

Title: **“The Gospel According to Matthew”** (TR) {A}  
 stylized by adding “St.” before “Matthew” in the KJV to read,  
**“The Gospel According to St. Matthew”** (AV).

The TR’s Greek title, “*Euaggelion* (The Gospel) *kata* (according to) *Mathaion* (Matthew),” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text, e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53, “Matthew” is here spelt with two thetas {θ = th} i.e., “*thth*” {θθ}), and it is repeated at the end of the Gospel as “*Euaggelion kata Maththeon*”), and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is further supported as Latin, “*Euangelium* (Gospel) *secundum* (according to) *Mattheum* (Matthew),” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions q (6th / 7th century, “Matthew” is here spelt with one “t”) and g1 (8th / 9th century); and as Latin, “*Euangelium* (Gospel) *cata* (according to, i.e., a Latinized form of the Greek *kata*<sup>1</sup>) *Matheum* (Matthew),” by old Latin , k (4th / 5th centuries).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine Text, which must therefore stand as correct. With support from the Latin Vulgate, we cannot doubt the accuracy of this title. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “Gospel (or ‘The Gospel’) according to Matthew” an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Of course, Bible translators may to some extent stylise such titles, providing they are not thereby unfaithful to the basic meaning of the original. In all likelihood, this was the intent of the Clementine Vulgate (1592), which changes the title to, “*Sanctum* (Holy) *Iesu* (Jesus) *Christi* (Christ) *Evangelium* (Gospel) *secundum* (according to) *Matthaeum* (Matthew),” i.e., “The Holy Gospel of Jesus Christ according to Matthew.”

---

<sup>1</sup> This Latinization of *kata* is also found in e.g. the Latin *Catholica* for the Greek *Katholike*, in, for instance, the Vulgate’s title of the General (Catholic) Epistle of James.

Anglicans sometimes use the honourific titular title “St.” before the name of any NT saint; together with *prominent* “saints” from the second to five centuries (or less commonly till the sixth century,) in general, and for “saints” after this time only in a localized context, for instance, a church dedicated to the glory of God and in memory of a saint (Philp. 3:17; I Thess. 1:7; II Thess. 3:9; Heb. 11; 12:1; James 5:10,11; I Peter 3:6). Here “saint” means any Christian in the universal sainthood of all believers (e.g., Eph. 1:1; Rev. 14:12). E.g., St. John’s *Church of England (Continuing)*, London, UK (South Wimbledon), is named in memory of the Apostle John. Or the Anglican regional Cathedral, St. John’s, Parramatta (Diocese of Sydney), Australia, was named in memory of the early (Presbyterian) New South Wales Governor, John Hunter (1737-1821); though Hunter would not be called generally “St. John” in this Anglican tradition. Or the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) Calendar places at 5 Feb., the martyr “Agatha.” Though from the first five centuries, she is not sufficiently prominent to be generally called “Saint Agatha,” however one would refer to 5 Feb. as “St. Agatha’s day.” Lutherans also sometimes follow this tradition. E.g., St. Martin’s Evangelical Lutheran Church and School, Watertown, South Dakota, USA, is so named in reference to Martin Luther, although Luther would not generally be called “St. Martin” in the Lutheran tradition<sup>2</sup>.

So too, Presbyterian sometimes use the honourific titular prefix, “Saint,” e.g., the “St. Andrew’s Cross” (derived from the martyrdom of the Apostle Andrew, traditionally said to have been in Patra, Greece, on an X-shaped cross), on the Flag of Scotland; and usage of “Saint Andrew” the national (motif) saint of Scotland. While the greater number of Presbyterian churches of different Presbyterian denominations are not named in honour of a “Saint,” a relatively small percentage historically are. For example, St. Jude’s *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland*, Glasgow, Scotland (a Free Presbyterian Church), is named in honour of “St. Jude” (first century A.D.), the writer of the second last Book of the New Testament. Or in the City of Sydney, St. George’s *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia* (a Free Presbyterian Church), is named in honour of “Saint George” (died c. 303), the national (motif) saint of England; and in memory of St. George’s Church, Edinburgh, Scotland (which at the time was a Free Presbyterian Church in the *Free Church of Scotland* known as *Free St. George’s Church*, but which later left the Free Presbyterian Church and joined the Presbyterian Church, then becoming known as St. George’s West *Church of Scotland*). Or John Knox (c. 1514-1572) preached at, and is now buried behind, St. Giles’ *Church of Scotland Cathedral*, Edinburgh (a Presbyterian Cathedral), named after a seventh century figure.

Against this backdrop of Protestants using the honourific titular title “St.” or “Saint” before a name, we cannot doubt that stylizing the Greek reading, “The Gospel according to Matthew,” to the AV’s “The Gospel according to St. Matthew,” is perfectly reasonable. It should also be remembered, that the AV is not just a first class Bible translation. It is also a first class piece of English literature. When one says the names of the books of the NT in English, there would naturally be no assonance between “Luke” and “John,” or “John” and “Acts.” But by using the honourific titular title “St.,” not only is alliteration formed between the “St.” of the four gospels, but assonance is formed between the “S” and “t” of “Saint,” and the “t” and “s” of

---

<sup>2</sup> Bladen, F.M. (Editor), *Historical Records of New South Wales*, Printed by Authority, Charles Potter, Government Printer, Sydney, N.S.W., Australia, 1896, Vol. 4, p. 802; Letter from Rev. D.A. Hayes, Pastor, St. Martin’s, Watertown, 30 Oct. 1990 in reply to my letter of 3 Sept. 1990.

“Acts i.e., saying, “St. Matthew, St. Mark., St. Luke, St. John, Acts,” etc. .

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading, “The Gospel according to Matthew,” is also found in e.g., the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type in the Gospels), 565 (9th century, independent text type), and 700 (11th century, independent text type); as well as the Family 13 Manuscripts, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century). It was also followed by the NKJV.

*Variant 1*, which adds Greek, “*agion* (holy),” i.e., “The Holy Gospel,” is found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.*

Another reading (*Variant 2*), “According to (*Kata*) Matthew (*Matthaion*),” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century)<sup>3</sup>. This looks like a typical Alexandrian pruning, also found in the other Gospels. Because people were familiar with fact that these were the Gospels, the Alexandrian scribes evidently took it upon themselves to make a “more concise and succinct” text, by reducing this to simply, “According to Matthew,” and people would have still known what they meant. This reading of *kata* (“according to,” a preposition), followed by the object of the sentence, *Matthaion* (“Matthew,” a second declension masculine in the singular accusative, which is used for the direct object of a sentence), is uncharacteristic of Matthean Greek, which generally has a subject in a sentence (e.g., “The Book,” Greek *Biblos* in Matt. 1:1, a second declension masculine nominative, which is used for the subject of a sentence). This textual defect is remedied by the representative Byzantine reading, which includes the subject, *Euaggelion* (“The Gospel,” a second declension neuter in the singular nominative, which is used for the subject of a sentence).

Thus the representative Byzantine reading is clearly better Matthean Greek.

Moreover, it should be remembered that the Four Gospels are the Four Evangelists. These were originally told orally by an evangelist, that people might be brought under conviction by “the Holy Ghost” (Matt. 3:11), recognize their sinfulness and inability to keep God’s law to the required standard (Matt. 19:1-22), “repent” (Matt. 4:17), have their “sins” “forgiven” (Matt. 9:2,5), and “be converted” (Matt. 13:15; 18:3), confessing Jesus as “the Son of God” (Matt. 27:54) and “Lord” (Matt. 8:6,8); that is, the virgin born (Matt. 1:18-25) God incarnate Lord (Matt. 3:3; 19:17), who died in their place and for their sins (Matt. 20:28; 26:26-28), rose again

---

<sup>3</sup> According to the textual apparatus of Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72) and Swanson (1995), this is the reading of these two Alexandrian manuscripts; whereas according to the textual apparatus of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) this is, with minor differences, the reading of these two manuscripts.

the third day (Matt. 28), and was returning to judge the living and dead (Matt. 25). Under these circumstances, clearly it would make no sense for a man to stand up before unchurched people, and simply say, “According to Matthew.” Rather, for such people to understand him, he would have to say, “The Gospel according to Matthew.”

The incorrect *Variant 2* entered the neo-Alexandrian NU Text *et al.* Making this simply “Matthew” (ESV), appears to be a stylized form of *Variant 2*; and the NIV has the same reading. However, this erroneous reading was not followed in the NASB, RSV, or NRSV, all of which perhaps influence by the strength of support for it outside the Byzantine Text, on this occasion, uncharacteristically followed the representative Byzantine reading, found earlier in the parent ASV’s, “The Gospel According to Matthew” (ASV). Or better still, is the RV’s “The Gospel According to S. Matthew.” Probably influenced by its support in the Western Text, the correct reading was also followed by Moffatt as, “The Gospel According to S. Matthew” (Moffatt Bible).

**Matt. 1:6** “the king” (second occurrence after “David”) (TR & AV) {A}

The second occurrence of the TR’s Greek words, “*o* (the) *basileus* (king),” in the words, “David the king begat Solomon” etc., are supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, “*rex* (king),” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However, “the king,” is omitted in old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), g1 (8th/9th century), and g2 (10th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore the correct reading. Stylistically, this genealogy repeats information in the preceding clause at the end of the fourteen generations marker, but not elsewhere. Thus on the one hand, since “Solomon of her that had been the wife of Urias” (Matt. 1:6) is not at a fourteen generation marker, this clause is not repeated, but we simply then read, “And Solomon begat Roboam” (Matt. 1:7). But on the other hand, when we go to the fourteen generations markers, we find information from the last clause, is carried over to the next clause. Thus we first read at the end of the second fourteen generations, “And Josias begat Jechonias and his brethren, about the time they were carried away to Babylon” (Matt. 1:11), and then some of this information is repeated in the next verse, “And after they were brought to Babylon, Jechonias begat Salathiel” etc. (Matt. 1:12).

This same format is found in Matt. 1:17, where of the fourteen significant generations here selected, we first read, “from Abraham to David are fourteen generations,” then part of the last clause is repeated with respect to the name “David,” since that is all that is first said in the preceding clause, i.e., “from David until the carrying away into Babylon are fourteen generations,” and then information from the last clause is repeated again at the start of the next clause, “and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ are fourteen generations.” Since the words, “Jesse begat David the king” (Matt. 1:6) come at the end of one of these fourteen prominent generation markers, stylistic comparative analysis with Matt. 1:11,17 would lead us to

expect that the next clause would repeat this information, which indeed it does, saying, “and David the king begat Solomon” etc. .

The reason for the omission is necessarily in the realm of speculation. Was this an accidental loss due to a paper fade / loss of “*o basileus* (the king),” in which the passage still made *prima facie* sense without these words, and so a subsequent scribe took the break to simply be a “stylistic space gap”? Or was this omission a deliberate stylistic “improvement”? If so, the scribe responsible does not appear to have understood the distinction made in the genealogy with the repetition of the longer information of the last clause in the next clause *only at the fourteen generation markers*. Thus noting this style is not used for Solomon in the part immediately after David, i.e., “And Jesse begat David the king; and David the king begat Solomon of her that had been the wife of Urias; and Solomon begat Roboam” (Matt. 1:6,7); did the copyist seek to assimilate the style of not repeating the longer information used for Solomon from the previous clause evident in “Solomon begat Roboam,” by likewise omitting the words, “the king” in their second occurrence after “David”? If so, the scribe’s “improvement” left behind it the fatal evidence of its removal though the incongruity it creates in stylistic analysis of Matt. 1:6,7,11,12,17.

The TR’s reading has clear support from the three witnesses i.e., the Byzantine Greek, the Latin, and an ancient church Latin writer in Jerome (d. 420) via the Vulgate. Since the reading, “the king” after “David” the second time in Matt. 1:6 is supported by the representative Byzantine Text, and there is no good textual argument against it, it is correct. Taking into account its support in the three witnesses, together with the textual analysis, *supra*, the reading of the TR and AV is sure with a high level of certainty. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the second occurrence of reading, “the king” after “David” in Matt. 1:6 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 1:6, “the king” after “David” the second time in Matt. 1:6, was preserved by (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (*Codex Paris Ephraemi Rescriptus*, 5th century); the Syriac Harclean Version (616); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

But the incorrect reading, omitting “the king,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (Codex B 03, 4th century) and London: Sinaiticus (Codex Aleph 01, 4th century); as well as the two manuscript traditions of the Syriac Versions *Vetus Syra* (3rd / 4th century) in Syrus Sinaiticus and Syrus Curentonianus; all Egyptian Coptic Versions (beginning in the 3rd century); and the Armenian Version (5th century). These words have also been omitted in the NU Text *et al*; and hence they are not found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, or NIV. So too, the ASV reads simply, “And David begat Solomon” (ASV).

#### **Matt. 1:7,8** “Asa” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s reading, “Asa (Greek, *Asa*),” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as, “Asa (Latin, *Asa*),” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions f (6th

century) and ff1 (10th / 11th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Pseudo-Eustathius of Antioch (before 337), and with minor differences of sentence segmentation by Epiphanius (d. 403).

However, an alternative reading, “Asaph,” is found as Latin, “*Asaph*,” in old Latin Versions q (6th / 7th centuries), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century); and as Latin, “*Asaf*,” in old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries) and aur (7th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, with minor differences of sentence segmentation in Epiphanius (d. 403); and ancient church Latin writer, Ambrose (d. 397).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as the correct reading. Context strongly supports this reading, since the genealogy of Matt. 1 is clearly cross-referrable to OT genealogies in a number of places, and where this is so, the names carefully correlate with the names from these OT genealogies. “Asa” is found in I Kgs 15:8ff. Even if one did not, like myself, believe in verbal inspiration, it would still beggar belief to suggest that a writer with such an evidently good knowledge of the OT, as St. Matthew, who on the uninspired view of Scripture, would have had to go through OT genealogies at this point to find Asa (I Kgs 15:8ff), could then have gotten it wrong. By contrast, it is well within reason to consider that a later scribe may have sought to stylistically improve the text. Was his motive “practical”? I.e., especially in times of continuous script, did the reading “ACAACA” strike a scribe as “confusing” due to its shortness, and did the fear of loss due to ellipsis then prompt him to make this “*Asaph*”? If so, did he further think that “Asa” was an abbreviated form of “Asaph,” and finding value in the form, “Asaph” (e.g. II Kgs 18:18,37; Pss. 50; 73-83), then alter the text? Or was the scribe working from a copy of the genealogies given to him, and wrongly think the name here was “Asaph,” and so sought to “correct” the text? Or was there a paper loss / fade with “ACAACA” coming at the end of a line, so that it looked something like “ACA...,” and did a careless scribe then “reconstruct” this through reference to the OT name of “Asaph,” and so change the reading by inadvertence? We cannot be certain as to the variant’s origins, we can only be certain that it is a deviation from the original.

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the reading of “Asa” at Matt. 1:7,8 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Though outside the closed class of three reputable sources, the correct reading at Matt. 1:7,8, “Asa,” was preserved in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), much celebrated Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (c. 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions. By contrast, the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century), read, “Asaph” not Asa. This variant was also followed in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century), Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries), and Syriac Harclean’s marginal reading (616). The two variants were clearly known by the time of Epiphanius (403) who refers to both with minor differences. It is found in the main text of the NU Text *et al.*

Following on from earlier neo-Alexandrian texts such as Westcott-Hort (1881), on the first page of the NT text, we find the textual critics of the NU Text *et al*, use the erroneous reading “Asaph” here in Matt. 1:7,8. It is difficult to find a better example, of how religious liberals have fabricated and fantasized so called, “Bible blunders,” than here in the NU Text’s claim that Matt. 1:7,8 should read, “Asaph” not “Asa.” The ASV footnote wrongly claims that the “Gr[ee]k” reads “‘Asaph’.” This footnote was continued in the NASB’s 1st ed. and 2nd editions, and some, though not all, NASB 3rd editions. Both the NRSV and ESV have the variant in the main text, with a footnote referring to the TR’s reading. The RSV and NIV main text is the same as that of the ASV i.e., “Asa” (ASV), but while this means that *prima facie* the RSV and NIV have the correct reading, to this we must make the qualification that “Asa” (ASV) may have been used by one or both of these versions, for what the RSV and / or NIV regard as a dynamic equivalent for Greek *Asaph*.

**Matt. 1:10** “Amon” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s reading, “Amon (Greek, *Amōn*),” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as, “Amon (Latin, *Amon*),” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Version a (4th century); and as Latin, “*Ammon*,” in old Latin Versions f (6th century) and aur (7th century). From the Latin support for this former reading, Latin, “*Amon*,” it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Pseudo-Eustathius with minor differences of sentence segmentation (4th / 5th century), and the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

However, an alternative reading, “Amos (Greek *Amōs*; Latin, *Amos*),” is found in old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), q (6th / 7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), g2 (10th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is further followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Epiphanius (d. 403).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine Text, which must therefore stand. Context strongly supports this reading, since the genealogy of Matt. 1 is clearly cross-referrable to OT genealogies in a number of places, and where this is so, the names carefully correlate with the names from these OT genealogies. “Amon” is found in e.g., Zeph. 1:1, where we read of “Josiah, the son of Amon, king of Judah.”

The origins of the variant are speculative. Did a paper fade / loss, make the original “... *AMQNAMQN*...” look something like, “... *AMQ::MQ::...*”? Was this then “reconstructed” by a scribe as, “... *AMQCAMQC*...”?

It seems the similarity of the names of the OT king, “Amon” and the OT prophet, “Amos,” evidently led to some confusion. Notably, some Septuagint versions first made this mistake, erroneously substituting “Amos” for “Amon.” In Brenton’s Septuagint, II Kgs (or IV Kgs in the LXX) 21:18,19,23,24,25 reads *Amōs* rather than *Amōn*. This same error is found in Brenton’s Septuagint for Jer. 1:2; 25:3, where we read of “Amos (*Amōs*) king of Juda,” rather than “Amon king of Judah” (AV). After consulting one of the corrupted Septuagint readings of “Amos” for “Amon” the king of Judah, was the text of Matt. 1:10 either “reconstructed” to “Amos” following a paper fade / loss *supra*; or deliberately changed as a scribal “correction,” by

a scribe with too high a view of the Septuagint? We cannot be sure of the variant's origins, we can only know for sure that it is not the original reading.

The TR's reading, "Amon," has good support from the three witnesses i.e., the Byzantine Greek, the Latin, and church writers in e.g., the Western church doctors, St. Jerome and St. Augustine. The fact that St. Matthew's genealogy shows general correlation with the Hebrew OT; and the fact that the alteration can be adequately and reasonably explained on the basis that in post NT times the Greek Septuagint came to replace the Hebrew as the OT for a number of copyists, who if following a corrupt Septuagint would have wrongly thought this king's name was "Amos;" means that the reading "Amon" is undoubtedly correct. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 1:10 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Though outside the closed class of three witnesses, the correct reading at Matt. 1:10, "Amon," is also found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (c. 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions. It is also found with minor differences in the Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century).

The incorrect reading, "Amos" at Matt. 1:10, was adopted by the two chief Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Bohairic (3rd century), and Fayyumic (3rd century) Versions; Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries); and Georgian Version (5th century) (from Transcaucasia, i.e., the region of the traditional line dividing Europe from Asia around the Caucasus Mountains). This incorrect reading of "Amos" at Matt. 1:10 in these manuscripts and versions appears to be a testimony to the ever widening view that the Septuagint in its corrupted readings was to uncritically preferred over the Hebrew OT, and that in this context some copyists thought themselves to be at liberty to make "corrections" to the NT text.

A footnote at Matt. 1:10 in the ASV wrongly claims the "Gr." or Greek reading is "Amos," but gives the correct reading in the main text as "Amon" (ASV). This spurious reading of "Amos," is also found in the main text of the NU Text *et al.* The NASB's 1st ed. and 2nd edition continue the parent ASV's format with footnote, and the footnote is found in some, though not all, NASB 3rd editions. The NRSV and ESV follow their RSV father in reversing the ASV order i.e., making "Amos" (ASV ftn) the main reading, with a footnote giving the alternative. The NIV main text is the same as that of the ASV i.e., "Amon" (ASV), but while this means that *prima facie* the NIV has the correct reading, to this we must make the qualification that "Amon" (ASV) may have been used by the NIV translators, for what they regarded as a dynamic equivalent for Greek *Amos*.

**Matt. 1:11** "begat" (in "Josias begat Jechonias") (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek reading of "*egennese* (begat)" in "Josias begat (*egennese*) Jechonias" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); and Lectionaries 185 (11th century), 70 (12th century), 333 (13th century), 1761 (15th century), and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin,

“*genuit* (begat),” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported by the ancient church Greek writers Hippolytus in a similar reading (d. 235) and Pseudo-Eustathius (4th / 5th century); and the ancient church Latin writers Ambrose (d. 397), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430).

But another reading, *Variant 1*, in which to the TR’s “Josias begat Jechonias,” is added after “*Iosias* (Josias) *egennese* (begat),” the additional words “*ton Joakim* (Joakim), *Joakim* (Joakim) *de* (and) *egennesen* (begat),” i.e., “Josias begat *Joakim and Joakim begat* Jechonias.” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), M 021 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), and Minuscule 1006 (11th century, Byzantine in Matthew to Jude).

It is also found in a similar form to this in the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation (c. 395), and Epiphanius (d. 403).

Another reading, *Variant 2*, omits the words, “*Iosias* (Josias) *de* (And) *egennese* (begat) *ton* (-) *Iechonian* (Jechonias),” i.e., “And Josias begat Jechonias” (AV). This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 2378 (11th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is thus correct. The Hebrew genealogies sometimes omit names, and make a selection of names deemed important or significant for the purposes of the genealogy. The reason for this selection may contextually vary. E.g., in Matt. 1:1 we read, “Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham,” a trilogy of names that requires many generations between Christ and David, and between David and Abraham are omitted. Here the *raison d’etre* for the genealogical omissions is simply to make the point that Christ is a descendant of both David and Abraham.

Likewise, Nashon the son of Amminadab dates from the pre-Conquest period (Num. 1:7; 2:3; 7:12,17; 10:14), Rahab from the Conquest period (Josh. 2:1,3; 6:17,23,25), and Boaz and Ruth from the period of the Judges. God says he will cut short the life of miscegenationists (Prov. 2:16,18,19; 5:3-5; 5:20,23), in this context setting an upper limit of 120 years (Gen. 6:3) but no lower limit. That the Moabitess Ruth’s first husband, an Israelite, died young, may thus be regarded as a manifestation of this judgement (Ruth 1:4,5). But another penalty is bastardy generations. I.e., with regard to Matt. 1:5, there would have been many more generations between Nahshon and Amminadab in the pre-Conquest period, and David in the post Judges period of the monarchy, than those here given. Since the genealogy of Matt. 1:5 spans the period of the judges i.e., about 350-400 years from the time of the Conquest to King David, Matt. 1:5 therefore omits 3 or 4 generations of bastardy for Rahab (see Gen. 24:2-4; 28:1,2; Deut. 5:9), and about 10 generations of bastardy for Ruth between Boaz and Jesse (Deut. 23:2,3). Moreover, Joram married Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel (II Kgs 8:16,18,26, n.b., “daughter of Omri” in II Kgs 8:26 means a female descendant, and is rendered “granddaughter” in an ASV footnote), and Jezebel was of “the Zidonians” (Sidonians) (I Kgs 16:31) i.e., of “Sidon” (cf. Matt. 15:21; Mark 7:24) and so “a Syrophenician” (cf. Mark 7:26) “woman of Canaan” (cf. Matt. 15:22). She was a Canaanitish idolater (I Kgs 16:31) and between “Joram” and “Ozias” / “Uzziah” (St. Matt. 1:8), we know of three extra generations here omitted in Matt. 1:8 since II Kgs 8-15 and II Chron. 21-26 tell us the order was Joram / Jehoram, then Ahaziah, then Jehoash / Joash, then Amaziah, and then Ozias / Azariah / Uzziah.

In the Matthew 1 the women's name is only mentioned inside the genealogy if it raises a bastardy issue. Hence "Thamar" (Tamar) is mentioned (Gen. 1:3) because she was a prostitute that Judah adulterously went unto (Gen. 38). It teaches us of God's *justice* which says of "Thamar" who "played the harlot" and was "with child by whoredom," that she should "be burnt" to death (Gen. 38:24); and also of God's *mercy* which pardons and remits this sentence. It is a cutting story against self-righteousness, for it also reminds us that Judah himself was guilty of the sin of adultery and so he had to then admit, "she hath been more righteous than I" (Gen. 38:26). These type of words are echoed by our Lord in the Gospel story of the Woman Caught in Adultery, when Christ says, "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her" (John 8:7). Likewise reference is made to Solomon marrying "her that had been the wife of Urias" (Matt. 1:6), because this union with Bathsheba had been adulterous. It thus shows the *justice* of God which for David's sin of murdering Uriah and committing adultery with Bathsheba decreed, "the sword shall never depart from thine house" (II Sam. 12:9,10); and the immediate son of this union died shortly after birth (II Sam. 12:18-24); and also the *mercy* of God in that of her, another son was born, "Solomon: and the Lord loved him" (II Sam. 12:24).

Three Gentile women are focused on, two by name, in this genealogy, Rahab, Ruth (Matt. 1:5), and Athaliah (Matt. 1:8). These genealogical references teach *the justice* of God, since for the sin of miscegenation, 3 or 4 generations of bastardy are omitted for Rahab, and 10 generations of bastardy are omitted for Ruth; for though these unions were not religiously mixed marriages in that both women worshipped the true God (Ruth 1:16; Heb. 11:31), nevertheless, they were racially mixed marriages. And God so greatly abhors this sin that the penalty decreed at the time of the unions between Seth's race and Cain's race, (whose generalized continuation was one of the reasons for the Flood of Noah,<sup>4</sup>) namely, a reduction of age to those accustomed

---

<sup>4</sup> Unlike Cain's race (Gen. 4:16-24), Seth's race (Gen. 6-5:32) enjoyed God's racial election, and thus are called "sons of God." These same Hebrew words, "sons (*ben*) of God (*Elohim*)" are used of Israel in Deut. 14:1,2, rendered in the AV as "children (*ben*) of God (*Elohim*)," though they might also be translated here, "sons of God" (as e.g., in the NASB). On the one hand, racial election as God's "sons" (Exod. 4:22,23) remains even when the racial group is in apostasy (Hosea 11:1,2; 13:12,13). But on the other hand, "they are not all Israel, which are of Israel" (Rom. 9:6; cf. 2:29), for the covenant of grace was always made on an individual basis with the redeemed, and should not be confused with racial election (even though in OT times most of those with whom the covenant of grace was made were inside the elect race). Thus though Seth's race was religiously apostate and generally most in it in Gen. 6 were damned to hell, nevertheless, on the basis of racial election rather than spiritual election, they are called "the sons of God" (Gen. 6:2). Thus the emphasis on the passage is on the preservation of the racial groups God created. (The marriages between "the sons of God" and "daughters of men" contextually occurs immediately after the genealogies of Cain's race and Seth's race, thus identifying them as the two groups in question. The claim of some that Gen. 6:2 refers to angel-human unions is not sustainable. God said he would destroy "man" in Gen. 6:7, i.e., Hebrew '*adam*, if these were angel-human hybrids they would not be Adamites but half-men or half-'*adam*. Objections also exist to angel-human hybrids based on genetics in sexual reproduction.) The story of the Flood manifests God's hostility towards inter-racial unions and violence, and commends "Noah" who was "perfect in his" racial "generations" by begetting full-blooded Sethites (Gen. 6:9,10). Homily 11, Book 1, Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* says,

to living many hundreds of years down to just “an hundred and twenty years” (Gen. 6:3); was also applied by God to Moses. For on the one hand, God insisted that he alone, and no man, be judge over Israel’s leader of Moses (Num. 12:1-15); but on the other hand, he imposed this penalty of 120 years on Moses. For having married “Zipporah” of “Midian” (Exod. 2:15,21), also known as “the Ethiopian woman” (Num. 12:1), since Midian was on a joint Hamite-Semitic strip on the western side of the Arabian Peninsula (see Sheba, Gen. 10:7b,21,28; “Cushan” and “Midian” which are placed in Hebraic poetical parallel, Hab. 3:7; and Havilah, Gen. 10:7a,21,29; 25:18), though Moses’ father “Amran” lived “an hundred and thirty and seven years” (Exod. 6:20); and though at the age of 120 Moses’ “eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated,” nevertheless, “Moses was an hundred and twenty years old when he died” (Deut. 34:7).

