor a translation, but with 16.7% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

28:22 – παρα σου ακουσαι || ~ 312 [13%] 328,394,444,604,928,1247,1249,1508,1723,1740,1749,1856,2261,2441,2466 {432,664,1768,2289}

Out of the 90 MSS, 6 are missing, so out of 84 extant MSS (within the family) 19 have the variant, which equals 22.6%. Since Greek nouns and adjectives have case endings, that signal grammatical function, changing the order of the words within a phrase rarely makes any difference in the meaning; they are two ways of saying the same thing, as in this case. Either choice affects neither the meaning nor a translation, but with 22.6% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

28:25 – ημων || υμων [22%] 444,1075,1248,1503,1652,1740,1746,2261,2352,2431  
{1618,1745,1748,1754<sup>s</sup>,2777}

Out of the 90 MSS, 6 are missing, so out of 84 extant MSS (within the family) 15 have the variant, which equals 17.9%. Within the context, either pronoun makes good sense, but with 17.9% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

28:27 – ιασωμαι || ιασομαι [75%] 141,1058,1075,2218,2261,2303,2378,2554 {1763,2221}

Out of the 90 MSS, 6 are missing, so out of 84 extant MSS (within the family) 10 have the variant, which equals 11.9%. Is the verb aorist subjunctive, or future indicative? There is a slight difference in meaning, but with 11.9% attestation, the variant is not a credible candidate. The first form reproduces the archetype, beyond reasonable doubt.

That completes the discussion of the twenty-nine 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 Acts, 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, but due consideration needs to be given to the discussion of the divisions, above. Mere alternate spellings should be discounted, and so on.<sup>1</sup>

Chapter 1: Aside from the division in verse 11, no variant has more than three MSS. Including verse 11, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 33 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 three MSS. Of the 61 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 19 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter two.

Chapter 3: Aside from the division in verse 1, no variant has more than four MSS. Including verse 1, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 39 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 three.

Chapter 4: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 36 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 four.

Chapter 5: No variant has more than seven MSS. Of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 31 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter, and the MSS yet to be collated will

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter five.

Chapter 6: No variant has more than one MS (but this chapter is very short). Of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 50 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 11 more (which gives us all 61 MSS!). It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter six.

Chapter 7: No variant has more than three MSS. Of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 27 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter (and it is very long), and the MSS yet to be collated will probably add a few more. If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 14 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter seven.

Chapter 8: No variant has more than two MSS. Of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 40 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 15 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter eight.

Chapter 9: Aside from the division in verse 7, no variant has more than four MSS. Including verse 7, of the 61 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 11 more. (And if we ignore the division, since it is merely an alternate spelling, we will add even more.) It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter nine.

Chapter 10: Aside from the divisions in verses 3 and 30, that are parallel, no variant has more than three MSS. Including verses 3 and 30, of the 61 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 13 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter ten.

Chapter 11: Aside from the divisions in verses 9 and 26, no variant has more than five MSS. Including verses 9 and 26, of the 61 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 3 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter eleven.

Chapter 12: Aside from the divisions in verses 4 and 25, no variant has more than two MSS. Including verses 4 and 25, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), only 9 are perfect representatives of the archetype in this chapter (because of the splinter in verse 25). If we disregard singular readings (within the family), we add 9 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twelve.

Chapter 13: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 61 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 13 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter thirteen.

Chapter 14: Aside from the divisions in verses 10 and 17, no variant has more than three MSS. Including verses 10 and 17, of the 61 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 8 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter fourteen.

Chapter 15: No variant has more than four MSS. Of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 31 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 16 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter fifteen.

Chapter 16: Aside from the division in verse 26, no variant has more than three MSS. Including verse 26, of the 61 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 15 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter sixteen.

Chapter 17: Aside from the divisions in verses 4 and 25, no variant has more than six MSS. Including verses 4 and 25, of the 61 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 10 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter seventeen.

Chapter 18: Aside from the division in verse 17, no variant has more than four MSS. Including verse 17, of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 21 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 eighteen.

Chapter 19: Aside from the division in verse 34, no variant has more than six MSS. Including verse 34, of the 61 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 14 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter nineteen.

Chapter 20: Aside from the divisions in verses 3 and 9, no variant has more than three MSS. Including verses 3 and 9, of the 61 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 15 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty.

Chapter 21: No variant has more than five MSS. Of the 61 collated MSS (complete, or nearly so), 24 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 11 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty-one.

Chapter 22: Aside from the division in verse 20, no variant has more than three MSS. Including verse 20, of the 61 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 14 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty-two.

Chapter 23: Aside from the divisions in verses 24, 26 and 27, no variant has more than two MSS. Including verses 24, 26 and 27, of the 61 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 9 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty-three.

Chapter 24: Aside from the six parallel spelling divisions, no variant has more than five MSS. Including those six divisions, of the 61 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 7 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty-four.

Chapter 25: Aside from the divisions in verses 11 and 14, no variant has more than five MSS. Including verses 11 and 14, of the 61 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 9 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty-five.

Chapter 26: Aside from the divisions in verses 3 and 29, no variant has more than six MSS. Including verses 3 and 29, of the 61 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 twenty-six.

Chapter 27: Aside from the division in verse 2, no variant has more than five MSS. Including verse 2, of the 61 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 11 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty-seven.

Chapter 28: Aside from the divisions in verses 14, 22, 25 and 29, no variant has more than five MSS. Including verses 14, 22, 25 and 29, of the 61 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 13 more. It follows that we know the precise archetypal form of chapter twenty-eight.

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