And when the *Council of Jerusalem* met they said of “the Gentiles” who “are turned to God,” that “they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood” (Acts 15:20,29; 21:25). Did this mean that contrary to wider NT teaching, Gentiles were e.g., free to blaspheme (I Tim. 1:20; 6:1) and steal (Eph. 4:28) which are not here itemized? Did this mean that contrary to the wider NT teaching (Rom. 14; I Cor. 8), Gentiles had to abstain from food offered to idols even if they were stronger brethren eating away from weaker brethren? Did this mean that contrary to the wider NT teaching (Col. 2:16; I Tim. 4:3-5), Gentiles had to follow Jewish dietary laws against the eating of blood (Lev. 3:17)? Broader NT context precludes such a view. And so these were evidently table-rules, used to govern fellowship meals between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians. What then does “fornication” (Acts 15:20) here mean? Since there is only one type of “fornication” that can occur when Jewish and Gentile Christians come together, but not when they are apart, this was evidently a prohibition on inter-racial dating and marriage between Jewish and Gentile Christians. And little wonder, for at his Second Advent Christ will judge miscegenationists (Dan. 2:43,44; Matt. 24:37-39). But though *the justice* of God is seen in the bastardy generations applied to Rahab and Ruth for their mixed marriages here in Matt. 1:5; yet also *the mercy* of God is here seen, in that being Gentiles, they signify to us that Christ came not only to save the Jews, but also the Gentiles.

Indeed, in the case of Ruth we have a contrast given between Ruth who chose to worship the true God, and Orpah who chose to worship idols (Ruth 1:4,8-18). This is broadly comparable to the contrast between Abel worshipping God as he ought, and Cain engaging in impure worship (Gen. 4:2-5; Prov. 15:8; 21:27; Heb. 11:4). But the mercy of God unto Ruth’s salvation does not remove the judgement of God against miscegenation with ten generations of bastardy (Deut. 23:2,3). For this is stated as an absolute rule with no contingency. There is nothing which e.g., says, “if at some point along these ten generations one of these bastards turns to worship the true God then his bastardy is removed and his offspring will be legitimate.” That is because he who created the races wants them to maintain a basic level of racial purity. It is an autonomous concern to that of religious purity, even though the two concerns sometimes exist simultaneously, so that with e.g., the mixed marriages of Ezra 9 & 10 reference is made to issues of both religious purity against “abominations” (Ezra 9:1) and racial purity with regard to Israel’s “seed” (Ezra 9:3). Hence this passage may still be used to show God’s prohibition of racially

---

“to show how greatly he abhorred adultery, whoredom, fornication, and all uncleanness,” “God” “destroyed the whole world and all mankind, eight persons only excepted.”

mixed marriages, even where there is no religious impurity i.e., among Christians. This autonomous concern to that of religious purity, i.e., the concern for racial purity, is part of a corporate concern with regard to keeping the planet segregated into nations that are largely race and cultural identifying (Gen. 6:1-14; 10), being among other things God's way of inhibiting man's sinful push for "a one world government." To try and *personalize* such matters, and say e.g., "Ruth was a wonderful godly person and so these bastardy generations *just couldn't* apply to her," is to thus miss the point, and fail to declare the whole counsel of God. But Deut. 23:2,3 also reminds us that there was a limit set. It was ten generations, not eleven, or twelve, or more.

And so once the hot displeasure of a holy God against such miscegenation was finally expired, it happened that in the fullness of time first King David, and later the Messiah, King Christ, were born on this line. And so we see that *the mercy* and *the judgement* of God are intermingled. And this indeed is a much wider Attribute of God, for "He ... spared not his own Son" (Rom. 8:32), but "set" him "forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood," "to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just" (God's judgment) "and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus" (God's mercy) (Rom. 3:25,26).

As for the third Gentile woman, not specifically named, Athaliah, and for whose mixed marriage three generations of bastardy are omitted in Matt. 1:8; she was a Canaanite, an unrepentant idolater (I Kgs 16:31), and a murderess (II Kgs 11:1). Matt. 1:8 here teaches us about *the judgement* of God in that "they slew Athaliah with the sword" (II Kgs 11:20), for God has decreed the death penalty for murder (Gen. 9:6), saying, "he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword" (Rev. 13:10). But Matt. 1:8 also here teaches us about *the mercy* of God, in that Athaliah was a Gentile, and so the Scripture here teaches us that Christ came not only to call the Jews to repentance, but also the Gentiles.

What an amazing genealogy we thus find in Matthew 1! It refers to two prostitutes, Tamar (Matt. 1:3) and Rahab (Matt. 1:5). It reminds us of *the judgment of God* against such sins as prostitution or adultery, whether adultery by Judah with "Thamar" (Matt. 1:3) or David with "her that had been the wife of Urias" (Matt. 1:6); or miscegenation, whether by Salmon or Boaz (Matt. 1:5); or idolatry by Athaliah (Matt. 1:8); or murder, whether by David (Matt. 1:6) or Athaliah (Matt. 1:8). These sins of idolatry, adultery, miscegenation, and murder, are so great that an unsaved man could, by the common grace of God which is not unto salvation, perceive them to be wrong. He could perceive that there is a Creator and so idolatry is wrong. He could perceive that God has instituted the family unit with marriage between a man and his wife from whom children are born, and so adultery is wrong. He could perceive that *Good God made the white man and, Good God made the coloured man; but then man's sinful sexual deeds, made the half-castes and quarter breeds*. He could tell from race and culture that God separated the races into broad cultural, racial, and linguistic groups. He could perceive that man is made in the image of God, and that murder is not only wrong, but that equal justice requires "life for life" of the murderer. Good Christian reader, these are most heinous and terrible sins that have here been isolated for us here in Matthew 1, and *the judgment of God* against them is here clearly taught.

And yet this same genealogy of Matt. 1 teaches us *the mercy of God*. For "we know that all things work together for good to them that love God" (Rom. 8:28). We here see *the mercy of God* to the Gentiles, for Rahab, Boaz, and Athaliah were all Gentiles, and so the Scriptures here signify to us that Christ came not only to save the Jews, but also the Gentiles. We here see *the mercy of God* to those who repent of adultery and murder, for Judah repented (Gen. 38:26), and

unto him was born Pharez (Phares) (Gen. 39:29), and the Lord did not slay Pharez, so that Judah did “raise up seed” through Tamar (Gen. 38:8). And so too, unto David and Bathsheba was born Solomon, who was loved of the Lord and made a king of Israel. For what saith the Christ of this amazing genealogy? He saith, “I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance” (Matt. 9:13). And what saith he to the self-righteous? “Verily, I say unto you, That the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you” (Matt. 21:31).

But wait one moment more, good Christian reader. For Christ doth not end there. But he further saith, “For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not; but the publicans and the harlots believed him: and ye, when ye had seen it, repented not afterward, that ye might believe him” (Matt. 21:32). For Christ taught that men must “Repent” (Matt. 4:17). For he upheld and maintained the Biblical teaching of the Hamitic curse, such as found upon the Canaanites (Gen. 9:22,25,26), not healing the Canaanitish woman’s daughter till she too accepted her place as a servant race (Matt. 15:25-28); and in this regard, spoke to her quite differently compared to how he addressed the white supremacist army officer of the Japhethite Roman Empire (Gen. 9:27; Matt. 8:5-13). He taught the immorality of miscegenation (Gen. 6:1-4,9-11; Matt. 24:37-39), adultery (Matt. 19:9), impure worship (Matt. 15:9), murder, and many other sins (Matt. 15:19,20; 19:17-19). Yet he proclaimed the gospel of grace, saying he would have “mercy and not sacrifice” (Matt. 9:13; 12:7), calling upon men to have to have “faith” (Matt. 23:23) in the one who was “to give his life a ransom for many” (Matt. 20:28), even the one whom Isaiah calls “the Lord,” that is, God (Matt. 3:3; quoting Isa. 40:3 where “the Lord” is Jehovah); and the saved also call, “the Son of God” (Matt. 27:54). He who “shed” his “blood” on Calvary’s cross “for the remission of sins” (Matt. 26:28). Good Christian, our Lord spake of “judgement, mercy, and faith” (Matt. 23:23), for his mercy is not “cheap grace,” but requires that his “judgement” be also satisfied, and that men have “faith” in him. This is not just the teaching of the Matt. 1 genealogy, but of the Gospel According to St. Matthew more widely; and of the Scriptures in general more widely again.

*So good Christian reader, with this better understanding of how the genealogy of Matt. 1 works, let us now return to a more specific focus on the immediate point, here relevant to textual analysis in Matt. 1:11.* Specifically, while it is true that Hebrew genealogies sometimes omit names for reasons of emphasis without any particular reference to a sin of those so omitted (Matt. 1:1; Luke 3:36), it is clear that St. Matthew’s general methodology is motivated by a desire to achieve the number of 14 generations thrice (Matt. 1:17), and show both God’s judgement and mercy through reference to those names omitted. With this methodology in mind, we now come to a particular omission that here gave rise to *Variant 1*.

In the chronology at Matt. 1:11, the name of “Jehoiakim” is omitted between “Josias” (Josiah) and “Jechonias.” For first came “Josiah” (II Kgs 22:1); then “the son of Josiah” who became “king” was “Eliakim,” also known as “Jehoiakim” (II Kgs 23:34) or “Joakim” (II Kgs 23:34, LXX); and he was followed by “Jehoiachin his son” (II Kgs 24:6; II Chron. 36:9), also known as “Jechoniah” (I Chron. 3:16) or “Jechonias” (I Chron. 3:16, LXX) or “Coniah” (Jer. 22:24,28; 37:1).

The Bible teaches that we should be buried and not cremated (Amos 2:1). But to this are made some small number of exceptions, such as when a Christian martyr is burnt at the stake,

and so is unable to do anything about the fact that he is burnt to death<sup>5</sup>. Indeed, many Protestant martyrs have died for their faith this way at the hands of Papists, e.g., the Marian Martyrs under Bloody Mary (Regnal Years: 1553-1558). The Bible also makes an exception for God's Divine judgment, since he has sometimes destroyed the evil ones by fire (Gen. 19; Num. 11:1-3; 16:35).

Thus heinous crime may also be punished by burning (Gen. 38:24; Lev. 20:14; Josh. 7:25,26; I Kgs 12:28; 13:1-3). In like manner, burial has some times been denied evildoers (Jer. 25:33 cf. Num. 25:4). This was evidently a symbol of the fact that they had no part in the resurrection of the just. E.g., Oliver Cromwell was guilty of "seditions" and "murders" (Gal. 5:20,21), having murdered King Charles I in 1649; and thus with all "murderers" Cromwell has his "part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone" (Rev. 21:8). Hence in 1661, King Charles II ordered that Oliver Cromwell's body be exhumed, and his skull placed on a public gazing pole at Westminster Hall, next to the Westminster Parliament, where Cromwell's skull remained throughout the further 24 year duration of this Caroline reign. The remainder of Cromwell's body was hung in chains at Tyburn in Hyde Park.

In this context it is to be noted that like a number of other kings, Jehoiakim "did that which evil in the sight of the Lord" (II Kgs 23:37). But his sins evidently went beyond even that which bad kings normally did, for the Old Testament prophet, Jeremiah, prophesied of him, "thus saith the Lord concerning Jehoiakim the son of Josiah king of Judah; They shall not lament for him, saying, Ah my brother! Or, Ah sister! They shall not lament for him, saying, Ah lord! Or Ah his glory! He shall be buried with the burial of an ass, drawn and cast forth beyond the gates of Jerusalem" (Jer. 22:18,19). This meant that when he was slain in Babylon's second siege (II Kgs 24:1,2), he died *like a donkey* i.e., his body was to rot on the ground; and thus of his death we do not read he was "buried" (II Kgs 21:26; 23:30). Rather, in contrast to the normative formulae of words in which a king "was buried" with "his fathers" (II Kgs 8:24; 9:28; 10:35; 12:21; 13:9,13; 14:16,20; 15:7,38; 16:20; 21:18), we read of "Jehoiakim" simply that he "slept with his fathers" (II Kgs 24:6) i.e., he did not receive a burial. We thus see *the judgment of God* on "Jehoiakim" who was denied a burial, and whose name is here omitted at Matt. 1:11. But we also see *the mercy of God* in that God came to save sinners, and through his son, "Jechonias" who is mentioned in this genealogy (Matt. 1:11), the Messiah's line is here reckoned.

These selections are made in Matt. 1, in part, for the stated reason of reckoning "generations" three times in succession (Matt. 1:17); and for the purposes of showing God's judgment and mercy. Therefore, the fact that the genealogy goes from Josias to Jechonias in Matt. 1:11 is consistent with these wider stylistic features, both with respect to the omission of a name, and also with keeping the count at fourteen generations. *Variant I* i.e., the insertion of the missing name of "*ton Joakim*," i.e., Jehoiakim in the Septuagint form, "Joakim" (II Kgs 23:34, LXX; I Chron. 3:16, LXX), is clearly an assimilation to I Chron. 3:15,16 which has "Josiah"

---

<sup>5</sup> For a more general discussion on cremation, see my work, *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist* (2006) (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>), "Part 2: The Antichrist revealed," chapter 16, "The Antichrist's *sin*: 'the mystery of iniquity doth already work with all deceivableness' (II Thess. 2:3,7,10): the sin of cremation." Howard, D., *Burial or Cremation, Does it Matter?* Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, 2001 (see my qualifications about this work at *Ibid.*, chapter 16); Levell, A.J., *Cremation Not For Christians*, Gospel Standard Trust Publications, Harpenden, Hertfordshire, England, UK, 1981, 4th edition, 2000.

(Josias) begat “Jehoiakim” (Joakim) (I Chron. 3:15), and “Jehoiakim” (Joakim) begat “Jechoniah” (Jechonias) (I Chron. 3:16). This therefore “corrected” the reading of Matt. 1:11 which omits Joakim (Jehoiakim), and goes from grandfather “Josias” (AV) / Josiah to grandson “Jechonias” (AV) / Jechoniah, saying simply, “And Josias begat Jechonias” etc. . But both the incongruity this creates with the count of fourteen generations (Matt. 1:17), raising it to fifteen generations, and the fact that such omissions are a stylistic feature of Hebrew genealogies in general, and for sin as God’s judgement in Matt. 1:1-17 in particular, acts as witnesses against the “correction” of *Variant 1*.

Was *Variant 1* a gratuitous “correction” by a scribe, who on the basis of I Chron. 3:15,16 (LXX) simply added in “the missing name” of “Jehoiakim”? Was this an accidental “correction”? Given the possible confusion created by the similar types of names, and indeed different names of some of the same kings, *supra*, did e.g., one scribe first abbreviate “*Jechonian* (Ιεχωνιαν / ‘Jechonias’ in AV),” to something like, “*Jchin* (Ιχτιν / ‘Jchin’),” and then a subsequent scribe wrongly unravel this abbreviation to something like “*Jchin* (Ιωχτιν / ‘Jochin’)?” Did another scribe in this same line of manuscripts then “correct” this through reference to e.g., I Chron. 3:16 (LXX) to “*Joachim* (Ιωακιμ / Joakim)?” Did yet another scribe, in possession of both a manuscript with the correct reading, “Josias begat Jechonias” (TR), and this corrupt reading, “Josias begat Joakim,” then conflate these two readings, which on the basis of e.g., I Chron. 3:15,16 (LXX) he deduced “had to have been the original reading” which “was lost in different ways from both these manuscripts” he had? Or was there a paper fade / loss; and a scribe seeking to fill in the missing words then wrongly thought that these were “the original words” on the basis of e.g., I Chron. 3:15,16 (LXX)?

Or was *Variant 1* a deliberate scribal “correction” due to a miscount of the “fourteen generations” selections (Matt. 1:17)? I.e., the correct count is “all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations” (Matt. 1:17): 1) Abraham 2) Isaac 3) Jacob 4) Judas 5) Phares of Tamar 6) Esrom 7) Aram 8) Aminadab 9) Naason 10) Salmon 11) Booz of Rachab 12) Obed of Ruth 13) Jesse and 14) David. Then “from David until the carrying away into Babylon are fourteen generations” (Matt. 1:17): 1) David 2) Solomon 3) Roboam 4) Abia 5) Asa 6) Josaphat 7) Joram 8) Ozias 9) Joatham 10) Achaz 11) Ezekias 12) Manasses 13) Amon and 14) Josias who “begat Jechonias and his brethren about the time they were carried away to Babylon” (Matt. 1:11). Josias (Josiah) is dated at c. 640-637 B.C. and the first fall of Jerusalem and deportation from Jerusalem to Babylon under Joakim (Jehoiakim) (II Kgs 24:1-6; Dan. 1:1-6) at c. 605/604 B.C. . (This should not be confused with the second fall of Jerusalem and deportation from Jerusalem to Babylon under Zedekiah in 586 B.C., II Kgs 24:18-25:21.) Hence this second lot of fourteen generations ends “about the time they were carried away to Babylon” the first time i.e., about 30-35 years before this event. Then “from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ are fourteen generations” (Matt. 1:17): 1) Jechonias (Jehoiachin, II Kgs 24:6) 2) Salathiel 3) Zorobabel 4) Abiud 5) Eliakim 6) Azor 7) Sadoc 8) Achim 9) Eliud 10) Eleazar 11) Matthan 12) Jacob 13) Joseph, the husband of Mary, and foster father of Jesus, and 14) Jesus (by marital law).

But did a scribe, missing the fact that Matt. 1:17 requires that David both end the first 14 generations and start the second 14 generations, count the second 14 generations as: 1) Solomon 2) Roboam 3) Abia 4) Asa 5) Josaphat 6) Joram 7) Ozias 8) Joatham 9) Achaz 10) Ezekias 11) Manasses 12) Amon and 13) Josias, and then wrongly conclude, “A name is missing from this list”? Did this OT Septuagint using scribe then refer back to e.g., I Chron. 3:15,16, to “discover that the missing name is ‘Joakim’” (LXX), and then deliberately insert *Variant 1* as a

“correction” to Matt. 1:11?

There is so much lost in the unrecorded history of textual transmission, that we can only guess at such things, and perhaps guess wrongly. But we do not have to guess about this basic fact. The correct reading has been here preserved for us in the Received text, and so *Variant 1* is most assuredly incorrect.

*Variant 2* omits “And Josias begat Jechonias.” Was *Variant 2* an accidental omission? Did the eye of the scribe copying out this section jump by ellipsis from the “*ian*” ending of “*Iosian* (Josias)” at the end of Matt. 1:10, to the “*ian*” ending of “*Iechonian* (Jechonias),” thus accidentally omitting, “*Iosias* (Josias) *de* (And) *egennese* (begat) *ton* (-) *Iechonian* (Jechonias)?”

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate omission? The name of “Jechonias” at Matt. 1:11, also known as “Coniah,” is significant because of the Lord’s decree pronounced upon him by the Old Testament prophet, Jeremiah. Of “Coniah the son of Jehoikim king of Judah” it was decreed, “Thus saith the Lord, Write ye this man childless, a man that shall not prosper in his days: for no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling any more in Judah” (Jer. 22:24,30). Since God’s decree here forbids any of Jechonias’s descendants sitting upon the throne of David, it follows that this genealogy of Matt. 1 is that of Jesus’ foster father, Joseph. It thus shows one of Jesus’ royal lines *by law* since he was *the legal foster son of Joseph*. Nevertheless, Jesus’ claim to the royal throne of David as a biological descendant of David is not made on the basis of this genealogy.

Rather, Christ’s biological claim to the royal throne of David is based on the fact that “being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph” (Luke 3:23), he was in fact the biological son of Mary whose genealogy is found in Luke 3:21-38. Joseph was the son-in-law of Heli, Mary’s biological father (Luke 3:23), and Christ’s biological descent from King David through Mary is genealogically different from that of Joseph’s descent from King David. Christ through Mary was a descendant of David via “Nathan” (II Sam. 5:13,14; I Chron. 3:1,5; 14:3,4; Zech. 12:12; Luke 3:31), whereas Joseph was a descendant of David via “Solomon” (Matt. 1:6). Thus unlike Joseph, Mary and Christ were not biological descendants of Jechonias. The Matt. 1 genealogy thus here reminds us of *the judgment of God* against sin in excluding the line of Jechonias from sitting on David’s throne (Jer. 22:30); and also *the mercy of God* in allowing one of Jechonias’ descendants to be *the legal foster father* of the Messiah, and thus provide *a legal basis* (though not the only such legal basis,) *for the claim of the Messiah to be a descendant of David and Abraham* (Matt. 1:1). *Let the reader note how God’s justice in judgement is repeatedly mingled with his mercy here in the Matthew 1 genealogy!*

Did a scribe who was aware of the Lord’s decree in Jer. 22:30; and who wrongly thought that the Matt. 1 genealogy was that of Mary’s rather than that of Joseph’s, then wrongly conclude that “the words ‘And Josias begat Jechonias,’ could not possibly be correct, and so must have been added in by a later scribe”? Did such a scribe then deliberately remove the words, “And Josias begat Jechonias,” in order to “correct this scribal alteration”? If so, he either did not pay attention to the issue of “fourteen generations” (Matt. 1:17), or left a paper space as he did not know what “the correct wording” was. If the latter, then possibly a later scribe copying this out, misunderstood the paper gap for an overly generous paper space, and omitted it in his copy.

As far as we know *Variant 2* is a late scribal error originating in the 11th century. Was

*Variant 2* an accidental or deliberate omission? In my opinion most probably the former, though possibly the latter, but in either instance it is certainly incorrect.

The shorter reading of the TR, “begat,” is the representative Byzantine Greek reading, against which there is no good textual argument. It has strong support from the three witnesses i.e., the Byzantine Greek, the Latin, and church writers (especially ancient writers, although also including mediaeval church writers, especially early mediaeval church writers); and it also has contextual stylistic support in the omission of other names to create a trilogy of fourteen *significant* generations (Matt. 1:17). The TR reading is thus sure. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the reading of “begat” (in “Josias begat Jechonias”) at Matt. 1:11 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of three witnesses, the correct reading at Matt. 1:11, “begat,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century). It was also followed by the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), Bohairic (3rd century), and Fayyumic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Version (c. 500); Georgian Version (5th century); and Slavic Version (9th century).

The incorrect *Variant 1*, “Josias begat *Joakim and Joakim begat* Jechonias,” was followed by (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century), and Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type). It is also found in the Syriac Harclean Version (616) in an asterisk marked out text (indicating it is not the representative reading of the Harclean Version), and the Palestinian Syriac Version (c. 6th century).

With the TR’s reading followed in the two main Alexandrian texts, for mainly the wrong reasons, the correct reading was followed in the NU Text *et al*; and so entered the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. It is found in the ASV (based on the earlier Westcott-Hort text) as, “and Josiah begat Jechoniah” (ASV).

**Matt. 1:16** “the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus,  
who is called Christ” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek reading at Matt. 1:16, “*ton Ioseph (Joseph) ton (the) andra (husband) Marias (of Mary), ex (of / from) es (whom) egennethe (was born) Iesous (Jesus) o (‘the [one]’) legomenos (called) Christos (Christ),*” i.e., “the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ;” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.)<sup>6</sup>. It is further supported as Latin, “*Ioseph (Joseph)*

---

<sup>6</sup> For “*egennethe*” Lectionary 2378 reads, “*egennethei*,” but at Matt. 26:24 (p. 72b) it reads “*egennethe*.” At for instance, Matt. 1:22; 2:15; 4:15 the “*e*” suffix of “*plerothe* (might be fulfilled),” is likewise changed in Lectionary 2378 to, “*plerothei*.” This multiplicity tends to indicate that they are not transcriptional errors in which the “H” (*e*) suffix was confused for an “EI” suffix by a somewhat careless scribe; but rather a deliberate localised spelling, albeit one

*virum* (the man / husband) *Mariae* (of Mary), *de* (of / from) *qua* (where) *natus* (born) *est* ('is,' literally, 'he is') *Iesus* (Jesus), *qui* (who) *vocatur* ('is called,' literally, 'he is called') *Christus* (Christ)," i.e., "the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ;" by Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions f (6th century, which only varies from the Vulgate in using "*dicitur*" rather than "*vocatur*" for "called,"), aur (7th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported by the ancient church Greek writers Pseudo-Eustathius (4th / 5th centuries) and Nestorius (d. after 451); ancient church Latin writer Augustine (d. 430); and with slight variation by both the ancient church Greek writers Didymus (d. 398) and Cyril (d. 444), and also the ancient church Latin writers Tertullian (after 220) and Jerome (d. 420).

But an alternative reading, "to whom being betrothed the virgin Mary bore Jesus, who is called Christ" (*Variant 1*), is found in old Latin Versions a (4th century), q (6th / 7th century), c (7th / 8th century), gl (8th / 9th century); and with minor difference in old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), d (Cambridge 5th century and Paris 5th / 6th century), and b (Verona 5th century & Budapest 8th / 9th centuries). The alternative is also supported with minor difference by the ancient church Latin writer, Ambrosiaster (after 384).

One only moves away from a representative Byzantine reading, to another reading inside the closed class of sources, reluctantly and for a good textual reason. There is no such good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text, which must therefore stand as correct.

The alternative reading of Ambrosiaster *et al*, clearly acts to increase the emphasis on Mary's virginity, evident in the terminology, "the virgin Mary." Taking this into account and given that stress is laid on the fact it was Joseph "to whom she was betrothed," rather than the TR's "Joseph the husband of Mary," does this indicate that it was altered to read, "to whom being betrothed the virgin Mary bore Jesus," out of a concern that the terminology, "the husband of Mary" might be taken as a denial of the virgin birth? If so, then in fact a more careful reading of Matt. 1 makes it very clear that this was a virgin birth (Matt. 1:18-25). Hence the fact that we read, "Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary" is a wording focusing on the fact that this is Joseph's genealogy. Thus as Mary's son, by affinity Christ has a legal claim to this genealogy of "Joseph," who is "the husband of Mary." Conversely, if the alternative reading of Ambrosiaster *et al* was original, there seems no good reason as to why it would be changed to the TR's reading. Therefore, the TR preserves the original reading of Matt. 1:16.

---

that was not consistently followed.

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the reading of, “the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ” at Matt. 1:16 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Though outside the closed class of the three sources which preserved the text and had reasonable access over the centuries, the correct reading, “the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ” in Matt. 1:16 was also preserved by the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century). It was also preserved in some of the Syriac Versions: the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century), Syriac Harelean h (616), and Palestinian Syriac (c. 6th century). It is further found in the Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century) and Georgian Version (5th century). Similar readings are found with slight variation in the Armenian Version (5th century) and Ethiopic Version (c. 500). Though I agree with some key elements of Metzger’s textual analysis of this verse (*Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 1994, pp. 2-6), it is nevertheless ultimately in connection with the wrong reasons of its wide attestation in such “external sources” beyond the Alexandrian texts, that the NU Text *et al* adopted the correct reading. Hence it is found in the ASV, NASB, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

The incorrect reading *Variant 1*, as Greek “*ὁ μνηστευθεῖσα παρθένος Μαρίας ἐγέννησεν Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν*,” i.e., “to whom being betrothed the virgin Mary bore Jesus, who is called Christ,” is found in the (mixed text type) Codex Theta (9th century), and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. Another reading is found in the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century), “Joseph to whom was betrothed Mary the virgin, begot Jesus who is called the Christ” (*Variant 2*). Yet another reading is found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), “to whom was betrothed Mary the virgin, she bore Jesus the Christ” (*Variant 3*). Another reading again, is found in the Coptic Middle Egyptian (from the 3rd century) and Coptic Bohairic (3rd century), “the husband of Mary, who bore Jesus who is called Christ” (*Variant 4*). *Variants 2* and *3* fall upon the same rock as *Variant 1*. *Variant 4* is an attempted stylistic improvement.

*Variant 2* appears in an RSV (2nd ed. 1971) footnote. This promotion of *Variant 2*, in combination with its mistranslation of Isa. 7:14, found in the RSV like in Moffatt’s Isa. 7:14 as “young woman” (Moffatt), means the RSV seeks to legitimize the denial of the virgin birth.

So too, great distortion of Matt. 1:16 is found in the religiously liberal Moffatt Bible. The apostate “Protestant” Bible “translator,” James Moffatt, says “nearly every page” of his version “contains some emendation of the text.” Drawing on a Greek “reconstruction” seemingly influenced by, though not identical with, *Variant 2* i.e., the Syriac Sinaitic Version (“Joseph to whom was betrothed Mary the virgin, begot Jesus who is called the Christ”), he added parentheses and denied the virgin birth. Moffatt translated Matt. 1:16 as “Joseph (to whom the virgin Mary was betrothed) the father of Jesus, who is called ‘Christ’.” Thus like the RSV footnote, Moffatt tried to relegate the description of Mary as a “virgin,” to the period after she became “betrothed” to Joseph, but before she conceived Christ. To help complete his

deception, Moffatt also changes Greek *parthenos* at Matt. 1:23, which means “virgin,” to “maiden.” Thus his translation claims, “Joseph” was “the father of Jesus;” and the prophesy quoted in Matt. 1:23 is, “The maiden will conceive.” This has no justifiable textual basis in Matt. 1:16; and is also incongruous with the immediate context of Matt. 1:18-25 which clearly affirms the virgin birth.

The virgin birth is strongly supported in Scripture. It was prophesied by Isaiah, as testified by Greek *parthenos* (virgin) in the Septuagint translation of Isa. 7:14 and Matt. 1:23. This prophetic fulfilment was recorded by St. Matthew (Matt. 1:18-25). The virgin birth of Christ was also recorded by St. Luke (Luke 1:26,27,31,34,35,37,38). Article 3 of the *Apostles’ Creed*, says Christ, “was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.” In either allowing for a denial of the virgin birth such as occurs in the RSV (2nd ed.), i.e., on the basis of some “contradiction” between Matt. 1:16 (footnote reading) and the “virgin” of Matt. 1:23, which “we religious liberals *just know* is a fraudulent claim” since “Isa. 7:14 really says, ‘young woman;’” or like Moffatt specifically denying the prophesy of Isa. 7:14 and its fulfilment in Matt. 1:23 by a “virgin” (*parthenos*), both the RSV and Moffatt also here attack the doctrine of Divine inspiration of Scripture (II Tim. 3:16; II Peter 1:20,21). This is a denial of Article 9 of the *Apostles’ Creed*, “I believe in the Holy Ghost;” and Section 3 of the Reformation Motto, “*sola Scriptura*” (Latin, “Scripture alone”).

The RSV and Moffatt further attack the Christian morality safeguarded in the 7th precept of the *Ten Commandments*, “Thou shalt not commit adultery” (Exod. 20:14; Matt. 19:18; James 2:11). In the first instance, this commandment prohibits extra-marital sex by a married person; but in its wider orbit, this commandment condemns any sexual acts between persons outside of marriage. Thus e.g., St. Paul uses “the law” of the Decalogue to condemn “whoremongers” and homosexuals (I Tim. 1:7,10); or the *Catechism* in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) interprets this precept as meaning, “To keep my body in” “chastity.” But instead of upholding Mary’s godly example of lady-like virtue as a virgin before marriage (I Cor. 7:25,28,34,37), or in her instance, before the birth of Christ (Matt. 1:25); the RSV allows for the violation, and Moffatt specifically violates, the 9th precept of the *Ten Commandments*, “Thou shalt not bear false witness” (Exod. 20:16; Matt. 19:18; Rom. 13:9), by falsely portraying Mary as an example of those “fornicators” (I Cor. 6:9) whose sin is condemned in Holy Writ.

Those who like the RSV (2nd ed. 1971) and Moffatt, deny these fundamentals of the Christian faith, are guilty of what St. Peter calls, “damnable heresies” (II Peter 2:1). Since on the first page of the New Testament, the RSV and Moffatt pervert Scripture so as to deny Articles 3 & 9 of the *Apostles’ Creed*, and Section 3 of the Reformation Motto, as well as to violate the 7th and 9th precepts of the *Ten Commandments*, we ought not to be surprised that the rest of these translations are so unsatisfactory also.

#### **Matt. 1:18** “Jesus Christ” (TR & AV) {B}

The TR’s Greek reading “*Iēsou* (Jesus, word 1) *Christou* (Christ, word 2),” at Matt. 1:18 is supported by the majority Byzantine text, e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), E 07 (8th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.)<sup>7</sup>. It is further supported by

<sup>7</sup> In both Lectionaries this is abbreviated as “*iu xu*”, and in Lectionary 2378 the “*x*” is illuminated in red ink (in contrast to the normal brown ink of the manuscript).

the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century), Origen (d. 254), Eusebius (d. 339), Epiphanius (d. 403), Chrysostom (d. 407), Theodotus-Ancyra (d. 5th century), and Nestorius (d. after 451). It is also followed in word order, 2,1, by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; and the ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420); and the reversal of the order of the words here seems to simply have been an element in its original translation from Greek to Latin.

But in a minority Byzantine reading, Manuscript Washington or W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in St. Matthew's Gospel and parts of St. Luke's Gospel), reads simply "*IY* (Jesus);" as does the early mediaeval church writer Pseudo-Athanasius (6th century) whose writings are preserved in Greek and / or Latin works (*Variant 1*).

The Latin reading, "*Christi* (Christ)," (*Variant 2*), is found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century); and old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), b (Verona 5th century & Budapest 8th / 9th centuries), d (5th / 6th centuries), f (6th century), q (Munich 6th / 7th centuries & Munich 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). This reading is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation (c. 395); and the ancient church Latin writers, Chromatius (d. 407), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430).

On the basis that one starts with the representative Byzantine text, and only moves away from it to another reading within the closed class of three witnesses with reluctance if there is a good textual reason to do so; it follows that the reading, "Jesus Christ," must stand as the correct reading, unless textual analysis within the closed class of three reputable sources can disprove it. Textual analysis of Matt. 1:18, can provide no satisfactory reason as to why the representative Byzantine reading should be moved away from in this instance.

The clear tendency of various scribes was to remove "Jesus" (Matt. 4:12,23; 8:3, *et al*). Was this a deliberate stylistic pruning of the text by removing either "Jesus" or "Christ," in order to make a shorter, and what from their superficial sense of elegance would be a "more succinct" reading? Or was accidental this accidental due to an undetected paper fade? We know from e.g., W 032 that "Jesus" and "Christ" were usually abbreviated to their first and last letters (with a bar placed on top to show an abbreviation had been made). This was written in capital letters and continuous script i.e., generally without spacing between the words. Thus "Jesus (*IECOY*) Christ (*XPICTOY*)" here at Matt. 1:18 would have looked something like, "*IYXY*." Was a scribe moving his finger along the page, and being momentarily distracted jump from the last "Y" letter of "*IECOY* (Jesus)" to the last "Y" letter of "*XPICTOY* (Christ)," and thus accidentally omit "Jesus" here? Or was it for reasons of subjective stylistic preferment, or because they first made the mistake of omitting "Jesus," *supra*, and then realizing their error, added "Jesus" back in after "Christ," that some manuscripts changed the word order from "Jesus Christ" to "Christ Jesus"?

There being no good textual reason against it, the reading "Jesus Christ" (TR & AV) is correct. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the reading of "Jesus Christ" in the TR of Matt. 1:18 a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

The correct reading at Matt. 1:18, “Jesus Christ,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century). It is also followed in a number of Syriac Versions, with the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century), Syriac Harclean h (616), and Palestinian Syriac (c. 6th century). It is further followed in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions. It is also found in the Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries); and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century). For the wrong reasons, the correct reading is found in the NU Text *et al* (although Westcott-Hort placed “Jesus” in square brackets as optional); and so also, the NASB and NIV.

But the word order was reversed in one of the two leading Alexandrian Texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century), to “Christ Jesus.” The incorrect pruned reading of “Christ” is also found in the Syriac Sinaiticus and Curetonian versions. Do such changes act to further exhibit the tendency of such scribes to alter the text in what they would superficially regard as “stylistic improvements”? The Word of God is perfect, it needs no such “improvements.”

The ASV, based on the Westcott-Hort text, puts the correct reading in the main text, but gives the incorrect shorter reading, “of the Christ,” in a footnote, and the father ASV is here followed by the RSV, and in turn one of the RSV’s son, the ESV. However, the correct reading, with no such footnote, is found in the RSV’s other son, the NRSV. The footnote reading of the RSV and ESV is not warranted for so sure a reading as “Jesus Christ” (AV & TR) has here at Matt. 1:18.

**Matt. 1:22** “the prophet” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek reading of “*tou prophetou* (the prophet)” in Matt. 1:22 is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., *Codex Freeranus* (W 032, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), the purple parchment, *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century); and the two Sydney University Lectionaries written in brown ink with colourful bright red illumination of key letters and section markers, to wit, *Sidneiensis Universitatis* Lectionary 2378 (11th century) and *Sidneiensis Universitatis* Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also found as Latin, “*prophetam* (the prophet)” in *Versio Vulgata Hieronymi* (Jerome’s Vulgate Version, 4th / 5th centuries), and *Codex Corbeiensis* (old Latin Version ff1, 10th / 11th century); and with minor spelling variation in *Codex Bobiensis* (old Latin Version k, 4th / 5th centuries, “*profetam*”); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the *Vulgata Clementina* (Clementine Vulgate, 1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420) (Letter 57:8)<sup>8</sup>.

However, in an alternative reading, Greek, “*Essiou* (Isaiah),” is added, i.e., “the prophet, Isaiah.” This is found as Latin, “*Esaiam* (Isaiah) *prophetam* (the prophet)” in old Latin Versions

---

<sup>8</sup> St. Jerome in: Migne (Latin Writers Series) (1845 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 22, p. 574 (Letter 57:8, To Pammachius) (Latin). Schaff, P. & Wace, H. (Editors), *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, second series, Vol. 6, p. 116 (Letter 57:8) (English).

d (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century, “*profetam*”), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century); and with minor spelling variations in old Latin Versions b (5th century, “*Eseiam*”) and c (12th / 13th century, “*Ysaiam*”). It is further found in a Latin translation (c. 395) of the ancient church Greek writer, Irenaeus (2nd century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as correct. I.e., if original, there is no good reason why “Isaiah” would have been removed. The variant was evidently a scribal addition, possibly influenced by the usage of “the prophet” with “Esais” / Isaiah at Matt. 3:13; 4:14, *et al.*

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the reading of “the prophet” at Matt. 1:22 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 1:22, “the prophet,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century). It is also found in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the incorrect reading, “the prophet, Isaiah,” is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); It is also found in the Armenian Version (5th century); the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th centuries) and Syriac Harclean h (616) Versions, and with slight variation in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century).

With strong support from the Alexandrian text, for the wrong reasons, the correct reading entered the NU Text *et al.*, and is found in the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

**Matt. 1:23** “they shall call” (TR & AV) {A}

#### *Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

*The First Matter.* Manuscript Washington (*Codex Freerianus*, W 032), is difficult to read at Matt. 1:23; and like others, e.g., Swanson gives no reading for this manuscript at Matt. 1:23. Yet one can clearly read the “KALECOYC” (*kalesous*). The last letter on this line is clearly “O” and the next line clearly starts, “NO” then becomes unclear for 2 letters, before the top of an “A” appears; and this, as confirmed by the rest of the line (some of which is also difficult to read,) is clearly “ONOMA” (*onoma*) (“name,” AV). Before the “o” of “*onoma*,” there is a rounded letter with a marking coming off its right, which is evidently the “O” of “TO” (*to*), for what in Greek, is literally, “*to* (the) *onoma* (name),” although “*to* (the)” is not translated in English. Before this “O” is what looks to be the top bar of a “T” with an “A” underneath it, but which by deduction is a left tilted “T” with a marking coming off the right, since it must be the “T” or “TO” (*to*).

At this point i.e., between “KALECOYC” (*kalesous*) and “TO” (*to*), the text is unclear, and *prima facie* looks like “NNN” in which the middle “N” is finer and lighter than the first and last “N.” But stylistic analysis with the preceding “IN” of “INA” (“that,” Matt. 1:22, AV) and “IN” (an abbreviation for IHCON / *Ieson*, “Jesus,” AV), shows that the 45 degree bar between

the two upright columns of the “N” is lighter and finer in shade. Moreover, the bar on the “N” does not start at the top of the left bar, but approximately a third of the way down. This fact results in the conclusion that the markings on the section in question, could be a heavy “T” followed by the lighter 45 degree angle downward stroke of the typical “N.” I.e., the first heavy line is an “T” and the second heavy line is the first heavy bar of an “N.” Notably, the 45 degree angle bar down from it, starts about a third of the way down, as one would expect.

One can then see, the top half of the right bar on the “N” only, but on the basis that the scribe’s bar joins the bottom right bar on the two above “N’s” in consideration, it follows that this was a poorly formed “N,” in which the bottom right of the “N” was not as low as it should have been. A bit of a blotch then follows. The reason for this is speculative, but the combination of the higher than normal ending to the “N,” followed by the blotch, indicates to me that either the scribe was, in all probability, either dozing off due to fatigue, or was suddenly interrupted, and this led to the combination of the poorly formed “N” followed by the ink blotch.

Thus we have here a “snapshot” of a scribal incident, in which we can still deduce that the correct reading of *Codex Freerianus* is “KALECOYCIN” (*kalesousin*) i.e., “they shall call.”

That in fact this is the correct interpretation, is confirmed by the fact, that the other possible declensions, which either make no contextual sense can be ruled out, i.e., “KALECO” (*kaleso*) (“I shall call”), or “KALECOYMEN” (*kalesoumen*) (“we shall call”); as well as those that might make contextual sense i.e., “KALECEIC” (*kaleseis*) “thou (i.e., “you” singular) shalt call” (*Variant 1*); “KALECEI” (*kalesei*) (“she shall call”) (*Variant 2*); and “KALECEITE” (*kaleseite*) “ye shall call” (*Variant 3*). That is because the beginning of the “OYCIN” (*ousin*) stem, is very clear as “OYC” (*ous*).

Thus both on the positive basis that the reading “KALECOYCIN” (*kalesousin*) i.e., “they shall call,” seems the most likely construction of the difficult to read section; and the negative basis that the other likely alternatives can be ruled out; it follows that the correct reading for W 032 is *kalesousin* (which includes the optional “n” at the end of *kalesousi*).

*The Second Matter: Part A – The Hebrew of Isa. 7:14.* What does the Hebrew read at Isa. 7:14 with regard to the verb, *QaRA’* (קרא) meaning, “call”? My own views on the Hebrew have been the subject of some fluctuation over time, and presently remain unsettled, so that *at this point in time*, I only wish to raise certain questions of a sufficient level of depth which relate to a better understanding of issues of relevance to my textual analysis of *the Greek* here at Matt. 1:23.

The AV’s translation of Isa. 7:14 reads at the relevant part, “Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call (Hebrew *QaRA’T* / קראת) his name Immanuel” (AV). The meaning here of Hebrew *QaRA’T* (קראת) is of some importance for the purposes of considering the Greek and Latin readings at Matt. 1:23, *infra*.

*Prima facie* the Hebrew *QaRA’T* (קראת) here is an active perfect, 2nd person singular, feminine kal verb, from *QaRA’* i.e., addressing the “virgin” of Isa. 7:14, “thou shalt call his name Immanuel.” At Matt. 1:23, this is the *Variant 1*, *infra*, and in this context notably it is the reading of Isa. 7:14 in Brenton’s Greek Septuagint, *infra*.

On general principles of the Divine Preservation of OT Scripture, we accept the Masoretic

Text, such as printed in the early 16th century in the Bomberg Text, unless there is a good textual argument against it. I.e., the OT Hebrew and Aramaic *Textus Receptus* is not the Masoretic Text, although it must be said that it is very close to it, and the differences between the OT's TR and Masoretic Text are very few relative to the differences between the NT's TR and the representative Byzantine Text. In this context, it does not matter that the Masorites added the pointings or vowels well after New Testament times, (depending on whose dates one follows,) in a process starting around the sixth or seventh centuries A.D. and ending around the tenth or eleventh centuries A.D. . The Masorites work was part of the ongoing process of the *Divine Preservation* of the Old Testament Oracles, and dependant on God's power rather than man's (Rom. 3:1,2; 11:29), with the consequence that it does not matter that these Jews were in deep religious apostasy, having shamefully rejected the Messiah (II Cor. 3:13-16). Thus the Masoretic pointings or vowels are authoritative, and may only be set aside if there is a good textual reason for doing so (and support for this inside the closed class of OT sources).

The question may thus be asked, "Does the *prima facie* meaning of Isa. 7:14 as found in the Masoretic Text present any semantic or textual problem, and if so, what is the remedy?" Is the fact that Isa. 7:14 changes from the indirect speech of, "Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son," to the direct speech of the virgin, "and thou shalt call his name Immanuel," somewhat odd? If so, is it odd to the point of representing a semantic or textual problem?

The issue of a possible textual problem may only be raised if the issue of a possible semantic problem has first been found in the negative. Hence we must first ask, "Does the *prima facie* meaning of Isa. 7:14 as found in the Masoretic Text present a semantic problem, and if so, what is the remedy?"

This view does not consider *that the Masorites here "made an error,"* but rather presents a different interpretation of what the Hebrew of the Masoretic text means at Isa. 7:14. Specifically, is the view that the feminine ending with the letter "h" (ה / He) is either a development of an original ending from the letter "t" (ת / tau), or simply a rarer form sometimes used instead of the letter "t" (ת / tau), relevant here? (See "Preliminary Textual Discussion," "The Second Matter: Part C," *infra*.) I.e., is the idea correct here at Isa. 7:14 that a "t" (ת / tau) ending is an alternative form of a "h" (ה / He) ending, in which instance, the Isa. 7:14 Hebrew *QaRA'T* (קראת) might be read as the active perfect, 3rd person singular, feminine kal verb, from *QaRA'* i.e., as *QaRA'H* (קראת) meaning, "she shall call"? If so, one finds such a reading in the 3rd person singular inside the closed class of OT sources with Latin, "*vocabit*" ("she shall call," indicate active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *voco*)," in old Latin d & ff1 (*Variant 2, infra*). The traditional classic Hebrew lexicon work is Gesenius, and he takes the view that at Isa. 7:14, *QaRA'T* (קראת) is a 3rd person singular feminine<sup>9</sup>.

The AV's translation of Isa. 7:14 reads at the relevant part, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call (Hebrew *QaRA'T* / קראת) his name Immanuel" (AV). Of

---

<sup>9</sup> Brown, Driver, & Briggs, p. 895, citing Gesenius's *Hebrew Grammar* (Kautzsch ed.) 74g. This is also here given by Gesenius as a "consecutive" verb, but I shall not now discuss Hebrew grammarian debates with regard to the validity or non-validity of a "consecutive" verb category of thought.

these two possibilities, the AV's usage of "shall" indicates it is rendering the Hebrew as "she shall call," since if it was rendering it as "thou shalt call" this would read here "and shalt call" not "and shall call." In the Geneva Bible (1560) Isa. 7:14 reads, "and she shall call his name Immanuel;" and while the main text of Matt. 1:23 reads, "and they shall call his name Emmanuel," a footnote (sidenote) at "they" reads, "Or, *thou*." The argument in favour of "thou" in the Greek at Matt. 1:23 (*Variant 1, infra*) relates to a view of the Hebrew that regards *QaRA'T* as a 2nd person singular verb. It might thus be reasonably concluded that this diversity within the Geneva Bible of 1560 between the readings of Isa. 7:14 and the footnote of Matt. 1:23 bespeaks of *scholastic differences of opinion* among the Geneva Bible translators on this issue.

I shall not now further consider the merits of the issue as to what the Hebrew reads here at Isa. 7:14 i.e., "thou (the virgin) shalt call" (*QaRA'T* as a 2nd person singular feminine verb), found in the Greek (*kaleseis*<sup>10</sup>) or Latin (*vocabis*<sup>11</sup>) of *Variant 1, infra*; or "she (the virgin) shall call" (*QaRA'T* as a 3rd person singular feminine verb), found in the Greek (*kalesei*<sup>12</sup>) or Latin (*vocabit*<sup>13</sup>) of *Variant 2, infra*. Either way, the salient point for my purposes is that the Hebrew applies *QaRA'T* to the virgin, whether as, "Thou, [O virgin], shalt call," or "she shall call," and so I shall refer to this point of unity in the meaning of the Hebrew as "*the virgin names the child*;" whereas the Greek of Matt. 1:23 reads, "they shall call (*kalesousi*, indicative active future, 3rd person plural verb, from *kaleo*)." This then is relevant as a starting point for one element of the textual analysis of the Greek in the "Principal Textual Discussion," *infra*.

*The Second Matter: Part B – The Hebrew of Isa. 7:14 in the Dead Sea Scrolls.*

As discussed in "The Second Matter: Part A," any matters of meaning are resolvable within the Masoretic Text, and hence there is no textual problem with the Masoretic Text here at Isa. 7:14. Nevertheless, in seeking to reconstruct the thinking of the "many which corrupt the Word of God" (II Cor. 2:17), one must sometimes explore certain erroneous perspectives in order to better understand the rise of certain variant readings. This is just one such case in point.

Did a scribe, noting the change at Isa. 7:14 from the indirect speech of, "Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son," to what he took to be the direct speech of the virgin, "and thou shalt call his name Immanuel," first conclude that this was somewhat odd; and then, without first checking if the matter was a semantic

---

<sup>10</sup> It is, for instance, so found at Isa. 7:14 in Codex Vaticanus (the Septuagint attached to the Alexandrian NT text, Rome Vaticanus).

<sup>11</sup> Both Tischendorf and von Soden say the Greek *kaleseis* ('thou shalt call,' indicative active future, 2nd person singular verb, from *kaleo*) is followed by the Latin church writer, Vigilius (d. after 484), but they do not give his Latin reading. Therefore for the purposes of this preliminary textual discussion, this is my Latin reconstruction from the Greek i.e., Latin, "*vocabis* ('thou shalt call,' indicative active future, 2nd person singular verb, from *voco*)."

<sup>12</sup> It is so found at Isa. 7:14 in Codex Sinaiticus (the Septuagint attached to the Alexandrian NT text, London Sinaiticus).

<sup>13</sup> Indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *voco*.

problem, leap to the wrong conclusion that there is a textual problem here in the Hebrew Text?

If so, what did he think was the remedy? Looking at *QaRA'T* (קראת), if one leaves out the vowels and argues that the later Masorites here “made an error” or “continued to copy out an earlier error,” then the consonants are the same for both the masculine and feminine forms of the active perfect, 2nd person singular, kal verb, from *QaRA'*. Inside the closed class of OT sources, a similar ambiguity *arguably* exists in the Greek Septuagint reading of “*kaleseis* (‘thou shalt call,’ indicative active future, 2nd person singular verb, from *kaleo*),” *infra*, i.e., “*kaleseis* (thou shalt call),” could *prima facie* be either a masculine or feminine “thou,” and on this basis one *might argue* that a *masculine* gender is thus a *possible* reading “in the Hebrew and the Greek” of Isa. 7:14. Does this therefore read, “and thou” in the masculine i.e., “Ahaz” (Isa. 7:10), “shalt call his name Immanuel?”

Along not unrelated lines is one of the two possibilities for a reading we find in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Unlike the Hebrew Received Text of Isa. 7:14, which reads *QaRA'T* (קראת), in which *the virgin names the child* (see *QaRA'T* as a 2nd person singular feminine verb, “thou [O virgin] shalt call;” & *QaRA'T* as a 3rd person singular feminine verb, “she shall call,” *supra*); the Dead Sea Scrolls<sup>14</sup> of Isa. 7:14 read *QRA'* (קרא, active imperative, 2nd person masculine singular, kal verb, from *QaRA*), i.e., “thou shalt call.”

Was this an accidental change following a paper fade of the last letter of “*QaRA'T* (קראת)” so that it read “*QeRA'* (קרא)” (bearing in mind that the Dead Sea Scrolls come from a time before the Masorites added vowels or pointings)?

Was this a deliberate change? Was this a deliberate assimilation application to “Ahaz” (Isa. 7:10), of the concept in the reading at Isa. 8:3, “The Lord said to me, Call (*QeRA'* / קרא) his name Mahershalal-hash-baz”?

If deliberate, why was this done? The Septuagint reading of Isa. 7:14 as “virgin (Greek, *parthenos*),” shows that in inter-testamental times Jews were aware that the Messiah would have a virgin birth. Therefore, is it possible that this Dead Sea Scrolls’ Hebrew reading of Isa. 7:14 indicates that around 100 B.C., a Jewish scribe understanding the force of Isa. 7:14; 8:3 as a Messianic prophecy, deliberately changed the Hebrew reading of Isa. 7:14 to “*QeRA'* (קרא),” in recognition that the virgin born Messiah would have a foster-father typed by Ahaz (Isa. 7:10), who did not name the child later named by Isaiah (Isa. 8:3), and who was thus here used as a prophetic type pointing forward to a foster father who would be involved in naming the Messiah, “Immanuel” (Matt. 1:21,23)?

Does a similar type of logic also underpin a *possible* change to the Hebrew to *QaRA'T* being viewed as a masculine (rather than a feminine) active perfect, 2nd person singular, kal verb, from *QaRA'*; a view *arguably* found in the Greek Septuagint form “*kaleseis* (thou shalt call)”? Or is the contextual evidence for the Greek “*kaleseis* (thou shalt call)” referring to the feminine virgin so strong, that one can safely rule out the possibility that it was reflecting such a “reconstruction” of the Hebrew in the masculine, rather than the feminine gender?

---

<sup>14</sup> Qa, The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark’s Monastery, Vol. 1, 1950, in *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft Stuttgart, Germany, 1967/77, 1984), pp. xlvi, 685.

However such questions and uncertainties are resolved, with respect to the reading we find in the Dead Sea Scrolls, we Christians of the holy Protestant faith who believe in the Divine Preservation of Holy Writ (Isa. 40:8; 59:21; Matt. 5:18) cannot accept that a Hebrew manuscript, secreted in the dark, dingy corner of a cave in Palestine or Israel, and lacking general accessibility for over 2,000 years, can suddenly reappear and challenge the Old Testament Received Text's veracity. For "the word of our God shall stand for ever" (Isa. 40:8), and it is clear that this long lost, forgotten, and then rediscovered Dead Sea Scroll reading of Isaiah did not so endure. This manuscript may be used *where it agrees* with the Masoretic Text with respect to showing an earlier date, much like *Codex Leningrad* may be so used. But not where they disagree with the established Masoretic Text such as we find in the Bomberg Text, and no good textual argument coupled with sources inside the closed class of sources can be found to agree with the change in these earlier, but later discovered, Hebrew texts.

There is a closed class of OT sources used for constructing the OT Received Text, which had reasonable accessibility over the ages, the greater details of which I shall leave to the Final OT Volume of these commentaries. In broad terms these are the Masoretic Text (including Masora); Greek Septuagint Versions; Jerome's Latin Vulgate (or old Latin Versions); church Greek and Latin writers (especially ancient writers of the first five centuries A.D., though also including mediaeval writers); and Jewish Hebrew or Aramaic sources (especially ancient ones composed by the fifth century A.D., though also including mediaeval writers), and having general accessibility over the centuries, such as the (Hebrew) Talmud. I shall not now discuss the issue of Jewish oral traditions said to be either ancient or mediaeval, or mediaeval sources potentially consulted in qualified extension of any of these categories i.e., with a lower textual commentary rating than would be given for ancient material. Suffice to now note that while Divine Inspiration existed only in Bible times, Divine Preservation was and is an ongoing process, and e.g., the Jewish community had different ways of preserving relevant OT textual information over time (see Rom. 3:1,2; 11:29). The main text for the representative Masoretic Text is found in the Bomberg Text. On general principles, only where textual analysis occasionally requires it, one reluctantly moves away from the representative Masoretic text to another reading within the closed class of OT sources. There is no contextual reason pointing to such a need to depart from the Bomberg Text at this point here at Isa. 7:14, which thus here constitutes the OT Received Text.

*The Second Matter: Part C – Hebrew & Aramaic with respect to The Tower of Babel.*

It is important that in the study of any of the Biblical languages, whether Greek, Latin, Aramaic, or Hebrew, that one does not inadvertently "swallow" certain anti-supernaturalist "poison pills" that are sometimes put about. E.g., many study NT Greek in colleges and without really thinking about the matter just accept the anti-supernaturalist claims of the neo-Alexandrians which deny Divine Preservation. Indeed, without the doctrine of Divine Preservation, Latin is not regarded as a Biblical language of the OT and NT, and so the failure to teach this doctrine in turn leads to the neglect of Latin. So too, we have to be careful with respect to an issue that sometimes arises in OT Hebrew and Aramaic studies. This matter touches on issues sometimes called, "proto-Hebrew," and linguistic theories which look to other Semitic tongues such as Aramaic, Arabic, and Ugaritic for comparative analysis.

In this context, let the reader consider the questions I put in "The Second Matter: Part A,"

*supra*. Here I ask, “is the view that the feminine ending with the letter ‘h’ (ה / He) is either a development of an original ending from the letter ‘t’ (ת / tau), or simply a rarer form sometimes used instead of the letter ‘t’ (ת / tau), relevant here?” We must be very careful that any “language theory” about Hebrew is Biblically sound relative to the Story of the Tower of Babel, and given the close affinities of Aramaic and Hebrew, also Aramaic which evidently came from the same source i.e., the Tower of Babel. E.g., we must be very careful about “proto-Hebrew” theories.

Let us consider the story of the Tower of Babel at Gen. 11:1-9. To my mind “the whole earth was of one language” requires a regional or local “earth” and heaven (cf. Gen. 41:56; Deut. 2:25 cf. 7:1; Matt. 12:42; Col. 1:23), since diverse languages had been given long before to Noah’s three sons who in their diverse racial and cultural families then went out in Gen. 10 across the planet, with specific reference in Gen. 10 to Europe, Asia, and Africa. I.e., the words of Gen. 10:5,20,31 on diverse “tongues” precedes the words of Gen. 11:1 of a local earth which had “one language” and thus was broadly of one racial “family,” which since it included the Hebrews, was therefore a Semitic family, and since the “families” of “Shem” had “their” own “tongues” in Gen. 10:22-31, was thus an internal group descended from “Arphaxad” (Gen. 10:22,24). This local “earth” (Gen. 11:1,8) was evidently in the region of Mesopotamia since the tongue of ancient Babylon came from this event (Gen. 11:1); as did the tongue of Hebrew<sup>15</sup>.

We are not specifically told how many of these local Shemitic tongues were produced in this event, but to the extent that Hebrew was clearly one of them, this means we must be careful about any language theory that looks to a “proto-Hebrew” which is linguistically related to other Semitic tongues such as Arabic, Ugaritic, and Aramaic. E.g., “Arphaxad” and “Aram” each had their own tongues (Gen. 10:22); and if as seems likely to me, Hebrew was e.g., formed from a Mesopotamian world that spoke Sumerian (an unclassified linguistic type), then the relationship between Hebrew and Aramaic must be seen in this light. E.g., what strikes me as a plausible possibility is that Semitic descendants of Aram were first culturally absorbed into a Sumerian speaking Mesopotamian world, and so being “of one speech” with them (Gen. 11:1), had lost their original Aramaic tongue. Then, after the Tower of Babel, the Children of Aram were given the Aramaic tongue and the Children of Shem that became Israel the Hebrew tongue, so that they are closely related, but post Tower of Babel Semitic tongues.

Such a language theory also may explain an element of the old conundrum, *From whence cometh the Mongolian and Cathay seed?*<sup>16</sup> The Mongoloid’s ancestry in Gen. 10 is not as

---

<sup>15</sup> I think the base Shemitic group from Arphaxad here isolated were the Sumerians who came up from the Persian Gulf into Mesopotamia as this was increasingly flooded. They followed other earlier immigrants from this Persian Gulf region, which world had been increasingly flooded since the ending of the last ice age. All such immigrants brought with them to Mesopotamia in their north, or Egypt to their west, elements of the earlier post-diluvian civilization flood culture of the old Edenic region now under the Persian Gulf. Civilization thus did not start in Mesopotamia or Egypt, but in a region now under the Persian Gulf (Gen. 4:2,3,16; 8:20; 9:20), being later transported after many thousands of years into both Mesopotamia selected due to the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers, and Egypt selected due to the Nile River.

<sup>16</sup> Cathay refers to north China. “Tartar” was also sometimes used of Mongoloid peoples. The Mongoloid secondary race (*Head Hair*: black & straight; *Prognathism*: medium;

easily resolved as the other four secondary races (Caucasoids, dividing into the white Caucasian Caucasoids of Japheth, and Mediterranean Caucasoids of Shem and Ham; Negroids from Ham via Cush; Capoids from Ham meaning “black,” and being in southern Africa thus from the Patriarch Ham; and Australoids from Shem via Elam as seen in Proto-Elamo-Dravidian). Africa is clearly Hamitic, under the patriarch Ham; and Europe is clearly Japhetic, under the patriarch Japheth. But Asiatic territory was given to Ham, under Canaan; to Japheth, with Magog and Madai; and Shem, with numerous descendants. Hence Bible scholars, while agreeing on the Mongoloid’s Asiatic origins, have sometimes disagreed on their descent from Noah’s sons.

My own views on this issue have changed over the years, and I am not dogmatic about the matter. But on general principles I see Shem as the Patriarch of Asia, notwithstanding exceptions to this general rule. Thus in the absence of being able to clearly identify Mongoloids in the population groups of Japheth or Ham said in Gen. 10 to have been put in West Asia, I think we can say that the Asiatic Mongoloids (and further spreading American Mongoloid) are Shemitic. Thus I think they a pure Shemitic race, coming from Aram’s son, Mash (Gen. 10:23), a fact preserved in the Hebrew word for “silk” as *meshiy* (Ezek. 16:10,13). For Scripture isolates them in the NT through reference to the great Silk Route stretching from Europe to China (Rev. 18:11,12). Moreover, “Mesha” is depicted as the most easterly Asiatic point of Joktan, “as thou goest unto Sephar a mount of the east” (Gen. 10:30). Thus the name “Mesha” is a logical territorial starting point for “Mash,” whose holdings were therefore so far east in Asia as not to be specifically referred to in the *Table of Nations*. “Sephar” (Gen. 10:30) may be related to “Siangu-fu,” e.g., for reasons of assonance, a patriarch may have selected the name, “Siang-fu (Father Sin) of Sephar,” or “Siangu-fu Sephar” and in time Biblical “Sephar” became Chinese “Siangu-fu.”

---

*Eyes:* brown; *Skin:* brown) has five tertiary races. 1) Mongolians (north-east Asia): *Male facial & body hair:* slight; *Head size:* broad; *Nose:* medium; *Eyes:* slanty shaped; *Stature:* below average. Ethnic groups in this tertiary race include: Mongolians, Chinese, Korean, and Japanese. Mongolia is partitioned; *Outer Mongolia* was formerly part of the Soviet Union but is now an independent State under the name, “Mongolia;” and *Inner Mongolia* is part of the Chinese State. The pug nosed Mongolian ethnic race artistically types the Mongolic quaternary race, Mongolic tertiary race, and Mongoloid secondary race. The Mongolic quaternary race (e.g., the Chinese ethnic race), has large broad flattish faces, and skin that is a yellowish hue of brown, especially in old age, and so contrasts with the Japanese and Korean ethnic races (which do not belong to the Mongolic quaternary race) who have lighter brown skins. 2) The Malaysians of S.E. Asia and the Malay Archipelago: *Male facial & body hair:* slight; *Head size:* medium to broad; *Nose:* medium width noses that are slightly concave with a depressed root; *Skin:* dark brown; *Stature:* below average. 3) The Eskimo of N.E. Asia and the North American Arctic: *Male facial & body hair:* slight; *Head size:* often narrow; *Nose:* narrow; *Skin:* light brown; *Eyes:* slanty shaped; *Stature:* below average; *Other:* long fattish face and prominent cheekbones. 4) The Red Indian of the Americas: *Male facial & body hair:* variable; *Head size:* variable; *Nose:* medium; *Eyes:* brown; *Skin:* light to medium red (meaning brown); *Stature:* medium to tall; *Other:* Usually have slight male facial and body hair but they have more male facial hair on NW Coast, N Calif., & S. Chile.) 5) The Ainu of North Japan are Mongoloid (*Head size:* narrow; *Nose:* medium; *Prognathism:* medium; *Skin:* light brown; *Stature:* medium), though they have some features more in common with Caucasian Caucasoids: (*Head Hair:* wavy & black; *Male facial & body hair:* abundant; *Eyes:* variable, usually brown but occasionally greenish).

The Chinese look to the origins of their civilization in the capital of Shensi i.e., Siangu-fu; and from this connection may also come the description of them as the “Sinim” (Isa. 49:12). The Far Easterners who traded with the Scythians were called “Sinae,” and their most important town, “Thinae” (or “Thsin”) is in the Province of Shensi, western China. The Sinae became independent in western China for some 650 years, before controlling the whole land when in 220 B.C. the Tsin (or Chin) Dynasty became supreme. “Tsin” is thought to have been changed by the Malays to “Tchina,” and then by the Portuguese who brought the name to Europe as “China.”

But the purer form “Sin” is still retained in the Anglicized form “Sino” e.g., the Sino-Japanese war; Sinology, the Sino-Tibetan Linguistic Family, or the Sinitic (Chinese) languages. On this view, in broad terms, Japheth settled Europe, Ham settled Africa, and Shem settled Asia i.e., Shem is the “patriarch of Asia” (and from here the Americas), so that the presence in Gen. 10 of Japhethites and Hamites in parts of west Asia was merely an exception to this general depiction. If they were neither specifically blessed nor cursed in Gen. 9:25-27, (nor later given a racial curse, as nature teaches occurred with the Shemitic Australoids from Elam,) this may explain why the Mongoloids are intermediate between Caucasians and others in having some *limited creative genius*, of a much lower intensity than Caucasians, while simultaneously often also showing high IQs.

Thus if Aram’s original tongue was lost in a cultural assimilation with Sumerian, and a new tongue given to them and the Hebrews at Babel in the time of Sargon I (Nimrod), this helps explain the lack of linguistic affinity between the Chinese tongue and present Aramaic. Put simply, on this model, the Mongolic group took with them to China a pre-Babel Aramaic tongue which is now lost to us.

Though we do not know the full extent of language diversification at the Tower of Babel it was clearly quite limited, since the major racial groups and languages created through Noah’s three sons on *The Table of Nations* in Genesis 10 were first firmly in place, and yet after this time the focus of Gen. 11:1-9 is a third millennia B.C. Mesopotamian world “of one language” (Gen. 11:1). The general description of Nimrod’s expansion in Gen. 10:9ff, fits well with what we know about the king of Akkad, Sargon I (bearing in mind that “builded” in Gen. 10 can also mean *built up* i.e., pre-existing places). E.g., “Nimrod ... began to be a mighty one in the earth” (Gen. 10:8) sounds like Sargon’s revolt against King Ur-Ibaba of Kish, after which he set up a rival capital at Accad (Akkad). The place names of Nimrod’s kingdom match those of Sargon I’s. For instance, the Sumerian king list states the first ruler of “Accad” (Gen. 10:10) was Sargon, although like his next two successors, he used the title “King of Kish”<sup>17</sup>. Or “Calah” (Gen. 10:12) is known as “Nimrud.” Though Sargon I’s mother is identified as a pagan priestess, the records of Accad do not know of his father’s identity. But Scripture fills in this gap, telling us his father was a negro (Gen. 10:7,8). He was thus a negro-Semite half-caste.

The most likely identification place for the Tower of Babel is the place known as “Birs Nimrud (Arabic, Temple of Nimrod).” This is c. 10 or 11 km or 6 or 7 miles south-west of the inner city of Babylon, being part of Greater Babylon. Found at “Borsippa” (The tongue tower), this is the place identified in the Jewish Talmud as the Tower of Babel site. In addition to this Jewish testimony (Borsippa) and Mohammedan Arabic cultural testimony (Birs Nimrud)<sup>18</sup>; we

---

<sup>17</sup> *Encyclopaedia Britannica* 15th ed., USA, 1994, Vol. 11, p. 973.

<sup>18</sup> Besides the OT, Jews refer to the Tower of Babel in the Talmud (Sanhedrin 109a); and

have some further notable data. When the much later, 7th to 6th century B.C. Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon built on the incomplete base (Gen. 11:8) of the tower at Birs Nimrud, he says in an inscription, “the house of the earth’s base [i.e., the basement substructure], the most ancient monument of Babylon I built and finished; ... since a remote time people had abandoned it, without order expressing their words; the earthquake and thunder had split and dispersed its sun dried clay” (Gen. 11:3,9)<sup>19</sup>.

Noah’s flood largely related to miscegenation between Seth’s and Cain’s race (Gen. 6:1-4,9) and violence (Gen. 6:11,13). Thus after the flood, God decreed that murder was to be a capital offence (Gen. 9:6; Rev. 13:10), and created and segregated racial “families” or race and cultural (linguistic) based nations spread over the planet as an inhibition on miscegenation. Yet Gen. 6:4 refers to another group of half-castes “after that” time who were “mighty men;” who arose under another half-caste, Nimrod, who was also “a mighty one” (Gen. 10:8). When a land cares so little for its racial purity that it has a half-caste negro like Nimrod as its leader, it is easy to understand how they started engaging in miscegenation more generally (Gen. 6:4), to make “the people one” (Gen. 11:6), resulting in God’s enforced segregation of many of them with the creation of different tongues. (These judgements in Noah’s time and at the Tower of Babel are also a type of the Final Judgement at the Second Advent, when among other things, miscegenation will again be all too common, Dan. 2:43,44; Matt. 24:37-39.)

We thus learn of a common linguistic origin of the ancient tongue of Babylon and Hebrew in this story, and given the clear affinities between Hebrew and Aramaic, I think we can also safely say Aramaic. As to how many tongues from this region were generated in toto at the Tower of Babel, in all likelihood from the antecedent “one language” (Gen. 11:1) of Sumerian, we cannot be entirely certain. Let us therefore be careful to ensure that any “language theory” we have about Hebrew e.g., in the discussion of Isa. 7:14, *supra*, arguing that the feminine ending with the letter “h” (ח / He) is a development of “an original” ending from the letter “t” (ט / tau); or from this idea saying that a “t” (ט / tau) ending is “an archaic form of a ‘h’ (ח / He) ending,” is made subject to this Biblical teaching about the creation of Hebrew in Gen. 11:1-9. Affinities among Semitic tongues does NOT necessarily mean they developed “naturally” from a common tongue, but rather may reflect commonality at the point of supernatural creation. I.e., they may simply be related elements of a Semitic linguistic family as created by God. Thus while it may be very relevant that certain similar forms are found in e.g., Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic, and Ugaritic, these may reflect a commonality in their creation, not necessarily a natural development from a common “proto” tongue.

---

the Mohammedans refer to “Babel” (Sura 2:96) as when, “Men were of one religion only: then they fell to variance” (Sura 10:20) in the Koran (*The Koran*, translated by J.M. Rodwell, 1861 & 1876, 1909 Everyman’s Library edition, *op. cit.*, p. 348, Sura 2:96 & p. 276, Sura 10:20).

<sup>19</sup> Faussett, A.R., *The Critical & Expository Bible Cyclopaedia*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, UK, “Babel, Babylon,” p. 66. Canon Andrew Faussett (1821-1910), was an Evangelical Anglican born and bred in the *Church of Ireland* (b. Silverhill, County Fermanagh, near Enniskillen, Northern Ireland; a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, southern Ireland), who later became Rector of St. Cuthbert’s *Church of England* York in 1859, and was made Canon of York from 1885.

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 1:23, the TR's Greek, "*kalesousi* ('they shall call,' indicative active future, 3rd person plural verb, from *kaleo*)," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). As Latin, "*vocabunt* ('they shall call,' indicative active future, 3rd person plural verb, from *voco*), it is found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592)<sup>20</sup>. It is further followed by the ancient Greek church writers, Iranaeus (2nd century) in *Against Heresies* 9:2; and the Apostolic Constitutions 4:16 (3rd or 4th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Athanasius (d. 373) who quotes "they shall call" on numerous occasions (*Incarnation of the Word* 33; *Four Discourses Against the Arians*, 3:29; Letter 60, *To Adelphius*)<sup>21</sup>. It is also found as Latin, "*vocabunt* (they shall call)" in the ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420) (Letter 57:8, *To Pammachius*)<sup>22</sup>.

*Variant 1*, "*kaleseis* ('thou shalt call,' indicative active future, 2nd person singular verb, from *kaleo*)," is a minority Byzantine reading, found in Lectionary 2378 (11th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers Origen (d. 254) and Eusebius (d. 339). This *Variant 1* Greek reading of "thou shalt call (*kaleseis*)" was adopted in Beza's 2nd to 5th editions. This reading is also found at Isa. 7:14 in some editions of the Septuagint, and it is the preferred reading of Brenton's Septuagint.

*Variant 2* is found as Latin, "*vocabit* ('she shall call,' indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *voco*)," in old Latin Versions d (5th century) and ff1 (10th / 11th century). Upon reconstruction, it is Greek, "*kalesei* (indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *kaleo*)."

*Variant 3* is not a NT Greek variant of Matt. 1:23, but is of some interest as it is a variant reading of Isa. 7:14 in the Greek and Latin. Jerome (Letter 57:8), *supra*, refers to a different "Septuagint" rendering of Isa. 7:14 as "ye shall call" (Latin, *vocabitis*, indicative active future, 2nd person plural verb, from *voco*; and hence upon reconstruction, Greek, *kalesete*, indicative

---

<sup>20</sup> Here the Clementine Vulgate distanced itself from the reading of the Sixtinam Vulgate (1590), "*vocabitur*" ("he will be called," future tense, passive indicative), and reverted back to the reading of Jerome's Vulgate.

<sup>21</sup> St. Athanasius in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1857 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 25, p. 153 (*Incarnation of the Word*, 33) (Greek); Vol. 26, p. 388 (*Against the Arians* 3:29), p. 1080 (Letter 60 to Adelphius at 60:6) (Greek). Schaff, P. & Wace, H. (Editors), *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, second series, Vol. 4, p. 54 (*Incarnation of the Word*, 33), p. 410 388 (*Against the Arians* 3:29); p. 576 (Letter 60 to Adelphius at 60:6) (English).

<sup>22</sup> St. Jerome in: Migne (Latin Writers Series) (1845 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 22, p. 574 (Letter 57:8, *To Pammachius*) (Latin). Schaff, P. & Wace, H. (Editors), *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, second series, Vol. 6, p. 116 (Letter 57:8) (English).

active future, 2nd person plural verb, from *kaleō*) (*Variant 3*). He contrasts this *Variant 3* with the reading of “Matthew” (Latin, “Matthaeus,”) which he says is, “they shall call” (Latin, *vocabunt*, indicative active future, 3rd person plural verb, from *voco*). Jerome was evidently influenced by this Greek Septuagint reading in the Vulgate, for at Isa. 7:14 this reads, Latin, “*vocabitis* (‘ye shall call,’ indicative active future, 2nd person plural verb, from, *voco*).”

On broad principles, one starts with the representative Byzantine Text, and only moves away from this reluctantly, to another reading inside the closed class of three witnesses, when textual analysis requires this. Contextually, there is no good textual argument against the “they” of “they shall call his name Immanuel” in Matt. 1:23, since the “they” would be the foster father Joseph and the mother Mary. In the immediate context, the foster father Joseph is told, “thou shalt call (*kaleseis*) his name JESUS” (Matt. 1:21), and of Joseph it is said, “he called (*ekalese*) his name JESUS” (Matt. 1:25). Since Joseph is depicted in this name calling role for the name of Jesus, it follows naturally that he is one of two people, together with Mary, that form the “they” of “they shall call his name Immanuel” (Matt. 1:23).

What are the origins of Variants 1 & 2? As discussed at “Preliminary Textual Discussion,” “The Second Matter: Part A,” *supra*, the Hebrew Text reads either “thou shalt call” as per *Variant 1* of Matt. 1:23, or “she shall call” as per *Variant 2* of Matt. 1:23. (I shall not further discuss the *Variant 3* reading of a rival Septuagint Version referred to by Jerome and also the Latin Vulgate at Isa. 7:14.) These two NT Greek variants thus look like assimilations to Isa. 7:14, whether through an assimilationist’s understanding of the Hebrew and / or Greek Septuagint Version (*Variant 1*), or just the Hebrew (*Variant 2*).

What then are we to make of the OT Hebrew form of Isa. 7:14 in which *the virgin names the child*, in comparison to the NT Greek form of Matt. 1:23 in which *they (Joseph & Mary) name the child*? I do not find this to present any conflict. Because the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, in one context we read, “the Father” “shall give you” “the Spirit” (John 14:16,17); in another context, the Son says, “I will send” “the Comforter” “unto you” (John 16:7); and in another context we clearly read of the double procession of the Holy Ghost, when Christ says, “the Father will send” “the Holy Ghost in my name” (John 14:26), and “I will send you from the Father,” the Spirit” (John 15:26). So too, because both St. Joseph and St. Mary are involved in calling Christ, Emmanuel, in one context one could say, *the virgin names the child “Immanuel”* (Hebrew of Isa. 7:14); and in another context one could say, *Joseph names the child Immanuel*, just like he called his name Jesus (Matt. 1:21,25); and in another context one could say, *they (Joseph & Mary) name the child “Emmanuel”* (Greek of Matt. 1:23).

The question that then arises, is whether or not Matt. 1:23 is a fair rendering of Isa. 7:14, given that St. Matthew says, this “was spoken of the Lord by the prophet” (Matt. 1:22)? In Biblical prophecy, a type is often used that partially fulfils the prophecy, but its incomplete nature means that the greater fulfilment is still future. This is the case in numerous OT Messianic prophecies (Acts 2:29-34), as well as some other prophecies. Isa. 7 is set in the context of the Syro-Ephramite War (c.732-731 B.C.). Ahaz stood at the aqueducts and the prophet Isaiah told him a child would be born, and before he is old enough to know good and bad, the enemy would be defeated (Isa. 7:14-16).

This had an immediate fulfilment in the prophetic type of Isaiah’s son, for in Isa. 8:3,4 the prophet Isaiah says, “And I went unto the prophetess; and she conceived, and bare a son. Then

said the Lord to me, Call his name Maher-shalal-hash-baz, for before the child shall have knowledge to cry, My father, and my mother, the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be taken away before the king of Assyria.” Ahaz hired the king of Assyria who came and destroyed Israel’s enemies (II Kgs 16:5-9) (by “Israel” I here mean faithful Hebrew Children of Israel in the House of Judah, as opposed to those in the unfaithful House of Israel), thus partially fulfilling this prophecy. But Isaiah’s son: was not born of “a virgin” (Isa. 7:14) as we are specifically told that Isaiah “went unto the prophetess” (Isa. 8:2); he was not called “Immanuel” (Isa. 7:14) but rather “the Lord” “said” “to” Isaiah, “Call his name Maher-shalal-hash-baz” (Isa. 8:3), even though he pointed to “Immanuel” (Isa. 8:8); and this child did not meet the description of Isa. 9:6 as, e.g., “The Mighty God.” Therefore, Maher-shalal-hash-baz must have been a messianic type pointing forward to the Messiah or “Immanuel” (Isa. 7:14; 8:8), and the deliverance of Israel from Damascus a prophetic type of a much greater deliverance of God (echoed in “O Immanuel” and “God is with us,” Isa. 8:8,10). That deliverance was met in Christ who in accordance with Isa. 7:14 was born of “a virgin,” called “Emmanuel” (Matt. 1:23), and in harmony with Isa. 9:6 was “the Mighty God,” for he is called “the Lord” in Matt. 3:3; which quotes from Isa.40:3 where “Lord” means “Jehovah.”

But more than this, if the Messiah was to be born of “a virgin” it follows that Isaiah’s wife was a type of Mary for these purposes. She was thus a type of the one described in the words, “she shall call his name Immanuel” (Isa. 7:14). Yet contextually, it is the father, Isaiah, who is addressed, “Then said the Lord to me, Call his name Maher-shalal-hash-baz” (Isa. 8:3); and that this types the naming of the Messiah i.e., evident from Isa. 8:7,8 where we read, “the king of Assyria” “shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel.” Since in its greater Messianic fulfilment, this was to be a “virgin” birth (Isa. 7:14), it follows that there could be no sense in which Isaiah here types the father. How then can he be told, “Call his name Maher-shalal-hash-baz” (Isa. 8:3) as a prophetic type? Only if one allows that the Messiah was going to have a foster-father of which Isaiah was a prophetic type. Thus contextually, the statements of Isa. 7:14 that *the virgin names the child* refer to the virgin Messiah’s mother, as prophetically typed by Isaiah’s wife; and the statement to Isaiah, “Call his name” (Isa. 8:3) refers to Isaiah as a prophetic type pointing to the Messiah’s foster father, Joseph. Hence it follows that in the context of Isa. 7 & 8, *they* i.e., the virgin mother of the Messiah, and the foster father of the Messiah, are to name the Messiah, “Immanuel.”

Therefore, when the Spirit of God selected for St. Matthew the words, “that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call (*kalesousi*) his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is God with us,” this was a reference to *not just* Isa. 7:14, but also a reference to Isa. 8:3. Thus the quotation in Matt. 1:23 is perfectly accurate as a quote of that “which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet” (Matt. 1:22).

However, by failing to carefully read Isa. 7-9 and Matt. 1:18-25, a copyist could reach the erroneous conclusion that there is a conflict between the Hebrew reading of Isa. 7:14 in which *the virgin names the child*, and the Greek reading of Matt. 1:23 in which *they (Joseph & Mary) name the child* i.e., “they shall call” (Greek of Matt. 1:23). Evidentially this is what happened with Origen and Eusebius, who assimilated “they shall call (*kalesousi*)” in Matt. 1:23 to the Greek Septuagint’s “thou shalt call” (*kaleseis*) of Isa. 7:14 and / or the Hebrew *QaRA’T* of Isa. 7:14 understood as a 2nd person singular feminine verb, “thou shalt call” (*Variant 1*); i.e., “thou [O virgin,] shalt call,” etc. . Beza was a great textual scholar, but in this instance he too failed to

properly understand the context of Matt. 1:18-25, and so he erroneously moved away from the representative Byzantine Text's "they shall call" (*kalesousi*) in Matt. 1:23 to Origen's and Eusebius's Septuagint influenced "thou shalt call" (*kaleseis*) (*Variant 1*).

Likewise, a Latin scribe (either in old Latin d, or the line of manuscripts old Latin d came through,) changed Matt. 1:23 to, "she shall call (*vocabit*)," to make it the same as the Hebrew *QaRA'T* of Isa. 7:14 understood as a 3rd person singular feminine verb, "she shall call" (*Variant 2*).

There is no good textual reason to move away from the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as the correct reading. It might also be observed, that in Matt. 1:23, "they shall call" is *prima facie* the more difficult reading given that in it *they* (*Joseph & Mary*) *name the child* whereas in the Hebrew form found in Isa. 7:14 *the virgin names the child*; and so on this particular occasion this acts to explain the origins of the two NT variants (*Variants 1 & 2*). When this factor is combined with the strong contextual support in Matt. 1:23 for the TR's reading, "they shall call" (*kalesousi*), we must arrive at a high level of certainty for this reading. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the reading, "they shall call" in Matt. 1:23 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

The incorrect reading of Matt. 1:23, "thou shalt call," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century), and also some of the Bohairic Coptic Versions (from the third century). The fact that the correct reading at Matt. 1:23, "they shall call," is supported by a wide variety of texts, including the Alexandrian Text; coupled with the intrinsic improbability of the reading, "thou shalt call" in Matt. 1:23 over "they shall call," means that the correct reading, partly for the right reasons (i.e., the intrinsic improbability of the reading, "thou shalt call"), and partly for the wrong reasons, is found in the NU Text. It went from here into the ASV as "they shall call," retained in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV; and this Greek reading is also followed in the NIV. The reading found in the RSV and Moffatt is ambiguous and appears designed to allow either reading. It is found in Moffatt's Bible as, "and his name is to be called Immanuel."

**Matt. 1:25** "her firstborn son" (TR & AV) {A}

#### *Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

There is no doubt as to the reading of the ancient Byzantine Text of *Codex Freerianus* at this passage, which includes its usage of "*autēs*" (of her). Of some stylistic interest though, is its usage of abbreviations. Four verses above at Matt. 1:21, and at the end of this verse, "*IHCOYN*" (*Ieson*) i.e., "Jesus," is abbreviated to simply "*IN*" with a line-bar on the top i.e., the first and last letters, comparable to our usage of "Wm" for "William." Although the line-bar on top is faded at Matt. 1:21, it remains clearly visible at Matt. 1:25; and this also reminds us that loss or obscuration of a manuscript's markings could result from fading. Moreover, here at Matt. 1:25, "*AYTHC*" (*autēs*) i.e., "of her," is written with the first three letters in normal size, "*AYT*," and then the last two letters, "*HC*," are written at half size to the top right of "*AYT*."

Such conventions are of some secondary interest to us, because of our great interest in the

Byzantine Text. But they may become of a primary interest to us when seeking to better understand how some textual transmission errors may have arisen. For example, in some manuscripts, “Jesus” sometimes dropped out of the text. When it is realized that it may have been abbreviated down to the first and last letter of “Jesus” (in whatever Greek declension it was in,) this helps explain how a paper loss, particularly if on the end of a line, might go unnoticed by a subsequent scribe copying out the manuscript (e.g., Matt. 4:18; 8:5).

For those of us in a computer age with right hand justified pages, we need to remember the protrusions of handwritten pages. E.g., on just about any page one can see unevenness in Manuscript Washington. But sometimes these are even more pronounced than normal (cf. preliminary textual discussion at Matt. 3:11). For instance, at the *Lord’s Prayer* on the page containing Matt. 6:7-17, at Matt. 6:10, the “*sou*” (“Thy” in “Thy will be done,”) discernibly extends about three letters further right than most words; although two lines above this at Matt. 6:9, the “*nois*” ending of “*ouranois*” (“heaven” in “Our Father which art in heaven”), is made about half the size of the normal letters, and put at the top right of “*oura*,” seemingly to make it fit on the one line, in a squeeze that also makes it protrude more than normal.

#### *Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 1:25, the TR’s Greek reading, “*ton* (the) *uion* (son) *autēs* (of her) *ton* (the) *prototokon* (firstborn)” i.e., “her firstborn son” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text, e.g., Codices W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), the purple parchment, Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), the purple parchment, N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). It is also supported as Latin, “*filium* (son) *suum* (her) *primogenitum* (firstborn),” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), together with old Latin Versions f (6th century), aur (7th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386), Basil the Great (d. 379), Didymus (d. 398), Epiphanius (d. 403), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Proclus (d. 446); the ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604). For instance, these words of Matt. 1:25 are very specifically highlighted by St. Basil, who in defence of the Holy Trinity against a heretic, says of the “son born of the virgin Mary, he is called ‘firstborn (*prototokos*) her (*autēs*)’ [i.e., ‘her firstborn’]. For it is said, ‘Till she had brought forth the son (*ton uion*) of her (*autēs*) the

firstborn (*ton prototokon*)' [i.e., 'her firstborn son']<sup>23</sup>”

An alternative reading, which simply reads, “a son” (Greek, *uion*; Latin, *filium*), is found in old Latin Versions k (Turin 4th / 5th centuries), b (Verona, 5th century & Budapest 8th / 9th centuries), g1 (Paris 8th / 9th centuries), and c (Paris 12th / 13th centuries). It is also found in the ancient church Latin writers Ambrose (d. 397) and Chromatius (d. 407); and in a similar form, namely, “her son,” in one dissertation by Jerome (d. 420).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as the correct reading. Indeed, the TR’s reading is strongly supported by contextual factors. In the immediate context of Matt. 1:25, Mary is described as a “virgin” (Matt. 1:23) who has therefore never had any other children, and thus to reinforce this point it seems logical to refer to Christ as “her firstborn son.” Another factor of immediate context, is that Jesus has legal appropriation of the genealogy of Matt. 1:1-16 making him “the son of David” (Matt. 1:1), through Mary’s affinity relationship of marriage with Joseph (whose genealogy this is), since Christ is Mary’s son by consanguinity. It is thus relevant that in the immediate context of St. Matthew’s Gospel that he is “her firstborn son,” and thus legal heir to this genealogy (cf. Deut. 21:15-17; I Chron. 5:1); and in the broader context of St. Matthew’s Gospel, for the purposes of declaring him, “the son of David” (Matt. 1:1; 9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 20:30,31; 21:9,15; 22:42), and “son of Abraham” (Matt. 1:1; 8:11; 22:31,32). It is also relevant in the broader context of St. Matthew’s Gospel since first we read in Matt. 1:25 that Joseph had sexual relations with Mary after Christ’s birth, since he “knew her not till she had brought forth he firstborn son,” “Jesus,” and then in Matt. 12:46,47 we read of Christ’s “brethren.” Thus Christ was the “firstborn” (Matt. 1:25) of a number of children mothered by Mary, and these later ones came because she sexually “knew” Joseph (Matt. 1:25).

With such impressive support for the reading, “her firstborn son” from the representative Byzantine text, St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, a number of ancient church writers, and both immediate and broader contextual factors in St. Matthew’s Gospel, the question naturally arises, why would some Latin scribes change this? If the change was deliberate, a clue may come in the fact that on one occasion, Jerome himself opts for the shorter reading. In his dissertation on the *Perpetual Virginity of Blessed Mary Against Heluidius*, 4, he quotes Matt. 1:25 as “brought forth her son,” which is very close to “brought forth a son.” It is clear, that for those who like Jerome,

---

<sup>23</sup> St. Basil in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1886 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 29, p. 701 (Against Eunomius, Book 4:46, On Col. 1:15) (Greek). Schaff, P. & Wace, H. (Editors), *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, second series, Vol. 8, p. xli (English).

were arguing for the idea of an “ever-virgin Mary,” that Matt. 1:25 was a difficult text to explain away, and the close relationship of “firstborn” with “knew her not till she had brought forth,” was so problematic, that even Jerome, who elsewhere cites the correct reading, here abbreviates it down to “her son,” seemingly, to avoid the issue.

If this was the type of thinking, then it might be asked why these same scribes did not omit “firstborn” in Luke 2:7 from the reading, “her firstborn son” there. Once again, the same three basic contextual factors justify its usage there, i.e., Mary is a “virgin” (Luke 1:27,34); Jesus is legally of the “lineage of David” (Luke 2:4); and Jesus is the first of numerous “brethren” from Mary (Luke 8:19,20). But the fact that Luke 2:7 does not specifically refer to sexual relations in which Joseph “knew” Mary as Matt. 1:25 does, perhaps made it easier to try and decontextualize Luke 2:7 and claim that “firstborn” here was being used in some “poetical sense” meaning one who was “pre-eminent.”

What if the change was accidental? Although I have here used transliterated and Anglicized letters rather than Greek letters, it is possible that a scribe had a page that looked something like the following. This section reads, “and” (*kai*) “not” (*ouk*) “knew” (*eginosken*) “her” (*auten*) “till” (*eos ou*) “she had brought forth” (*eteke*) “the son” (*ton uion*) “of her” (*autes*), “the firstborn” (*ton prototokon*); “and” (*kai*) “he called” (*ekalese*) “the name” (*to onoma*) “of him” (*autou*) “Jesus” (*Iesoun*).

*kai ouk eginosken auten eos eteke ton  
uion autēs ton prototokon kai ekalese  
to onoma autou Iesoun ...*

If the *ton* at the end of the first line was lost due to damage, the handwritten script might look thus:

*kai ouk eginosken auten eos eteke :::::  
uion autēs ton prototokon kai ekalese  
to onoma autou Iesoun ...*

A scribe having written *eteke uion*, and thinking of the last two letters, *on*, may have just looked up, with his eye catching the *on* ending of *prototokon*, and started writing on *kai ekalese* etc. .

It is difficult to gauge which is the more likely of these two possibilities, since we do not have enough information on the copyist in question. Was the scribe a man who having undertaken some “stylistic improvements” of the text, was now prepared to make a theological “improvement,” lest a reader “wrongly conclude” that Mary was not a perpetual virgin? Or was this an accidental omission? Was the scribe generally competent, but simply having a bad day? Did he have a head cold or some other temporary ailment effecting his competency? Certainly good copyists were evidently sometimes hard to find. Was he a just blithering fool for whom this type of thing was sadly all too common?

Whether or not this omission of *ton* and *autēs ton prototokon* at Matt. 1:25 was deliberate or accidental is a matter now lost in the darkness of man’s unrecorded history. But that it was omitted is beyond doubt, since there is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading. The TR’s reading, “her firstborn son” (TR & AV), has impressive support

from the representative Byzantine Text, Jerome's Latin Vulgate, a host of ancient church writers; two of the four ancient eastern church doctors, St. Chrysostom and St. Basil the Great, and three of the four ancient and early mediaeval western church doctors, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, and St. Gregory the Great. It is supported by textual analysis of both immediate and wider context in St. Matthew's Gospel. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the reading, "her firstborn son" in Matt. 1:25 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

The correct reading, "her firstborn son," was preserved outside the closed class at Matt. 1:25, not by miraculous means, but by high quality human efforts in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); and a number of Syriac Versions, i.e., the celebrated Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century), Syriac Harclean h (616), and a manuscript of the Palestinian Syriac (c. 6th century). It was likewise preserved in the Armenian Version (5th century), and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries). It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Version of Tatian's Diatessaron, where Ciasca's Latin reads, "*suum* (her) *promogenitum* (firstborn)" (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The incorrect reading of Matt. 1:25, "a son" is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); the Syriac Sinaitic and Curetonian Versions (3rd / 4th centuries), a Palestinian Syriac manuscript (c. 6th century); the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (from the 3rd century), and Georgian Version (5th century). It was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Thus the omission is found in the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV (which mentions the TR's reading in a footnote), ESV, and NIV.

We cannot doubt that Matt. 1:25 shows Alexandrian attempts at "stylistic improvements" of the text. In Matt. 1:25; 13:33; 18:30,34, the TR, with majority Byzantine Text support, correctly reads "till" (*eos ou*). This reading is also followed by the NU Text at Matt. 1:25; 13:33; 18:34. Though making no difference to the meaning, the *ou* is removed, so that it just reads *eos* at Matt. 1:25 in the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus (4th century); likewise at Matt. 18:30 in the Alexandrian Text's London Sinaiticus (4th century) and Rome Vaticanus (4th century); and again at Matt. 18:34 the *ou* is removed in Rome Vaticanus. In Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), the *ou* was included at Matt. 1:25; 13:33; 18:34; but omitted at Matt. 18:30. In Westcott-Hort's Greek NT (1881), the *ou* was put in square brackets at Matt. 1:25, included at Matt. 13:33, included at Matt. 18:30 with a footnote, and again put in square brackets at Matt. 18:34. In Nestle's 21st edition (1952), the *ou* is also put in square brackets at Matt. 1:25; removed to a footnote reading at Matt. 18:30; and retained at Matt. 18:34 with a footnote giving the alternative. It is also removed in the NU Text's reading of Matt. 18:30. Though these unwarranted departures from the representative Byzantine Text in no way affects the translation, which is "till" in Matt. 1:25; 13:33; 18:30,34, whether the Greek reads *eos* or *eos ou*, it nevertheless powerfully reminds us, that at Matt. 1:25, as elsewhere, the Alexandrian scribes were prepared to "improve" the text by making it briefer and "more concise." Thus the exhibition of this same tendency in the removal from the same verse of "*ton* (the)" and "*autēs* (of her) *ton* (the) *prototokon* (firstborn)," is not unrelated to this more general attitude. Alas, good quality scribes were evidently hard to find at Alexandria!

**Matt. 2:11** "they saw" (TR & AV) {B}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

*The First Matter.* Manuscript Washington (*Codex Freerianus*), is written in capital letters in continuous script i.e., *usually* without spacing between the words (although it contains spaces for ancient unnumbered “verse” divisions). Sometimes a word is simply continued onto the next line, but this practice is far more common than in English, and unlike in English grammar, there is not a hyphen (-) on the word of the first line, indicating that it joins a word on the second line. If one looks at, for instance, the page containing Matt. 9:19-30, one can, with difficulty, make out “*ekolou*” on the first line, and then with great clarity, the “*thesan*” on the next line, of *ekolouthesan* i.e., “followed” in the words, “two blind men followed him” (Matt. 9:27). But just two lines down, the script gets even worse on the right hand side of the page, and while one can, with ever-increasing difficulty, make out, “*eleesan* (have mercy on) *emas* (us),” the following words are not readable. Then on the next line, one can read with great clarity, the “*eid*” of “David,” and so we know the illegible part of the former line must be “*uie* ([Thou] Son) *Dau*,” which together with the “*eid*” reads, “*uie* ([Thou] Son) *Daueid* (David)” (Matt. 9:27).

Such factors help us to better understand how e.g., at Matt. 2:11, the “*eidon*” (they saw) of the majority Byzantine Text, may have become the “*idon*” (they saw) of the minority Byzantine Text. If the “e” from “*eidon*” was on one line, and the “*idon*” from “*eidon*” was on the next line, if the right hand side of the page became worn or damaged, as did the right hand side of the page containing Matt. 9:19-30 in Manuscript Washington; then a scribe may have taken the “e” for simply an age marking, and copied out “*idon*.” Of course, we cannot be sure that this is the origin of the minority Byzantine spelling form, “*idon*,” but inspection of Manuscript Washington shows that this is clearly a plausible reason for its origins. Alternatively, it may have been a deliberate change to the spelling of a local dialect.

It should be noted, that whatever one thinks is the origin of the variant spellings, for the purposes of English translation, there is no difference in the majority Byzantine spelling, “*eidon*,” and the minority Byzantine spelling, “*idon*,” here at Matt. 2:11.

*The Second Matter.* In Lectionary 2378 (11th century) the text jumps from the end of verse 9, “*to* (the) *paidion* (young child),” to verse 11b, “*kai* (and) *pesontes* (‘falling down’ = ‘fell down’)” etc. . Thus it omits reference to the words here considered at Matt. 2:11. The reason for this is speculative.

Was this an accidental change? Did the eye of the scribe first jump from the “*to* (the) *paidion* (young child)” of verse 9 to the “*to* (the) *paidion* (young child)” of verse 10; and then from the “*on*” suffix of the verse 11 “*paidion* (young child)” to the similar, but different, “*ou*” suffix of the “*autou* (‘of him’ = ‘his’)”, that is immediately before where his text resumes at “*kai* (and) *pesontes* (fell down)” etc.? E.g., was he talking to someone who had just walked in? If so, the substance of the discussion is anyone’s guess e.g., perhaps someone said to our scribe in Constantinople, “I hear you’ll be sending this Lectionary out to one of the lands of the beautiful Danube River, where the Bulgars [Bulgarians] dwell?” Whatever the content of the discussion, in seeking to do two things at once, the scribe made so silly an error without realizing it, before his friend then left and the scribe just kept on writing from after “*kai* (and) *pesontes* (fell down)” (verse 10)?

Was this a deliberate change? For “Lectionary purposes,” did the scribe of Lectionary 2378 take the view that the reading “should be shortened” to, “and stood over where the young child was; and worshipped him” etc.? Did he thus think something like, “Well now, we don’t want to give the Greek speakers living with the Bulgars [Bulgarians] too long a reading”?

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 2:11, the TR’s Greek reading, “*eidon* (‘they saw,’ indicative active second aorist, 3rd person plural verb, used as an aorist of *oraō*),” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text, e.g., Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.), and thus constitutes the representative Byzantine reading. It is also found in an alternative spelling form, “*idon*,” as a minority Byzantine spelling in, for instance, Codices W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), the purple parchment, Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), K 017 (*Codex Cyprius*, 9th century, Paris), V 031 (*Codex Mosquensis*, 9th century, Moscow), and Pi 041 (*Codex Petropolitanus*, 9th century, St. Petersburg); as well as the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Eusebius (d. 339); and the early mediaeval church writer, Pseudo-Chrysostom in a Latin work (6th century). It also has support as Latin, “*viderunt* (‘they saw,’ indicative active perfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *video*),” in old Latin Versions a (4th century), d (5th century), f (6th century), and q (6th / 7th century); and Latin, “*viderent* (‘they might see,’ subjunctive active imperfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *video*),” in old Latin Version k (4th / 5th centuries).

However, an alternative reading, “they found,” which on a Greek reconstruction is “*euron* (indicative active second aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *euriskō*),” is found in Beza’s last four editions (1565-1598)<sup>24</sup>. This reading is found as Latin, “*invenerunt* (‘they found,’ indicative active perfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *invenio*)” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions b (5th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is also found in the ancient church Latin writers, of *De Promissionibus* (generally considered to be Quodvultus, died 453), and Vigilius (died after 484); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

The text which God preserved and gave general accessibility to over the ages, is the text which God inspired. *Prima facie*, both the Byzantine Greek Text and Western Latin Text, which includes, most notably, Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, meet these criteria. Certainly readings inside these Greek or Latin traditions may be considered. However, the NT was originally written in Greek, not Latin, and so on fundamental principles, one starts with the representative Byzantine Greek text, and only reluctantly moves away from it to another reading within the closed class of three witnesses where textual analysis requires this. There is no contextual reason pointing to such a need to depart from this Greek text here. Indeed, the fact that there is a contextually emphasis on “seeing,” is most harmonious with the majority Byzantine reading i.e., “they saw

---

<sup>24</sup> An alternative reconstruction with the same meaning would be, “*euran* (indicative active first aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *euriskō*).” But Beza here appears to have selected the Greek second aorist in order to argue a reverse logic to mine on “E:::ON.”

(*eidon*<sup>25</sup>) “the star” “in the east” (Matt. 2:9), “when they saw (*idontes*<sup>26</sup>) the star, they rejoiced” (Matt. 2:10), and then “when they were come into the house, they saw (*eidon*) the young child” (Matt. 2:11). Indeed, the fact that they were supernaturally guided by the star surely means they had already *found* the Christ-Child in terms of his basic location, so that then “they saw (*eidon*) the young child” (Matt. 2:11) is surely a more stylistically expected reading.

I think the most likely explanation for this variation is that it arose from a damaged manuscript, in which the Greek *eidon*, probably in capital letters (or “unicals”), looked something like *E:::ON*; and the copyist, possibly Jerome himself, guessed from *prima facie* context that the reading was *euron*. If so, the mistake was certainly understandable. So too, given that Matthean Greek prefers *eidon* (Matt. 2:9,11; 3:16 *et al*) to *idon*, I think it likely that an original paper loss of the “*e*” (epsilon) in a manuscript in which *eidon* and the preceding word were fairly close together, probably resulted in the origins of *idon* in a number of Greek manuscripts, since if this were a “stylistic improvement” one might reasonably have expected such changes throughout St. Matthew’s Gospel, which is not the case<sup>27</sup>.

---

<sup>25</sup> Indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, used as an aorist of *oraō*.

<sup>26</sup> Masculine plural nominative, active aorist participle, used as an aorist of *oraō*.

<sup>27</sup> For a discussion of *idon*, see Tischendorf’s Vol. 3 (Prolegomena), pp. 55,89; and Tischendorf’s Vol. 1 & 2 at Matt. 2:9; 13:17; 17:8; 21:9; Mark 6:33; 9:8; 11:20; 16:5; Luke 2:20; 9:32; 19:37; 24:24; John 1:49; 18:26; 19:6; Acts 3:3; 6:15; 7:35; 11:5; 12:16; 22:18; 26:13; 28:4; Gal. 1:9; 2:14; Heb. 3:9; Rev. 1:12; 4:1; 5:1; 6:1; 7:1; 8:2; 9:1; 10:1; 13:1,2; 14:1; 15:1; 16:13; 17:3; 18:1; 19:11; 20:1; 21:1; 22:8.

With strong support from the representative Byzantine Text, and no contextual reason to move away from it, the reading “they saw” (*eidon*) must stand, and so the AV composers of the TR were quite right to adopt it over e.g., Stephanus’s Greek NT (1551) and Beza’s Greek NT (1598). With support for *euron* from the Latin Vulgate, and the faint theoretical possibility that the converse occurred i.e., the text was reconstructed to *eidon*, it is not possible to give this reading an “A.” On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the reading of “they saw” in the TR at Matt. 2:11 a “B” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

The correct reading at Matt. 2:11, “they saw (*eidon*)” is found outside the closed class of sources in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); and the leading (5th century) representative of the Western text, Codex D 05. Or likewise in the alternative form (*idon*) in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); and (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century). It is also found in a copy of the Syriac Curetonian Version (British Museum, 12th & 13th centuries); Egyptian Coptic Version (3rd century); Armenian Version (5th century); Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect reading, “they found (*euron*),” is found in Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type).

The TR’s correct reading is here followed in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). But in doing so, Burgon & Miller make the claim that the Textus Receptus reads, “*euron* (they found).” On the one hand, Burgon & Miller have some basis for this claim since this variant is found in Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and other Erasmus editions (1519, 1527, & 1535), Aldus (1518), Stephanus (1546, 1549, 1550, & 1551), Plantin (Antwerp, Polyglott, 1572), Beza (1560, 1565, 1582, 1589, & 1598), and Elzevir (1633). Hence e.g., “found the child” is the reading of Tyndale (1526 & 1534), Cranmer (1539), and the Geneva Bible (1557); as it had been in the earlier Latin based translation of Wycliffe (1380). But on the other hand, the “*eidon* (they saw)” of Scrivener’s Text (1894 & 1902) was earlier found in the Complutensians’ NT (1514, published 1521/2) and Aldus (1518). It is clearly found in the AV’s reading, “they saw the young child.” Showing some uncertainty about the matter, while “found the babe” remained from 1557 as the reading in the main text of the Geneva Bible (1560), a footnote alternative reads, “Or, *saw*.” Though I consider that the AV here represents the true Received Text, *supra*, we are thus reminded by this fact that there are some 250 to 400 places where 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantine NT texts disagree on readings<sup>28</sup>.

With the support of both main Alexandrian texts, for the wrong reasons, the correct

---

<sup>28</sup> Moorman says “under 400” places and Cloud says, “according to Scrivener . . . , there are . . . 252 places in which Erasmus, Stephanus, Elzevir, Beza, and [the] Complutensian Polyglot disagree sufficiently to affect the English translation;” See Preface to Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), “(1) Textual Commentary Principles,” section, “\* b) The Received Text (Latin, Textus Receptus),” subsection “\*ii) New Testament.”

reading entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt 2:11 as *eidon*, i.e., “they ... saw” (ASV). The correct reading was retained in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV; and also followed in the NIV.

**Matt. 2:18** “lamentation and” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek reading, “*threnos* (lamentation) *kai* (and),” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). The words are also found as Latin, “*plactus* (lamentation) *et* (and),” in old Latin Version d (5th century). They are further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Proclus (d. 446).

However these words are omitted in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century); and the old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), q (Munich 6th / 7th centuries & Munich 7th century), aur (7th century), l (Leon 7th century & Berlin 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th centuries), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th centuries); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). They are also omitted by the ancient church Greek writers, Justin Martyr (d. c. 165), Macarius / Symeon (d. 4th / 5th century), Hesychius (d. c. 450), and ancient church Latin writers Hilary (d. 367), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430).

There being no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine Text, it must stand as the correct reading. Matt. 2:18 is stated to be a quote by “Jeremy” (AV) or Jeremiah (Matt. 2:17). In the Hebrew OT of Jer. 31:15, one finds the doublet, “lamentation (*NeHI* / נהי), and bitter (TaMRuRIM / תמרורים, masculine plural noun, from TaMRuR / תמרור) weeping (BeKI / בכי)” (AV). In the Greek Septuagint of Jer. 38:15, one finds the triplet, “of lamentation (*threnou*), and of weeping (*klauthmou*), and mourning (*odurmou*).” In the TR of Matt. 2:18, one finds the triplet, “lamentation (*threnos*), and weeping (*klauthmos*), and great (*polus*) mourning (*odurmos*)” (AV). *Prima facie*, the Matthean triplet has some similarity with the language of the Septuagint, but closer inspection shows from its different declensions that it is clearly not a direct Septuagint quote, and it also says “great mourning” (Matt. 2:18) rather than simply “mourning” (Jer. 38:15, LXX). This requires the conclusion, that while there is some similarity between Matt. 2:18 and Jer. 38:15, LXX, nevertheless, Matt. 2:18 is basically a fresh translation of “Jeremy.”

The Hebrew word for “bitter” in “bitter weeping” (Jer. 31:15) is *tamrur*, and the AV rightly translates *the intensity found in the plural form* elsewhere with greater force as “most bitterly” (Hosea 12:14), or “most bitter” (Jer. 6:26)<sup>29</sup>. The AV’s translation of Jer. 31:15 understates the force of the Hebrew. It is not really strong enough, since the idea is one of “lamentation, and most bitter weeping,” or “lamentation, and great bitter weeping.” I think it instructive to note that in his Latin Vulgate, Jerome’s translation of Hebrew *tamrur* is Latin *multus* i.e., “great;” and I further note the NIV’s translation of *tamrur* as “great” i.e., “great weeping” (Jer. 31:15, NIV). Both Jerome and the NIV capture one element of the meaning of *tamrur*, but to the expense of the more general meaning of *tamrur* as “bitter.” By contrast, the

<sup>29</sup> Brown, Driver, & Briggs, pp. 601 (מרה / MaRaH & תמרור / TaMRuR) & 1071 (תמרור / TaMRuR).

AV's translation of *tamrur* as "bitter" i.e., "bitter weeping" (Jer. 31:15, AV), captures the more general meaning of *tamrur*, but to the expense of this more particular shade of meaning as "great." Thus I think a better translation would be, "great bitter weeping." Contextually, this "great bitter weeping," is indissolubly intertwined with "mourning" since God is to "turn their mourning into joy" (Jer. 31:13). This nexus between weeping and mourning is found elsewhere e.g., Jeremiah says, "the Lord," "saith," "mine heart shall mourn," "I will weep" (Jer. 48:30-32). Contextually, the "mourning" and "sorrow" of Jer. 31:13, includes, but is not exhausted by reference to, the "lamentation" and "weeping" of Jer. 31:15.

The Septuagint translator, recognizing the nexus between "mourning" (Jer. 31:13) and the "lamentation" and "weeping" (Jer. 31:15), conflated Jer. 31:15 by adding in "and mourning" (Jer. 38:15). While his theological perception was good, his "translation" technique was not, and it should be noted that Matt. 2:18 is not a direct quote from Jer. 38:15 (LXX). The Septuagint translation declines the triplet in the genitive i.e., "ou" endings meaning "of," hence "of lamentation (*threnou*), and of weeping (*klauthmou*), and mourning (*odurmou*)" (Jer. 38:15, LXX). By contrast, St. Matthew's translation declines the triplet in the nominative i.e., "os" endings for the subject, and also adds the word "great;" hence "lamentation (*threnos*), and weeping (*klauthmos*), and great (*polus*) mourning (*odurmos*)" (Matt. 2:18). Nevertheless, Matt. 2:18 is a quote that agrees with the Septuagint translator of Jer. 38:15, that the "mourning" of Jer. 31:13 relates to the "lamentation" and "weeping" of Jer. 31:15.

The words of Holy Scripture here are very particular. St. Matthew does not say, "spoken by Jeremy the prophet in the same verse," but rather, "spoken by Jeremy the prophet" (Matt. 2:17). St. Matthew is in fact putting together two verses from Jeremiah, not one, and so were we to use quotation marks, it would be, "'In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation, and 'weeping,' and 'great' [Jer. 31:15] 'mourning' [Jer. 31:13], 'Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not'" (Jer. 31:13,15). The "great" before the "mourning" (Matt. 2:18) is not found in the Septuagint's Jer. 38:15, because even though the Septuagint translator recognized the nexus between Jeremiah 31:13 and Jer. 31:15, he did not properly understand the full impact of "great bitter weeping" (Jer. 31:15, my translation), which requires as an outgrowth the associated "great bitter weeping" (Jer. 31:15, my translation), that the "mourning" must therefore also be "great" (Matt. 2:18).

On the one hand, I think that for we frail and non-Divinely inspired humans, such an understanding as we find in Matt. 2:18 is best left to a commentary, rather than made into an interpretative translation such as the Septuagint's Jer. 38:15. But on the other hand, for the Spirit of God, who first inspired Jer. 31:13,15, it is quite within the bounds of propriety to make such an interpretative translation of Jer. 31:13,15 in Matt. 2:18; and thus help us better understand the fuller meaning of what Jeremiah said in Jer. 31:13,15. Indeed, we thank him for helping us to better understand this OT passage.

The fact that the words, "lamentation and" in Matt. 2:18, are supported by the representative Byzantine Text, means that they must stand unless one can show through textual analysis, good reason why another reading within the closed class of three NT sources should be followed. No such textual reason can here be adduced. They must therefore be the correct reading.

Why then did the Latin tradition reduce this Matthean triplet to a doublet? Three quite

different possibilities present themselves. Firstly, this may have been a deliberate omission in an unwarranted attempt to assimilate the doublet of Matt. 2:18 to the Hebrew doublet of Jer. 31:15. The Latin *ploratus* can be translated as either “lamentation” or “weeping,” and *ululatus* can be translated as either “weeping” or “mourning.” Thus Jerome’s Latin translation of Jer. 31:15 is either “lamentation (*ploratus*) and (*et*) weeping (*ululatus*) great (*multus*);” or “weeping (*ploratus*) and (*et*) mourning (*ululatus*) great (*multus*.” His Latin translation at Matt. 2:18 is identical, “*ploratus et ululatus multus*.” If so, with all due respect to Jerome, this desire to harmonize the text of Matt. 2:18 was based on a misunderstanding of the fact that St. Matthew is not quoting Jer. 31:15, but Jer. 31:13,15. It is not for us to tamper with the Word of God. We can do God no favour, by thinking in our frail, limited, human brains, that we have spotted a so called “Bible blunder,” and then go about trying to fix it. We can only humbly seek God’s guidance as to what he means.

A second possibility is that this was a deliberate omission of “lamentation and,” for “stylistic” reasons. Certainly this looks like it could have been a typical pruning away of “unnecessary repetitious verbiage,” of “the idea already found in “weeping” at Matt. 2:18. Thus in order to make “a more succinct and concise” text, lacking “unnecessary flowery language,” the words of the TR, “lamentation and” may have been pruned away. Such attitudes cannot be held without impiety and arrogance. Sadly, these were evidently the types of views of some scribes.

A third possibility that presents itself to us, is not deliberate, but accidental omission. Matt. 2:18 says, “was ... heard (*ekousthe*), lamentation (*threnos*), and (*kai*) weeping (*klauthmos*), and (*kai*) mourning (*odurmos*) great (*polus*.” The text before a copyist would have looked something like the following (although obviously in Greek letters rather than Anglicized letters).

*ekousthe threnos kai klauthmos kai odurmos polus*

It is possible that a scribe, after writing *ekousthe* (“was heard”), then scanned forward with his eyes, remembering “the next words on the line end with “*os kai*” i.e., from “*threnos kai*” (“lamentation and”), and then after some distraction, going back and quickly seeing the “*os kai*” ending of “*klauthmos kai*” (“weeping and” ), then wrote down “*klauthmos kai*,” thus omitting “*threnos kai*” (“lamentation, and”). Such negligence cannot be ruled out. We do not know enough of the possible circumstances. E.g., was he reading at night by candlelight, tired, and weary?

Which of these three possibilities is correct I do not know. But we cannot get away from the fact, that the words, “lamentation and” in Matt. 2:18, are supported by the representative Byzantine Text, and there is no good reason under textual analysis to move away from this reading to another reading within the closed class of three NT sources. With the faint possibility that the converse occurred, i.e., that Matt. 2:18 was assimilated to Jer. 38:15 (LXX), being safely ruled out, both by the fact that this is clearly not a direct Septuagint quote as seen from the different declensions, and also from the addition of the word “great” in Matt. 2:18; the reading of the TR and AV is sure. Matt. 2:18 accurately quotes the words of Jeremy from Jer. 31:13,15, in a way that is not immediately obvious as being correct, and constituting a harder reading, it is the type of thing that a scribe, not spending due time and diligence on, would think to move away from, not move towards. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the reading, “lamentation, and” in Matt. 2:18 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

The correct reading at Matt. 2:18 which includes “lamentation, and,” was preserved outside the closed class of sources in the leading (5th century) representative of the Western text, Codex D 05; (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century). It is also found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Georgian Version (5th century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (c. 500).

The incorrect reading which omits “lamentation, and” in Matt. 2:18, is also found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century), who evidently found “the concise” and “less flowery” reading more to their liking. It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; as well as the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Palestinian (c. 6th century) Versions. It is further omitted in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

It found its way into the NU Text *et al*, and thus modern English versions based on the faulty NT NU text (and various neo-Alexandrian predecessors,) such as the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. Thus e.g., the American Standard Version (based on the predecessor Westcott-Hort text), reads simply, “Weeping and great mourning” (ASV). The reader should be aware that “great mourning” (ASV) might be translated “sore lamentation” (Moffatt), or something similar, but this is not to be confused with the omitted reading of “lamentation, and.”

**Matt. 3:6** “Jordan” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek reading, “*Iordane* (Jordan),” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Codices E 07 (8th century), K 017 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), V 031 (9th century), Pi 041 (9th century), S 028 (10th century), Gamma 036 (10th century); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century). It is also supported as Latin, “*Iordane*,” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), c (12th / 13th century); and the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century); and as Latin “*Iordanem*” in g1 (8th / 9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592) as “*Iordane*.” It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254). A supportive description which appears to reflect this reading, and for which the words, “in Jordan” should seemingly be placed in inverted commas as a quote, is also made by the ancient church Greek writer, Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386). Cyril quotes parts of Matt. 3:5-7, and for the Greek words of Matt. 3:6, “*ebaptizonto* (were baptized) *en* (in) *to* (-) *Iordane* (Jordan),” Cyril describes this as “*ebaptizen* (baptizing) *en* (in) *to* (-) *Iordane* (Jordan)” (*Catechetical Lectures*, 3<sup>30</sup>).

---

<sup>30</sup> Cyril of Jerusalem in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1857 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 33, p. 456 (Catechism III, About Baptism) (Greek); Schaff, P. & Wace, H. (Editors), *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, second series, 1891, Vol. 7, p. 16 (Catechetical Lectures, 3) (English).

But the Greek word “*Potamo* (River),” is added in a minority Byzantine reading, found in e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1:28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), M 021 (9th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.); and as Latin, “*Jordanne* (Jordan) *fluvio* (river),” in old Latin Version q (6th / 7th century). This addition is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

There is no good textual reason to move away from the representative Byzantine Text’s reading of “Jordan.” The terminology, “the Jordan” is certainly Matthean (Matt. 4:15,25; 19:1), and is used immediately before (Matt. 3:5), and just after (Matt. 3:13), this reference in Matt. 3:6.

The identical terminology, “river of Jordan” (AV) or “Jordan River” (*Jordane potamo*) is found in the parallel passage of Mark 1:5, and the addition at Matt. 3:6 appears to be a scribal assimilation with this, quite possibly originating with Origen.

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the reading, “Jordan” in Matt. 3:6 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

The correct reading, “Jordan” in Matt. 3:6, is found outside the closed class of three sources in the leading representative of the Western text, D 05 (5th century); as well as the Middle Egyptian Coptic Version (3rd century).

The incorrect and inflated assimilation with Mark 1:5, “Jordan River,” is also found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century). The conflation also occurs in all the Syriac Versions (3rd to 7th centuries); as well as some Egyptian Coptic Versions with the Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and also the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries). The addition of “river” (Latin, *flumine*) is also found in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

Though such textual expansions occur in the Alexandrian Text, they are relatively rare in comparison with their pruning omissions. It is possible, that its adoption here by the Alexandrians and others, echoes the selective influence of Origen. Whether or not one considers that there is such a thing as the Caesarean text type (a disputed matter), there can be agreement that the “Caesarean” type of manuscript blends Alexandrian Text and Western Text readings; and has been historically connected with the name of Origen. This Matt. 3:6 scribal gloss is found in Origen and the Alexandrian Text, but not the Western Text’s Codex D 05. Thus we might be seeing here some element of a two-way influence between Origen and the Alexandrians. The proposition is speculative, but if correct, the influence in both instances was certainly selective rather than general.

The incorrect reading was also adopted into the NU Text *et al.* It is found as “the river Jordan” in the ASV, and also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. It was not followed by Moffatt, who is best characterized as a semi neo-Alexandrian. I.e., while a neo-Alexandrian Proper will very occasionally determine a reading in a neo-Alexandrian text on non-Alexandrian text principles, so that the reading is not supported by the Alexandrian text(s); the frequency with which Moffatt does this same thing, though less than 10% of the time, is still of a

notably higher frequency than a neo-Alexandrian Proper, and this means he is a semi- neo-Alexandrian. Moreover, when Moffatt so operates on non-Alexandrian text principles, it is a case of him following “anything goes” Moffatt principles, e.g., on this occasion he appears to have been influenced by the Western text, D 05 in a way a neo-Alexandrian Proper would not here be. Thus for the wrong reasons, Moffatt has the correct reading here at Matt. 3:6.

**Matt. 3:7** “his” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek reading, “*autou* (‘his, or literally, ‘of him’),” in the words, “his baptism” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is further supported as Latin, “*suum* (his),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However, it is omitted by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254), and the ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367). I.e., “the baptism.”

Its attestation is thus of a very strong and good quality. When one adds to this the fact that no good textual reason can be adduced for its omission, its inclusion as part of the text cannot be reasonably doubted. The origins of this variant are speculative. Was it accidentally lost due to a paper fade / loss, in which the basic sentence still seemed to make sense and so no attempt was made by a scribe at a reconstruction? Alternatively, was its omission deliberate? E.g., Did Origen or a copyist he followed take the view that its presence was “an unnecessary extravagance” since the meaning of the passage can still be understood by the words, “But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees coming (*erchomenous*) to (*epi*) the (*to*) baptism (*baptisma*), he said” etc., or “coming (*erchomenous*) for (*epi*) the (*to*) baptism (*baptisma*), he said” etc.? A deliberate or accidental omission? We cannot be sure. We can only be sure that it was omitted from the original.

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “his” in Matt. 3:7 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

The correct reading, “his” in “his baptism” (Matt. 3:7), is found outside the closed class of three sources in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in a number of Syriac Versions, namely, the *Vetus Syra* (3rd / 4th) in both the Syrus Sinaiticus and Syrus Curetonianus, and Syriac Harclean h Version (616); as well as in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century)

The incorrect pruned reading, “the baptism,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as some Egyptian Coptic Versions in the Sahidic Version (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century); and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

On this occasion, not even the NU Text Committee could resist the logic that the removal of *autou* (“of him”), was best explained as a pruning of the text. Partly for the right reasons, and partly for the wrong reasons, the correct reading, found in the TR, was followed in the NU Text at Matt. 3:7. The ASV main text, generally based on an antecedent neo-Alexandrian, Westcott-Hort text (1881) which here omits “*autou*,” nevertheless here disregarded Westcott-Hort and followed the correct reading in the main text, “to his baptism,” although an ASV footnote still has the incorrect reading rendered, “for baptism.” The erroneous footnote reading of the grandfather ASV, was followed by his sons, the NASB and RSV, and grandsons, the NRSV and ESV. The NIV also follows the erroneous reading found in the NU Text footnote, though the matter is blurred by the change from “baptism” to “baptising” and additional words “where he was,” in their unnecessary dynamic equivalent, “coming to where he was baptising” (Matt. 3:7, NIV).

It was not followed by the semi neo-Alexandrian Moffatt; who on this occasion was probably influenced by the Western text and Syriac Versions. Thus for the wrong reasons, the Moffatt Bible has the correct reading here at Matt. 3:6, i.e., “coming for his baptism” (Moffatt).

**Matt. 3:8** “fruits” (TR & AV) {B}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 3:8, a number of old Latin Versions place *fructus* in the plural, and old Latin Version a, reads, “*fructos* (fruits) *dignos* (meet)<sup>31</sup>.” The plural masculine accusative of the adjective *dignus* is *dignos*. The adjective and noun must agree in gender, number, and case. The normative reading would be “*fructus dignos*,” i.e., declining *fructus* – *us* as a fourth declension masculine noun, making the plural accusative, *fructus*, as in the Latin of St. Gregory<sup>32</sup>, or Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*, both of which read, “*fructus dignos*.” But it is here declined in old Latin Version a, as “*fructos dignos*” i.e., declining *fructus* – *i* as a second declension masculine noun, making the plural accusative, *fructos*. Interestingly, the same second declension noun form, “*fructos dignos*,” is also found at Luke 3:8 in old Latin Versions, l, b, & aur.

The *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1968-82), though classifying *fructus* as usually a fourth declension noun, i.e., *fructus* – *us*; nevertheless makes some fascinating references to its occasional historical usage in Latin grammar as a second declension noun, i.e., *fructus* – *i*.

---

<sup>31</sup> Tischendorf’s textual apparatus refers to old Latin versions a, m, and g2. Julicher gives old Latin Version a, as, “*fructos dignos*.” I do not know the specific reading of old Latin versions m and g2 i.e., whether *fructus* is there declined as a second or fourth declension noun.

<sup>32</sup> St. Gregory the Great in: Migne (Latin Writers Series) (1849 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 79, p. 1157 (Book 1, Exposition on the Gospel according to Matthew, Chapter 51) (Latin). References to Bishop Gregory are original work, and citations from Migne are generally placed in the Preface, at “Scripture Citations of Bishop Gregory the Great in Matt. 1-14.” In another citation that could be from either Matt. 3:8 or Luke 3:8, St. Gregory again uses “*fructus dignos*” in Migne (Latin Writers Series) (1849 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 76, p. 1168.

E.g., it is declined as a second declension genitive singular, *fructi*, in P. Terenius Afer's (c. 195-159 B.C.) *Adelphi* 870, M. Porcius Cato's (234-149 B.C.) *de Agri Cultura* 4, and Sextus Turpilius's (d. 103 B.C.) *Com.* 12. It is declined as a second declension singular ablative, *fructo*, in *Instrumenta Dacica* 13. Of particular note for the purposes of Matt. 3:8, it is declined as a second declension plural accusative, *fructos*, on four occasions in M. Terentius Varro's (116-27 B.C.) *Res Rusticae* 1.1.5; 1.2.5; 1.44.3; & 2.5.7.

This raises an interesting abstract question of Latin grammar theory, "Who determines whether *fructus* is a second declension noun or a fourth declension noun anyway?" But such esoteric questions must surely give way to this ultimate historical reality, namely, that Latin grammar has generally regarded *fructus* as a fourth declension noun. That its fascinating etymological history includes a minority usage as a second declension noun, is nevertheless of great interest to we neo-Byzantines of the *Textus Receptus*, because of its importance to us in better understanding the Greek text here at Matt. 3:8. The Latin of this passage thus provides us with an unexpected grammatical treat.

(Cf. comments on Greek *eleos* in Appendix 3, *The Definite Article*, subsection *b*, *The Definite Article and eleos*).

#### *Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 3:8, the TR's Greek plural reading of "*karpous* (fruits) *axious* (meet)" (AV) or "fruits worthy" (NKJV), is a minority Byzantine reading found in *Codex Nanius* (U 030, Venice, 9th century); as well as Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), 267 (12th century), 998 (12th century), and 1010 (12th century). It is also found in the plural form, in old Latin Versions a (4th century), m (9th century), and g2 (10th century); reading in old Latin Version a, "*fructos* (fruits) *dignos* (meet)." It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, John Chrysostom (d. 407); ancient church Latin writer, Tertullian (d. after 220); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, a singular Greek reading, "*karpon* (fruit) *axion* (meet)," or "fruit worthy" (ASV), is found in the majority Byzantine Text, e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is also found as Latin, "*facite* (bring forth) *ergo* (therefore) *fructum* (fruit<sup>33</sup>) *dignum* (worthy)" etc., in both Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century, "*fructum dignum*;" and the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

A fine issue of textual analysis presents itself in the reading found in both the representative Byzantine Greek Text and Latin Vulgate. Specifically, the plural is used in both the verse before and verse after Matt. 3:8. In Matt. 3:7, we read, "O generation of vipers (*echidnon* i.e., plural), who hath warned you (*umin* i.e., plural) to flee from the wrath to come." This usage of the plural is also maintained in the following Matt. 3:9 where we read, "And think (*doxete* i.e., a "you" plural form of *dokeo*, so literally, "you" plural "think") not to say within

---

<sup>33</sup> The Latin *fructum* is a singular accusative (as indeed is the representative Byzantine Text's Greek *karpon*) i.e., "fruit" (singular).

yourselves (*eautois* i.e., plural), We have (*echomen* i.e., plural) Abraham to our father: for I say unto you (*umin* i.e., plural), that God is able of these stones (*lithon* i.e., plural) to raise up children (*tekna* i.e., plural) to Abraham.” St. John the Baptist then moves from a plural to a singular image in Matt. 3:10, saying, “And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees (*dendron*, plural): therefore every tree (*dendron*, singular) which bringeth not forth good fruit (*karpon* i.e., singular) is hewn down, and cast into the fire.”

Therefore, to switch from addressing a group (plural) in Matt. 3:7, to a singular “fruit” in Matt. 3:8, then back to a group (plural) in Matt. 3:9, seems incongruous. At the very least it creates an ambiguity, in which John the Baptist’s words could be taken to mean that a corporate group (plural) produce a singular “fruit.” This is a fundamental absurdity. It is not the only interpretation, and the fact that “fruit” is in some contexts a singular plural (e.g., Gal. 5:22), means one could bring this interpretation to the reading “fruit” here to try and save it. But such an interpretation, while possible, seems to strain at the text. Thus while the reading of the Byzantine Greek Text is not impossible, it seems strained *in this context*. The full force of this is evident in the words of Matt. 3:8, “Bring forth (*poiesate* i.e., a “you” plural form of *poieo*, so literally, “You” plural “bring forth”) therefore fruit (*karpon* i.e., singular) meet for repentance.” This reading, while theoretically possible, seems very peculiar, and the more natural expectation would surely be, “Bring forth (*poiesate* i.e., a “you” plural form of *poieo*, so literally, “You” plural “bring forth”) therefore fruits (*karpous* i.e., plural) meet for repentance.”

Hence when we read the learned church doctor and bishop, St. John Chrysostom, quoting Matt. 3:8 as, “Bring forth fruits (*karpous*) meet (*axious*) of repentance” (*Gospel of St. Matthew*, Homily 10, section 3); and likewise again quoting as “fruits (*karpous*) meet (*axious*) of repentance” later from Matt. 3:8 (*Ibid.*, section 7 or 8); these readings seem far more likely to be reflecting the correct reading of Matt. 3:8<sup>34</sup>.

That in fact “fruits” (plural) is the more natural reading in this context, is also evident from comparative analysis with Luke 3:7-9. It is the mistake of those seeking “parallel readings,” to try and equate readings such as Matt. 3:7-10 with readings like Luke 3:7-9, and claim they are the same event. Jesus’ Ministry spanned some three and half years, not some three and half months. Repetition is a great teaching method. Christ often repeated the same parables, or the Lord’s Prayer, in different contexts, and different times, slightly changing them for emphasis on different occasions. We might have a record in three different synoptic gospels of the same parable told on three different occasions; yet even this is as selection, since he almost certainly told it on many other occasions, in many other contexts, with many other minor variations. Those who try to claim “Bible blunders” by comparing such accounts have an overly simplistic view with their so called “parallel accounts” (cf. comments at Matt. 4:10).

Certainly I do not think Matt. 3:7-10 and Luke 3:7-9 were said at the same time. Nevertheless, they cover some common language and teaching applied by John the Baptist. The

---

<sup>34</sup> St. Chrysostom in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1860 Paris First Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 57, p. 187 (Gospel of St. Matthew, Homily 10:3); p. 190 (Gospel of St. Matthew, Homily 10:8 [or 7]) (Greek); Schaff, P., (Editor), *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, [first series,] 1887, reprint Eerdmans, Michigan, USA, 1956, Vol. 10, p. 63 (Gospel of St. Matthew, Homily 10:3), p. 66 (Gospel of St. Matthew, Homily 10:7 [or 8]).

fact that using similar language, St. John the Baptist says in Luke 3:8 “fruits (*karpous*) worthy (*axious*) of repentance;” means that we have an authoritative basis for saying that “fruits” makes more sense in the context of the type of language found in Matt. 3:7-10 and Luke 3:7-9.

A further consideration of relevance, is the question of where the reading “fruit” (singular) might have come from to have been placed in Matt. 3:8. Certainly we do not have to look very far, for we find in Matt. 3:10 when John the Baptist moves to the singular image of the “tree,” he then refers to “good fruit” (*karpon* i.e., singular). Thus a copyist seeking to “harmonize” Matt. 3:8 with Matt. 3:10, may well have changed the plural “fruits” in Matt. 3:8 to the singular “fruit” as an assimilation from Matt. 3:10. Certainly this same thing occurred at Luke 3:8 where some sources outside the closed class of three sources, sought to make “fruits” in Luke 3:8 into a singular “fruit” (see commentary at Luke 3:8). However, the converse i.e., that the plural “fruits” of Matt. 3:8 was an assimilation to Luke 3:8, seems unlikely, since if such an assimilation was being made, we would expect a greater attempt to assimilate such other differences as “think not” (*me doxete*) (Matt. 3:9) and “begin not” (*me arxesthe*) (Luke 3:8).

Therefore, on the one hand, the reading “fruits” in Matt. 3:8 firstly, is preferable on the basis of greater literary stylistic consistency in the usage of singulars and plurals in Matt. 3:7-10. Secondly, this conclusion is authoritatively substantiated by comparative analysis with the usage of “fruits” in Luke 3:7-9, which though said by the same person on a different occasion clearly uses very similar, and usually the same, language. Thirdly, this construction plausibly explains the origins of the variant singular “fruit” reading from assimilation with Matt. 3:10; whereas the converse possibility of an assimilation of “fruits” in Matt. 3:8 from Luke 3:8, fails to explain why other differences between these two passages were left. But on the other hand, the preponderance of the Greek and Latin manuscript support is with the variant singular reading, “fruit;” whereas the plural “fruits” in Matt. 3:8 was preserved over the centuries with accessibility through the centuries in a relatively small number of ancient and early mediaeval church writings, such as those of the church doctors, St. John Chrysostom and St. Gregory the Great respectively.

Though its attestation in the Greek is weak, it nevertheless always had accessibility through reference to the church father and ancient church doctor, St. John Chrysostom. And though it is a minority Latin reading, it is known from very early times through Tertullian, from ancient times in old Latin Version a; and in addition to some later old Latin Versions, it had accessibility through reference to the early mediaeval church doctor, St. Gregory. When to these factors are added the stylistic considerations in its favour, *supra*, then balancing out these considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s plural reading, “fruits” in Matt. 3:8 a low level “B” (in the range of 66% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of three sources, the correct reading at Matt. 3:8, “fruits,” is found in (the mixed text type) Manuscript L 019 (Paris, 8th century), Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 828 (12th century, independent); and the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century). Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century) also reads in the Arabic, “Do now the fruits which are worthy of repentance” (Hogg). In

Ciasca's Latin it reads, "*Facite* (Bring forth) *ergo* (therefore) *fructus* (fruits<sup>35</sup>) *dignos* (worthy)" etc. .

However, the incorrect reading, "fruit," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); a later supplement to the leading representative of the Western text, Manuscript D 05 (5th century); the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Memphilitica (3rd century) Versions, and a Syriac Version (Ephraemum Edessenum, 4th century). The strong manuscript support for the incorrect reading, "fruit" (singular) in the Alexandrian Text and elsewhere, led to its adoption in the NU Text *et al.* As in the ASV, it is accordingly found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

Burgon claimed, "the '*Textus Receptus*' ..., calls for ... revision," "upon the" basis of the "majority of authorities" (*Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, pp. 13,15); and thus Burgon's proud boast was this, "Again and again we shall have occasion to point out ... that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction" (*Revision Revised*, p. 21). Burgon & Miller (1899), as later followed by Hodges & Farstad and Robinson and Pierpont (2005), here seek to strike down the Received Text, on the basis that it is not the majority text reading.

On this occasion, the Received Text is like a prize boxer who agrees to fight two men in a row, following an intermission break of 15 minutes. Like a champion boxer, here at Matt. 3:8, the TR boxer first hits the boxer Burgon, and Burgon starts to see stars. Then with a finishing blow Burgon is knocked to the boxing ring's canvas by the TR boxer for the count of ten. The referee cannot revive him, and Burgonites under Miller's direction run into the ring to carry him out on a stretcher back into the change rooms. But before the TR boxer can catch its breath, the neo-Alexandrian boxer enters the ring to the TR's boxer's back, and an offsider quickly rings the bell with no 15 minute intermission, so that as the TR boxer turns he is, the neo-Alexandrian boxer hopes, to be caught off guard. But as the neo-Alexandrian boxer now lunges a hard right fist, it emerges that unbeknown to him, he does not know that the adroit TR boxer saw a signal given to ring the second starter bell early, and heard his approaching feet. The TR boxer is ready. He blocks the neo-Alexandrian boxer's punches, and smashes him into the canvas for the count of 10. NU Text stretcher-bearers run into the ring to retrieve their man. As the crowd applauds, the referee holds up the hand of the TR boxer and declares, "Once again the *Textus Receptus* has proven that it needs no correction from Burgon! And it needs no correction from the Neo-Alexandrians, either!!!" *The crowd erupts in thunderous applause.*

**Matt. 3:10** "also" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek reading, "*kai* (also)," in the words, "*ede* (now) *de* (and) *kai* (also)" i.e., "And now also" in Matt. 3:10, is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century).

By contrast, Greek "*kai* (also)," in Matt. 3:10 is omitted in a minority Byzantine reading, found in the Byzantine Text's Codex W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke

---

<sup>35</sup> The Latin *fructus* is a plural accusative (as indeed is the TR's Greek *karpous*) i.e., "fruits" (plural). Ciasca's Latin is the normative reading. Compare the old Latin, "*fructos dignos*," at Preliminary Textual Discussion, *supra*.

8:13-24:53). It is also omitted in the Latin reading, “*Iam* (now) *securis* (the axe),” of the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604). It is likewise omitted by the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century) and Origen (d. 254).

Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), like most of the old Latin Versions; as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century), reads, “*Iam* (now) *enim* (for) *securis* (the axe)” i.e., “For now the axe” etc. . From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). However, old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries) and d (5th century), read, “*Iam* (now) *autem* (but),” i.e., “But now the axe” etc. . The Greek *kai* and *de* are two of the most common and elastic words in the NT. Depending upon context, either word can mean e.g., “and,” “even,” “but,” “also,” “both,” “for,” *et al.* On the basis that the Latin *enim* meaning “for” translated either the Greek *kai* or *de* here, (or Latin “*autem*” in k and d), it follows that if Jerome was following a Greek text that read, “And (*de*) now (*ede*) also (*kai*),” either the “And” (*kai*) or “also” (*de*) in Matt. 3:10 was first translated as “for” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, and then the other one was regarded as redundant. Alternatively, Jerome translated from a Greek text that simply read, “And (*de*) now (*ede*).” In Luke 3:9, once again with majority Byzantine Text support, this same Greek terminology occurs i.e., “And (*de*) now (*ede*) also (*kai*);” yet once again the same Latin is used in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate i.e., “*iam* (now) *enim* (for) *securis* (the axe),” although on this occasion, without the support of the old Latin Versions, whose more common reading at Luke 3:9, is Latin, “*Iam* (now) *autem* (but) *securis* (the axe).” Since the Byzantine Greek reading at Luke 3:9 which includes “also” (*kai*) in the text is not disputed, it follows that Jerome necessarily translated either the Greek *kai* or *de* here as “for” (Latin *enim*), and considered the other redundant. (So too, the old Latin translators either did the same, or copied from a Latin manuscript that had done likewise.) This means that one cannot with any confidence use Jerome’s Latin Vulgate in support of either variant at Matt. 3:10, since it cannot be determined whether his text read “And (*de*) now (*ede*) also (*kai*)” (TR) at Matt. 3:10, as it did at Luke 3:9; or simply read at Matt. 3:10, “And (*de*) now (*ede*).”

The usage of *kai* and *de* together like this, is certainly within Matthean terminology. The Greek *kai* and *ego* meaning “I,” are sometimes united together to form the Greek *kago* meaning “And I,” or “But I,” or “I also,” etc. (This Greek union of *kai* and *ego* to form *kago*, is something like putting “I” and “am” together in English to form “I’m,” or “do” and “not” together in English to form “don’t.”) In Matt. 16:18 we read, literally, “And I (*kago*) also (*de*) to thee (*soi*) I say (*lego*),” i.e., “And I say also unto thee” (AV). Thus we find the close usage of “And” (*kai* here in *kago*) and “also” (*de*) in Matt. 16:18, is strikingly similar to the usage of these two words together in Matt. 3:10 i.e., “And (*de*) now (*ede*) also (*kai*).” Furthermore, there can be no serious textual arguments raised against the propriety of the Greek terminology, “And (*de*) now (*ede*) also (*kai*)” in Matt. 3:10, since all accept the propriety of this same terminology in a similar context in Luke 3:9.

Since there are no good textual reasons to move away from the representative Byzantine Text at Matt. 3:10, the reading of the Byzantine Text must stand. Was the omission accidental, resulting from a paper fade / loss? Was the omission deliberate, with a scribe considering the existence of both *kai* and *de* “unnecessary,” and so he pruned it away as “redundant;” and if so, was this first done by Origen? This tendency is clearly seen in the fact that Jerome’s Latin Vulgate indisputably did this very thing at Luke 3:9. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “also” (*kai*) in Matt. 3:8 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

The correct reading at Matt. 3:8, “also” in the words, “And now also,” is found outside the closed class of three sources in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (Paris, 8th century), and the Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century). Showing that the Arabic Diatessaron is not always Pesittoized, the incorrect reading which omits “also,” is found in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), which reads, “Behold (Latin, *Ecce*) the axe (Latin, *securis*)” etc. . This incorrect reading, which omits “also” (*kai*) is additionally found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); as well as the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century); and Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century).

The shorter text is the type of thing generally appealing to the Alexandrian prunists, and it passed from such unreliable sources into the NU Text *et al.* Nevertheless, the correct reading was retained in the ASV which reads, “And even (*kai*) now” (ASV); though the shorter incorrect reading is found at Matt. 3:10 in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

**Matt. 3:11** “and *with* fire” (TR & AV) {A}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

As occurs also in other instances, no reference is made to Manuscript Washington on this reading by Swanson or other textual apparatuses used by me. But I refer to it on this occasion, as the obscuration of one part of one letter, may give rise to unwarranted doubts about its reading in the minds of some unreasonable persons.

Inspection of *Codex Freerianus* at the page showing Matt. 3:11-4:3, contains the relevant words. In the TR we read, “*Pneumati* (the Ghost) *Agiō* (Holy) *kai* (and) *puri* (fire)” i.e., “the Holy Ghost, and [with] fire.” In *Codex Freerianus*, coming at the end of the first line of this page, we read with a bar over the top of it, “*Pni*” i.e., an abbreviation for “*Pneumati* (the Ghost).” On line 2, we then read “*Agiō*.” There is then a bar on the left, that looks like the left-hand bar of a “K” (kappa). The rest of this letter is no longer legible. The following two letters are clearly, “*ai*,” and the next word is clearly, “*puri*.” Therefore we cannot reasonably doubt, that this manuscript supports the TR’s reading.

For those of us in a computer age with right hand justified pages, we need to remember the protrusions of handwritten pages. These are found throughout Manuscript Washington; though sometimes they are even more pronounced than at other times (cf. preliminary textual discussion at Matt. 1:25). For instance, on the page containing Matt. 16:7-18, at Matt. 16:18, the “*legō*” of “*kagō* (And I) *de* (also) *soi* (unto thee) *legō* (I say)” i.e., “And I say unto thee” (AV), protrudes about three letters further than normal. Seemingly, the scribe coming to the end of the page, wanted to fit “*legō*” on that page, and so even though he was running out of space, he squeezed it in. Thus the unusual protrusion of “*legō*,” on the last line of this page.

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt 3:11, the TR’s Greek “*kai* (and) *puri* (fire),” or with the added “with” in the AV’s

italics indicating that this word is added for clarification by the translators, “and *with* fire,” in the words, “with the Holy Ghost, and with fire,” is a minority Byzantine reading, found e.g., in Codices W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-24; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), K 017 (*Codex Cyprius*, 9th century), M 021 (*Codex Campianus*, 9th century), U 030 (*Codex Nanius*, 9th century), Pi 041 (*Codex Petropolitanus*, 9th century), and Gamma 036 (*Codex Oxoniensis Bodleianus*, 10th century). It is also found as “*in* (in) *Spiritu* (Ghost) *Sancto* (Holy) *et* (and) *igni* (fire),” i.e., “in the Holy Ghost and fire,” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century); and with minor variation as “*in* (in) *Spiritu* (Ghost) *Sancto* (Holy) *et* (and) *in* (in) *igni* (fire),” i.e., “in the Holy Ghost and in fire,” in old Latin Version c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Justin Martyr (d. c. 165), Origen (d. 254), Eusebius (d. 339), and Cyril (d. 444); the ancient church Latin writers, Cyprian (d. 258) and Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604)<sup>36</sup>.

However, it is not found in the majority Byzantine Text. It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century) and Theophilus (d. 181); and ancient church Latin writer, Tertullian (d. after 220).

Three textual factors indicate a problem in the representative Byzantine Text that lead us to adopt the reading, “and fire” in this instance.

Firstly, in Matt. 3:11 we have the symbolism of “water” baptism representing “repentance.” This is then contrasted with “Holy Ghost” baptism, and one would logically and stylistically therefore expect the symbol of this to then be referred to. That symbol of the Holy Ghost would probably be either “oil” such as used in the OT sanctuary “lamp” (Exod. 27:20), or a flame, such as used in the OT sanctuary lamp (Exod. 27:20) or found in the “cloven tongues” “of fire” on “the day of Pentecost” (Acts 2:1,3). Thus the reading, “with (/ in) the Holy Ghost

---

<sup>36</sup> In an incomplete quote, Bishop Gregory lacks reference to “*et* (and)” and only uses the words “*in* (with) *igne* (fire).” See Migne “*in igne* ... (Matth. III,11,16).” (As noted by Migne in 79:529, contextually citing from St. Matthew’s Gospel per Matt. 10:16 before this introduced as Christ’s “disciple” i.e., this is not from Luke 3:16, which in the Vulgate also lacks the “*in*.”)

and fire” in Matt. 3:11, is more expected than the representative Byzantine Greek reading, “with the Holy Ghost.”

Secondly, we cannot doubt that the work of “repentance” baptism, wrought through the Ministry of John the Baptist, was a work of the Holy Ghost. Of St. John Baptist is it said, “he shall be filled with Holy Ghost even from his mother’s womb” (Luke 1:15), and that in him, “Elias is come” (Matt. 17:12) in fulfilment of Mal. 4:5,6; for he came “in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord” (Luke 1:17). Therefore, the sentence in the representative Byzantine Greek of Matt. 3:11 falls flat at “Holy Ghost,” since we are first told one who “is mightier” is coming, and then that his work is not mightier than that of St. John Baptist because like him, he “shall baptize” “with the Holy Ghost,” which thing John the Baptist was most assuredly doing when he preached a “water” baptism of “repentance.”

Thus, the stylistic expectation at the close of Matt. 3:11, is that we will read something like, Christ “shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost *in greater power.*” This expectation is met in the longer reading, since to say that Christ “shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost *and fire*” is capable of meaning, the Holy Spirit of God *in greater power.* This was clearly seen from Pentecost Sunday (Acts 2) onwards, when the great truths of the gospel being now clearly evident with the earthly ministry, atonement, and resurrection of Christ now completed, the Holy Ghost could “teach” “all things” (John 14:26). Hence once again, we find that the reading, “with (/ in) the Holy Ghost and fire” in Matt. 3:11, is stylistically more expected than the representative Byzantine Greek reading, “with the Holy Ghost.”

Thirdly, we have confirmation that the words “and fire” stylistically fit, and logically come after, “he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost” in Matt. 3:11, because we find in the similar words of John the Baptist, said at a different time to a different group of people, the same irreducible elements in the similar formulae of words in Luke 3:16, “I indeed baptize you with water; but one mightier than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and (*kai*) with fire (*puri*).”

That Matt. 3:11 is not an assimilation to Luke 3:16, is seen by the continuing differences. Notably, in Matt. 3:11 the words, “unto repentance” after “I indeed baptize you with water,” are not found in Luke 3:16. It is these words that sometimes help identify a quote in the ancient church writers as being from either St. Matthew’s Gospel or St. Luke’s Gospel. E.g., Austin of Hippo (d. 430) quotes these words with “unto repentance” ending with “and with fire,” saying in Latin, “*Ego (I) vos (you) baptizo (baptize) in (in) aqua (water) paenitentiae (unto repentance) ..., ipse (he) vos (you) baptizat (shall baptize) in (in) Spiritu (Ghost) Sancto (Holy) et (and) igne (fire)*” i.e., “I baptize you in water unto repentance ... he shall baptize you in the Holy Ghost and fire.” Thus we know that St. Austin is here quoting Matt. 3:11, as rightly observed also by Migne (Augustine’s Works, Book 2, Chapter 32, Letter of Petilian)<sup>37</sup>.

Therefore, these three factors require the conclusion that the words “and fire” in Matt.

---

<sup>37</sup> St. Augustine in: Migne (Latin Writers Series) (1841 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 43, p. 283 (Letter of Petilian, 2:32) (Latin); Schaff, P., *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 4, p. 548 (English).

3:11 are original, and preserved from an early Greek text in St. Jerome's translation of the Latin Vulgate, in the Greek *Codex Rossanensis* (late 5th / 6th century), and among a number of ancient church Greek and Latin writers. If so, the question then arises, how did the words, "and fire," come to be omitted at Matt. 3:11? Two possibilities present themselves i.e., either deliberate or accidental omission.

It is possible that these words were deliberately omitted as a consequence of a scribe getting confused with the mixed metaphors dealing with "fire" in this passage. On the one hand, John Baptist used "fire" for the fires of hell, when immediately before Matt. 3:11 he says in Matt. 3:10, "every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire;" and then immediately after Matt. 3:11, he refers in Matt. 3:12 to Christ's "fan" dividing the "wheat" (saved persons) and "chaff" (unsaved persons), and saying "He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." The metaphor of a "tree" being "cast into the fire" of hell (Matt. 3:10), or "chaff" being burnt in the "fire" of hell (Matt. 3:12); may have gotten mixed up in a scribe's mind, with the very different metaphor of Matt. 3:11, in which "fire" is used as a symbol of the "Holy Ghost," bringing greater truths than John Baptist brought to the hearts and minds of repentant and saved persons. If so, in the confusion a scribe may have omitted "and fire" in Matt. 3:11, on the basis it "just had to be an addition to the text," because the "fire" of hell (Matt. 3:10,12) would not be the lot of the saved who would receive "Holy Ghost" baptism (Matt. 3:11). If so, it was evidently a different scribe who copied out Luke 3:16.

The possibility of accidental omission also presents itself. Let us consider the words of Matt. 3:11,12 "shoes ... worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire. Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge ... ." It is possible that the lines before a scribe of the Greek text looked something like the following, for the words, "worthy (*ikanos*)" "the (*ta*) shoes (*upodemata*) to bear (*bastasai*): he (*autos*) you (*umas*) shall baptize (*baptisei*) with (or 'in,' *en*) the Ghost (*Pneumati*) Holy (*Agiō*), and (*kai*) [with] fire (*puri*): whose (literally, 'of whom,' *ou*) fan (*to ptuon*) [is] in (*en*) hand (*te cheiri*) his (*autou*), and (*kai*) he will thoroughly purge (*diakathariei*) ..." etc.

*ikanos ta upodemata bastasai autos  
umas baptisei en Pneumati Agiō kai puri  
ou to ptuon en te cheiri autou kai  
diakathariei ...*

For such a conjectural construction to be plausible, it must first be asked, why would the words *kai puri* constitute such an extrusion in the first place? The Latin word "codex" can mean a "book." While manuscripts were earlier written on scrolls e.g., the Dead Sea Scrolls of about 100 B.C., writers more generally moved to a codex or book form, in which writing was placed on both sides of a papyrus sheet, from about the third century A.D. . However, the codex form was certainly used before this time. Notably, the Ryland's African fragment, dated to the first half of the first century A.D., is clearly in codex or book form (see comments at John 18:31-33,37,38). If the words *kai puri* were at the very bottom of the page, the writer may have decided to squeeze in the *puri* before he turned the sheet over to continue writing *ou to* etc. This could thus explain the unusual extrusion. But it could also explain another matter. The papyrus sheets were perishable material, and holes could develop in them. The outer bottom right hand of the page at the edge of the sheet, might be more vulnerable to being ripped or falling off, due to weakening as a consequence of pressure as people repeatedly lifted the bottom right hand corner of the page

to turn the page. Thus with a paper loss in the bottom right hand corner of the page, the bottom right hand corner of the first page may have looked like:

*ikanos ta upodemata bastasai autos  
umas baptisei en Pneumati Agio :::::*

and the top of the next page like:

*ou to ptuon en te cheiri autou kai  
diakathariei ... etc. .*

If so, the fact that before careful consideration, *prima facie* the sentence may seem to make sense, may have led a copyist to think nothing had been lost in the paper loss at the bottom right hand corner of the page, and thus the words *kai puri* may have been accidentally lost.

Was “and fire” deliberately omitted by a scribe misunderstanding the mixed metaphoric usage of “fire” in Matt. 3:10-12? Or was “and fire” accidentally omitted from the outer right hand bottom corner of a decaying codex leaf? A deliberate omission or an accidental omission? We cannot now be sure. We only know that it omitted.

On the one hand, the reading “and fire” in Matt. 3:11 is the better reading since on the basis of literary stylistic textual analysis it relieves a problem presented by the representative Byzantine text, and this better reading was clearly known from Greek manuscripts in the 4th and 5th centuries by the ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (347-419/420). Its presence in St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate meant there was reasonable accessibility to this reading over the centuries through to the sixteenth century; and also from the writings of ancient church writers who supported this reading such as the church fathers, St. Justin and St. Cyprian; and the church father and doctor, St. Augustine of Hippo; and then in early mediaeval times with the church doctor, St. Gregory the Great; before the reading entered the formally composed Textus Receptus. It is also supported as a minority Byzantine reading by the purple parchment, *Codex Rossanensis*. But on the other hand, the reading “and fire” in Matt. 3:11 is omitted in the representative Byzantine Text. It might be argued that its standing as a minority Byzantine reading means on the system of rating textual readings A to E, it should be given a high level “B” (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty. But its attestation from the second and third centuries in both Greek (St. Justin Martyr) and Latin (St. Cyprian) writers, its strong attestation in the Latin textual tradition in general, and St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate in particular, means that balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “and fire” in Matt. 3:11 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of three sources, the incorrect shorter reading in Matt. 3:11 which omits, “and fire,” is found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Slavic (Slavonic) Version (9th century). However, the correct reading, “and fire” is found in a later supplement to the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (as the original is missing at this point in the manuscript); as well as in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century). It is

further found in the Sahidic (3rd century) Egyptian Coptic Version, and Syriac's Syrus Curentonianus *Vetus Syra* Version (3rd / 4th). With strong attestation in the leading Alexandrian texts, for the wrong reasons, the correct reading entered the NU Text *et al*, and so the correct reading is found with "in" in italics as "and in fire" in the ASV. The correct reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV

Burghon & Miller (1899) say of these TR words, "Omit." But Miller makes the qualification that "Burghon" "suggested" this "doubtfully." However, Burghon's later followers are more bold, since it is clear that e.g., Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005) express no such doubts. So too, the Burghonite Majority Text's *New King James Version*, says here at Matt. 3:11, that the "M[ajority]-Text omits 'and fire'," and it says in its Preface that the "Majority Text" "corrects" the "Textus Receptus" in "those readings which have little or no support in the Greek manuscript tradition."

On the one hand, Burghonites like Theodore Letis come in as a plague against the Received Text on Scriptures such as Matt. 3:11, prattling and prancing their intellectually and spiritually inferior minds against a man like Theodore Beza of Geneva, whose great and godly mind, by the grace of God, subjected to the Lord, was illuminated to understand textual analysis in a way that a man like Letis does not even begin to comprehend. For which reason, Letis perpetrates the most horrendous and wicked lies against Beza, which essentially portray him as a Majority Text advocate whose fumbling fascination for some non-majority readings got the better of him, so he fumbled, and stumbled, and bumbled by e.g., letting in I John 5:7,8<sup>38</sup>. What absolute balderdash! Letis lacks the spiritual and intellectual nous to understand what he is talking about.

On the other hand, Burghonites like David Ottis Fuller, come in as a plague against Saint Jerome's Vulgate. Is he so arrogant as to think that his spiritual and intellectual gifts even begin to compare with those of this great church father and doctor? In the context of the OT canon of Scripture, at a confessional level, the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* makes reference to the orthodox position of "Hierome" or Jerome (Article 6). Does Fuller think that these godly Anglican Reformers would ever confer such an honour on a Burghonite like him? It is one thing to disagree with this or that reading of the Vulgate for good textual cause, based on analysis of the Greek text, it is another thing to generally speak of the Latin Vulgate in the disgracefully derogatory and shockingly dishonest manner that Fuller does<sup>39</sup>!

On the left side, the pestilence of the Burghonite Letis, simply refers to some "thousands" of texts that are in error; and on the right side, the plague of the Burghonite Fuller, simply refers to some "thousands" of texts that are in error. Now on a pastoral application of Psalm 91, (as

---

<sup>38</sup> Letis, T., *The Majority Text*, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

<sup>39</sup> Fuller, D.O. *Which Bible?* *op. cit.*, pp. 32-3; 89; 219-21.

opposed to a propounding of the Scripture in terms of its immediate meaning,) what saith the Word of the Lord about such things? “Thou shalt not be afraid ... for the pestilence that walketh in darkness; nor for the destruction that wasteth at noonday. A thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand; but it shall not come nigh thee.” “Because thou hast made the Lord, which is my refuge, even the most High, thy habitation” (Ps. 91:5,6,9).

Good Christian reader, do you think I am too stern with Burgonites like Letis and Fuller? It is because I have been “baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire” (Matt. 3:11). These men seek to take “the fire” power out of the Scripture. But that “fire proceedeth out of” the “mouth” of “the two candlesticks” i.e., the OT and NT (Ps. 119:105,130), and “if any man will hurt” the OT and NT, as these Burgonites seek to, “fire proceedeth out of their mouth, and devoureth their enemies: and if any man will hurt them, he must in this manner be killed” (Rev. 11:4,5).

**Matt. 3:12** “his ... into the garner” (TR & AV) {A}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

Inside the closed class of sources, *prima facie* the Latin reading of Gregory the Great, “*in* (into) *horrio* (the garner) *suo* (of him),” supports the TR. However, Luke 3:17 also reads, Latin, “*in* (into) *horreum* (the garner) *suum* (his)” (Vulgate). Since it is not possible to know if Bishop Gregory is here drawing from Matt. 3:12 or Luke 3:17 or both, no reference is made to St. Gregory, *infra*.

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 3:12, the TR’s Greek words, “*autou* (‘his,’ literally, ‘of him,’) ... *eis* (into) *ten* (the) *apotheken* (garner barn),” in the words, “and gather *his* wheat *into the garner*” (AV), are supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). They also appear as “*suum* (his) *in* (into) *horreum* (the garner),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century); and in old Latin Versions d (Cambridge 5th century & Paris 5th / 6th centuries), f (Brescia 6th century & Cambridge 9th century), aur (7th century), l (Leon 7th century & Berlin 8th century), and c (12th / 13th centuries). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). They are further found in writings of the ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367) and Augustine (d. 430).

There are a further three variant readings. The first variant, is followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Justin Martyr (d. 165), Irenaeus (2nd century), and Clement (d. 444); as well as the old Latin Versions, a (4th century) and q (Munich 6th / 7th centuries & Munich 7th century). It reads, in Greek, “*eis* (into) *ten* (the) *apotheken* (garner),” i.e., “gather the wheat into the garner” (Variant 1). The second variant, followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century) and Cyril (d. 386), and ancient church Latin writer, Ambrose (d. 397); reads, in Greek, “*eis* (into) *ten* (the) *apotheken* (garner) *autou* (of him)” i.e., “gather the wheat into his garner” (Variant 2). The third variant, found in the Byzantine Text’s Codex W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), adds “*autou* (‘his,’ literally, ‘of him,’)” and reads, in Greek, “*autou* (of him) ... *eis* (into) *autou* (of him) *ten* (the) *apotheken* (garner)” i.e., “gather his wheat into *his* garner.”

Whether like Erasmus of Rotterdam, one determines the representative Byzantine Text from a small number of select manuscripts probably numbering less than about a dozen; whether like Beza of Geneva, or the Elzevirs of Leiden, or the AV translators under the Protestant Crown of England, Ireland, and Scotland, one determines the representative Byzantine Text from at least a couple of dozen, but up to 3 or 4 dozen or so manuscripts; or whether such as in contemporary times one determines the representative Byzantine Text from a majority Byzantine Text count of about 900 to 1,000 of von Soden's K group manuscripts such as Robinson & Pierpont, ultimately matters not. In all such instances, God has put in place a system that allows the determination of the representative Byzantine Text. On general principles, one only moves away from that representative Byzantine Text, to another reading inside the closed class of sources preserved over the centuries with reasonable accessibility, when compelled to do so by textual considerations. No such textual considerations can here be reasonably adduced, and so the representative Byzantine reading must surely stand. This was the conclusion of Beza and the AV translators, and this is my conclusion too.

As to the origin of the variants, was Variant 1, "gather the wheat into the garner," a stylistic pruning of the "unnecessary verbiage" of "his" before "wheat"? Or was it an accidental loss of "*autou* (his)" e.g., in an undetected paper? Variant 2, "gather the wheat into his garner," appears to be an assimilation with Luke 3:17, where we also read, "gather the wheat into his garner." Variant 3, i.e., "gather his wheat into his garner," appears to be a conflation of Matt. 3:12 with Luke 3:17, keeping the "his" before the "wheat" from Matt. 3:12, but adding to it the "his" before the "garner" from Luke 3:17.

The words, "his ... into the garner" in the words, "and gather *his* wheat *into the garner*," are found in the representative Byzantine Text, Jerome's Latin Vulgate, and quoted by the ancient church writer, the learned Augustine of Hippo. There is no good textual cause to doubt them. In a disputed passage, what better combination of sources and textual argument could one ever possibly have? On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading, "his ... into the garner" in Matt. 3:12 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of three sources, the correct reading at Matt. 3:12, "his ... into the garner," in the words, "and gather *his* wheat *into the garner*" (Matt. 3:12), is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century), (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), and a later supplement to the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (as the original is missing at this point in the manuscript). Support for the reading is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.

Variant 1, "gather the wheat into the garner," is found in two of the Georgian Versions (called "1" and "A") of Transcaucasia (5th century). Variant 2, "gather the wheat into his garner," is found in some of the Syrian Versions, namely, the *Vetus Syra* (3rd / 4th) in both the Syrus Sinaiticus and Syrus Curetonianus, Pesitto Version (first half 5th century), and Syriac Harclean h Version (616). It also appears in the Armenian Version (5th century). Variant 3, i.e., "gather his wheat into his garner," has the support of one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as some Ethiopic Versions (from about 500); and the

Georgian Version “B” (5th century).

As seen from Metzger’s Textual Commentary (1971), the NU Text Committee were partly influenced by the wrong reasons, namely, the attestation of “his ... into the garner” in sources outside the closed class of the three witnesses, such as one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century), the (mixed text type) C 04, or the Coptic Sahidic and Bohairic Versions. But they were also partly influenced by the right reasons, namely, the attestation of “his ... into the garner,” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate and some old Latin Versions; as well as textual considerations indicating that this was the most likely reading. Thus for partly the right reasons, and partly the wrong reasons, on this occasion, the correct reading, entered the NU Text. However, the fact that in the UBS 3rd corrected edition, they gave this reading a “C,” meaning, “the Committee had difficulty in deciding which variant to place in the text,” means that we cannot be sure that another Committee will not change its mind on this matter in the future.

Reflecting such confusion, the NIV 1st edition followed Variant 2, translating Matt. 3:12 as “gathering wheat into his barn” (NIV 1st ed.); while the NIV 2nd edition followed the NU Text’s preferred reading, as “gathering his wheat into the barn (NIV 2nd ed.). The NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV, also followed the preferred reading of the NU Text *et al*, and on this occasion, correct reading of the main text; and in this respect were like their originating American Standard Version, which reads, “gather his wheat into the garner” (ASV).

**Matt. 3:16a** “unto him” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek words, “*auto* (unto him),” in the words, “the heavens were opened unto him,” are found in the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Codices W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and the purple parchment, Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). They are also supported as Latin, “*ei* (unto him),” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). They are further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century), Eusebius (d. 339), Basil the Great (d. 379), Pseudo-Justin (4th / 5th centuries), and Chrysostom (d. 407); together with the ancient church Latin writers, Chromatius (d. 407), Jerome (d. 420), Augustine (d. 430), and Speculum (5th century).

However, the words “unto him” are omitted in some Latin Vulgate manuscripts. They are also omitted by the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation (c. 395), and Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386); and the ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367) and Pseudo-Vigilius (4th / 5th century).

There is no good textual reason to question the representative Byzantine Text reading “unto him” at Matt. 3:16a. The origins of this variant are speculative. Was it accidental loss due to a paper loss / fade of “*auto* (unto him)”? Was it a deliberate omission of “unto him” as an assimilation of the text to Luke 3:21, which reads simply, “heaven was opened”? If so, then why was “heavens” left in the plural in Matt. 3:16a, rather than the singular of Luke 3:21? If

deliberate, it seems the more probable explanation is that the omission of “unto him,” was a pruning away of what was regarded by a scribe as “unnecessary” wordage in the text. We cannot be sure as the variant’s origins. We only know that at some point this omission occurred.

With no good textual reason to doubt the reading, which has the support of the representative Byzantine Text, St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, and such notable ancient church fathers as St. Basil the Great, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, and St. Austin, the reading of the Greek *Textus Receptus* is unquestionably correct. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “unto him” in Matt. 3:16a an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

The correct reading at Matt. 3:16a, “unto him,” was preserved outside the closed class of sources in the (mixed text type) C 04 (5th century), and a later supplement to the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (as the original is missing at this point in the manuscript). It is further found in the Syriac: Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (c. 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; as well as the Armenian Version (5th century), Ethiopic Version (c. 500), and Georgian Version (5th century).

The incorrect reading, which omits “unto him” in Matt. 3:16a, is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). The omission also occurs in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century); and Georgian Version “B” (5th century).

With such strong support from the Alexandrian Text, “unto him” was omitted in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle’s 21st edition (1952); and it is clear that the NU Text Committee were also influenced by these considerations. But the force of the argument for pruning here was considered so strong, that at least on this occasion, the NU Text Committee did not follow Westcott-Hort or Nestle’s 21st edition (both of which place the TR’s reading in a footnote,) in omitting the TR’s reading outright. Rather, they put “unto him” in the main text, but enclosed it with square brackets i.e., “[*auto*].” Such confusion is also reflected in the ASV which has the correct reading, “unto him,” in the main text, but has a footnote saying, “Some ancient authorities omit ‘unto him’.” The parent ASV’s position was reversed in the RSV, which omits these words, thus making the ASV footnote the main RSV reading, and then making the ASV’s main reading an RSV footnote. Whereas the NRSV simply put the correct reading in the main text; the ESV followed the ASV’s format with a footnote referring to its omission in some manuscripts.

Given such uncertainties among neo-Alexandrians such as the NU Text composers, we ought not to be surprised that since Nestle’s first edition (1898) was published, there have been some twenty-seven editions with various revisions. And if the Lord tarries, we can only guess how many more editions there will be before Doomsday. The fact that we see such changes as whether or not *auto* should be in the text, between Nestle’s 21st edition (1952) which omits “*auto*,” and Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) which places “*auto*” in square brackets, shows that different religiously liberal neo-Alexandrian textual critics may decide such matters differently at different times. Such indecision and variation is further seen in the fact that the

NASB and NIV which are both based on the NU Text, both decided to omit “unto him” at Matt. 3:16a; as also did Moffatt.

**Matt. 3:16b** “the Spirit of God” (TR & AV) {A}

In Matt. 3:16b, the TR’s Greek “*to* (the) *Pneuma* (Spirit) *tou* (-) *Theou* (of God),” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Hippolytus (d. 235) and Eusebius (d. 339).

However, both the first “the (*to*)” and second “the (*tou*),” are omitted by the ancient church Greek writer, Irenaeus (2nd century). The reading of Irenaeus, would make it theoretically possible to translate Matt. 3:16b as either, “a spirit of God” i.e., an angel (Heb. 1:7), or even “a spirit of a god;” although this would not be a necessary translation i.e., one could still render this, “the Spirit of God.” However, the wider context of St. Matthew’s Gospel militates against this. Not only are the three Persons of the Holy Trinity depicted together in Matt. 28:18-20; but in Matt.12:17,18 (quoting Isa. 11:2), we read that which “was spoken by Esaias the prophet,” namely, that God would “put my spirit upon” the Christ, and in the context of Matthew’s Gospel this must be therefore manifested in Matt. 3:16b. This conclusion is also consistent with Mark 1:10; Luke 3:22; John 1:32 where no dispute exists in the Greek that this is “*the*” Spirit of God.

Since there is no good textual reason to doubt the reading of the representative Byzantine Text, it must stand as the right reading. The origins of the variant are speculative. Were both lost due to a paper fade / loss? Or were both deliberately pruned away? If the latter, was this because they were thought of as redundant, or was this due to some heresy held by the pruning scribe? We cannot be sure as to the variant’s origins. We only know for sure that it is an alteration of the original text preserved for us here in the representative Byzantine text.

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “the Spirit of God” in Matt. 3:16b an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 3:16b, “the Spirit of God,” is also followed by (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), and a later supplement to the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (as the original is missing at this point in the manuscript). However, the incorrect reading of Matt. 3:16b is followed by the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with the Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century), which all omit “the” (*to* and *tou*) on both occasions. Influenced by such considerations, Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle’s 21st edition (1952) removes “the (*to*)” before “Spirit” and “the (*tou*)” before “God” (literally “of the God”); whereas Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and the UBS 4th revised edition (1993) place both the first “the (*to*)” and second “the (*tou*),” in square brackets i.e., indicating doubt as to their place in the text, and regarding their inclusion or omission as entirely optional.

Though this would make it theoretically possible to mistranslate the NU Text *et al* as either, “a spirit of God” i.e., an angel (Heb. 1:7), or even “a spirit of a god,” as discussed above, the wider context of St. Matthew’s Gospel militates against this. Thus it still remains reasonably possible from the context, to translate the NU Text as “the Spirit of God” (ASV). Thus the correct translation is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV (2nd ed).

When the context clearly points to the Holy Spirit, the AV sometimes uses a lower case “s” in “spirit,” for the Third Person of the Trinity (Isa. 11:2; 42:1; Matt. 12:18; I Cor. 2:12; 6:20). Concerning the specific terminology found in Matt. 3:16b, “Spirit of God,” when the context can only mean the Holy Spirit, the AV occasionally uses a lower case “s” for “spirit of God” (Exod. 31:3; 35:31; Num. 24:2). But more generally, the AV’s convention is to use the capital “S” in the terminology, “Spirit of God” (Gen. 1:2; 41:38; I Sam. 10:10; 11:6; 19:20,23; II Chron. 15:1; 24:20; Job 33:4; Ezek. 11:24; Matt. 3:16b; 12:28; Rom. 8:9,14; 15:19; I Cor. 2:11,14; 3:16; 6:11; 7:40; 12:3; Eph. 4:30; I John 4:2). This makes a clear distinction between the Holy Spirit i.e., “the Spirit of God,” as opposed to the breath that God gives a man, i.e., “the spirit of God” (Job 27:3).

Given that the reading of the NU Text allows the “spirit” of Matt. 3:16b to be either the Holy “Spirit,” or another “spirit,” presumably an angel i.e., “the spirit” or *the angel* “of God;” the usage of the lower case “s” in the NIV (1st ed.), which translates Matt. 3:16b as “the spirit of God” (NIV 1st ed.), seems designed to preserve some, though not all elements, of the Alexandrian Text’s and NU Text’s ambiguity. It stands in contrast with the NIV’s usage of the capital “S” for “Spirit” in Mark 1:10 (NIV), *et al*. The 1st edition NIV’s implication is, that Matt. 3:16b is ambiguous, and could mean either the Holy “Spirit of God” or “the spirit (angel) of God;” but that comparison with Mark 1:10; Luke 3:22; John 1:32 shows that this was the Holy Spirit. However, a religiously liberal heretic, could use these diverse NIV (1st ed.) readings, to falsely claim that there was a contradiction in the text of Scripture. I.e., he could claim Matthew says *the angel* or “the spirit of God” came down “like a dove” (Matt. 3:16b, NIV 1st ed.); whereas the other Gospel writers say that the Holy Spirit came down like a dove (Mark 1:10, NIV; Luke 3:22, NIV; John 1:32, NIV); and on this basis, he could falsely claim that he had found a so called “Bible blunder.”

Thus the 1st edition NIV’s translation of Matt. 3:16b (NIV 1st ed.), exposes one of the great dangers of the NU Text, namely, the heretical denial of Trinitarian Scriptures. This same danger is seen more widely in the NU Text’s omission of other Trinitarian Scriptures, in such passages as I Tim. 3:16; I John 5:7,8. (Cf. my comments at Matt. 1:2-20,23,24,25 on the danger of Arianism in the change of the TR’s “*genesis*” at Matt. 1:18, translated “birth” in the AV; and the NU Text’s “*genesis*,” also translated “birth” in the NASB and NIV.) With regard to Matt. 3:16b, let us stand fast in affirming the words of our Christian faith, found in Article 9 of the *Apostles’ Creed*, “I believe in the Holy Ghost.”

#### **Matt. 3:16c** “and” (TR & AV) {B}

The TR’s Greek, “*kai* (and),” in the words, “and lighting upon him” in Matt. 3:16c, is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also found as Latin, “*et*,” in old Latin Versions d (Cambridge 5th century & Paris 5th / 6th century), f (Brescia 6th century & Cambridge 9th century), and l (Leon

7th century & Berlin 8th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century), Basil the Great (d. 379), Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Proclus (d. 446); and the ancient church Latin writer, Speculum (5th century).

However, the “and” (Greek, *kai*; Latin, *et*) is omitted in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century). Its omission is also followed by old Latin Versions a (4th century), h (Paris 5th century & Rome 5th century), b (Verona 5th century & Budapest 8th / 9th centuries), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th centuries), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th centuries). It is further followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation (c. 395); and the ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367), Jerome (d. 420), Augustine (d. 430), and Pseudo-Vigilius (4th / 5th centuries).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine Text’s “and (*kai*)” here, which flows naturally in the words, “and lighting upon him” in Matt. 3:16c. Did its omission come about as a “stylistic improvement” to create a “more succinct” text, after consideration of Mark 1:10, which simply reads, “like a dove descending upon him”? Its dissimilarity with the independent account of John 1:32, which records not what “Jesus” “saw” (Matt. 3:16c), but rather, what “John” the Baptist “saw,” which was, “I saw the Spirit descending like a dove, and it abode (*emeinen*) upon him” (John 1:32), rather than, “and (*kai*) lighting (*erchomenon*) upon him” (Matt. 3:16c), means that it is unlikely that the converse occurred i.e., that the “and” (*kai*) was added from John 1:32. Possibly its omission came about by accident, due to a paper fade / loss. Was the omission accidental or deliberate?

On the one hand, the TR’s reading comes from the representative Byzantine Text, is well attested to among the old Latin Versions, and ancient church writers. It has no good textual argument against it, and it seems unlikely that it was added from John 1:32. But on the other hand, its omission is supported by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, a number of old Latin Versions, and ancient church writers. Though it appears to be an omission in some way affected by Mark 1:10, it is remotely possible that the converse occurred i.e., “and” was added from John 1:32. Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “and” in Matt. 3:16c a “B” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

The Clementine Vulgate (or earlier Sixtinam Vulgate) must be consulted with caution, since its Roman Catholic compilers did not subject the lesser maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, to the greater maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. I.e., we Christians of the holy Protestant faith, always start with the representative Byzantine Greek Text, and only adopt a Latin reading if textual analysis *of the Greek* warrant this. Thus the maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, is always subject to the overriding maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. Thus the Greek has priority over the Latin. By contrast, the old Romish usage of the maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, had no such overriding qualification. Like the Sixtinam Vulgate (1590), the text of the Clementine Vulgate (1592) is thus ultimately based on textual analysis of the Latin, not the Greek, and so at times it errs. Nevertheless, because it generally follows Latin readings that are inside the closed class of Latin sources, the Clementine (or Sixtinam) Vulgate may generally be cited in a special qualified way, namely, as manifesting a specified Latin reading inside the closed class of Latin sources. The Clementine Vulgate specifically adds an “*et*” (and) from the old Latin Versions that is absent in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, so that on this occasion, the

Clementine Vulgate's selection of the Latin terminology at Matt. 3:16c is, "*et (and) venientem (coming) super (upon) se (him)*" is the right one.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 3:16c, which includes "and," is further followed by the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), celebrated Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Armenian (5th century), Ethiopic (c. 500), and Georgian (5th century) Versions. The incorrect reading, which omits "and," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with the Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century).

Influenced by these Alexandrian text considerations, Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952) remove the "and (*kai*)" at Matt. 3:16c; and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and the UBS 4th revised edition (1993) place the "and (*kai*)" in square brackets. Thus the NU Text indicates doubt as to its place in the text, and regards its inclusion or omission as fairly optional. On the one hand, the NASB translators evidently thought it should be omitted, and so they supplied the "and" in italics as a word they added, reading, "*and* lighting on him" (Matt. 3:16c, NASB). On the other hand, the ASV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV translators retained this *kai* in their reading, although in the case of the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV, the fact that they do not use italics for added words, means we cannot be certain as to which underpinning Greek reading they preferred.

**Matt. 4:10** "Get thee hence" (TR & AV) {C}

The TR's Greek reading, "*Ypage* ('Get thee [hence], present imperative active, 2nd person singular verb, from *upagō*)," is supported in a minority Byzantine Text reading found in Codices W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), Pe 024 (*Codex Guelferbytanus*, 6th century), K 017 (*Codex Cyprius*, 9th century), V 031 (*Codex Mosquensis*, 9th century), S 028 (*Codex Vaticanus*, 10th century); and Minuscules 399 (St. Petersburg, Russia, 9th / 10th century), 27 (Paris, France, 10th century), 262 (Paris, France, 10th century), 1187 (Sinai, Arabia, 11th century), 924 (Athos, Greece, 12th century), 1355 (Jerusalem, Israel, 12th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*Vade* ('Get thee [hence], present imperative active, 2nd person singular verb, from *vado*)," by Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century); and old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries) and f (Brescia 6th century & Cambridge 9th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Asterius (d. after 341), and Pseudo-Ignatius (4th / 5th centuries); the ancient church Latin writers, Tertullian (d. after 220), Hilary (d. 367), Chromatius (d. 407), and Jerome (d. 420); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604). There is also probable, though uncertain support for it, from the ancient church Greek writer, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation (c. 395).

However, a longer reading, "Get thee" (*upage*) "behind" (*opiso*) "me" (*mou*) is found in the majority Byzantine Text, e.g., Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It was also followed by old Latin Versions h (Paris 5th century & Rome 5th century), b (Verona 5th century & Budapest 8th / 9th centuries), d (Cambridge 5th century & Paris 5th / 6th centuries),

and I (Leon 7th century and Berlin 8th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Peter of Alexandria (d. 311), Asterius (d. after 341), Athanasius (d. 373), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Nestorius (d. after 451); and ancient church Latin writer, Pseudo-Vigilius (4th / 5th century).

A textual problem arises with the representative Byzantine reading, that can only be remedied by adopting the reading of Jerome's Latin Vulgate *et al.*

In Luke 4:2 we learn that during the "forty days," "the Devil" came and "tempted" Christ." Then, in Matt. 4:2,3, we learn that the three temptations of Matt. 4:3-10 came "afterward" i.e., after the "forty days and forty nights" (Matt. 4:2). The implication then, is that the Devil came to Christ with repeated temptations during the forty days, and that these three temptations were a climax at the end of the forty days. The three are mentioned in a different order, with some other differences, in the two Gospels. St. Luke has the food temptation, then the Devil worship temptation, then the presumption temptation (Luke 4:3-13); whereas St. Matthew has the food temptation, the presumption temptation, and then the Devil worship temptation (Matt. 4:3-11).

I do not make the error of the so called Synoptic Gospel's "parallel accounts" (cf. comments at Matt. 3:8). It seems clear to me, that this was a temptation circuit, in which the Devil came to Christ repeatedly with these three temptations at the end of the forty days. I think the most likely reconstruction, is that the events of St. Luke's Gospel happened first i.e., the food temptation to turn a "stone" (singular) into bread (Luke 4:3); then the Devil worship temptation from a "high mountain" (Luke 4:5); then the presumption temptation from "a pinnacle of the temple" (Luke 4:9). Then hoping that he had laid a seed of doubt or lust in the Saviour's mind, that he could now exploit, he returned. This time he increased the magnitude of the first temptation slightly, making the food temptation one in which he would turn "stones" (plural) "bread" (Matt. 4:3). Perhaps hoping that the Saviour would expect the Devil worship temptation next, as happened the time before, Satan now tries to catch Christ off guard, by taking him to "a pinnacle of the temple" (Matt. 4:5), whether the same or a different one to the previous time. Perhaps hoping that Christ would be expecting a return to the food temptation, since it came after the last Devil worshipping temptation; Satan then took Christ "up into an exceeding high mountain" (Matt. 4:8), which by the sounds of it was a different location to the previous time, and there presents a form of the presumption temptation again. But the Christ, who through his Spirit, instructs us, "A man that is an heretick after the first and second admonition reject" (Titus 3:10), here adopts the same approach with the Devil. He does not now say, "Get thee behind me, Satan" (Luke 4:8), but rather, "Get thee hence, Satan" (Matt. 4:10), for the matter is concluded, and "Then the devil leaveth him" (Matt. 4:11).

If on the one hand, the representative Byzantine reading were allowed, Christ does not command the Devil, "Get thee hence," but simply, "Get thee behind me," and so as in Luke 4:8 we would expect the temptations to continue, as they do in Luke 4. But here, after Christ's words we read, "Then the Devil leaveth" (Matt. 4:11). This requires something more radical than, "Get thee behind me, Satan." It requires, "Get thee hence, Satan," i.e., Satan is to depart from the location, and so the reading of the Latin Vulgate *et al* is the only one that makes contextual sense.

Moreover, if the added words, "behind me" were originally part of Matt. 4:10, there

seems no plausible reason to see how they could have been accidentally omitted from Matt. 4:10.

And if the omission were deliberate, then it seems unlikely that they would not be also omitted at Matt. 16:23. The fact that the Latin Vulgate wrongly omits the words, “Get thee behind me, Satan” at Luke 4:8, means that it would not need to omit “behind me” here at Matt. 4:10 in order to create an assimilation between the two readings, if they were wrongly considered the same event, and if for that reason they had been deliberately omitted at Matt.4:10 after considering the two divergent readings. I.e., they could then conflate the two readings with ease in discussions outside the text.

By contrast, if the original reading was simply, “Get thee hence (*upage*)” at Matt. 4:10; then it is quite understandable, that a copyist, not appreciating the multiple times the Devil presented these temptations, and seeking on the erroneous basis of “parallel accounts” between Matt. 4 and Luke 4, to assimilate the two readings, might add the words, “behind (*opiso*) me (*mou*)” at Matt. 4:10. In doing so, he may or may not have also been influenced by Matt. 16:23; Mark 8:33, i.e., considering “Get thee behind me” to be “more characteristic terminology of Christ than simply, “Get thee hence.” The likelihood of Matt. 4:10 being assimilated to Matt. 16:23; Luke 4:8, therefore seems stronger, than the possibility of omission.

On the one hand, the TR’s reading, “Get thee hence” has strong stylistic contextual support, and it is followed by such Byzantine Text manuscripts as Codices *Freerianus* (5th century) and *Rossanensis* (late 5th / 6th century), as well as Jerome’s Latin Vulgate and some old Latin Versions, together with a number of ancient church writers. But on the other hand, the longer reading, which adds, “behind me,” is the representative Byzantine Text reading, and also has the support of some old Latin Versions and a number of ancient church writers. Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “Get thee hence” in Matt. 4:10, a solid “C” (in the range of 60% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading, but has a lower level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside those manuscripts and versions lacking reasonable accessibility over the centuries, and so outside the providentially protected NT text determined with textual analysis by triangulation with the Byzantine Greek, Western Latin, and church writers (in the first instance especially, although not exclusively, ancient church writers of the first five centuries, and in the second instance especially, although not exclusively, early mediaeval church writers of the sixth to eighth centuries); we find that the correct reading, “Get thee hence” in Matt. 4:10, is also found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century). It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Palestinian Syriac (c. 6th century) Versions; as well as the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and some Bohairic (3rd century) Versions, together with some manuscripts of the Sahidic Version (3rd century); and the Georgian Version (5th century). It also appears in the Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries) as “Get thee hence Satan” (Hogg), and in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), where the Latin likewise reads (as in the Vulgate), “Begone (Latin, *Vade*) Satan.”

At Matt. 4:10, the longer conflated reading was followed by the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), and in the text enclosed between critical signs i.e., not constituting the translator’s

representative copy, the Syriac Harclean Version h (616). Among the Coptic Versions, the longer reading was also followed by some manuscripts of the Sahidic Version (3rd century), and some manuscripts of the Bohairic (3rd century) Versions. Yet further support for the wrong reading appears in the Armenian (5th century), Georgian “B” (5th century) Version, and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

While the Alexandrian Text copyists, and others outside the closed class of the three sources supporting the correct reading, on this occasion are to be commended for their human diligence in accurately copying the original, we who accept the Biblical teaching of the preservation of Holy Writ, could never accept that such texts should form the basis of our conclusions. Hence it was, that partly for the wrong reasons, and partly for the right reasons, on this occasion, the correct reading entered the NU Text *et al.* Thus we find it in the ASV as, “Get thee hence (*upage*), Satan;” in the NASB as, “Go (*upage*), Satan” (Matt. 4:10, NASB), or in Moffatt as, “Begone (*upage*), Satan!” (Moffatt Bible). The correct reading is also found in the RSV, NRSV, and ESV.

Burgon & Miller (1899) supported this conflation, as do the later majority texts of Hodges & Farstad (1985) & Robinson & Pierpont (2005). The agreement between the TR and NU Text on this occasion, results in a NKJV footnote which says at Matt. 4:10, simply, “M-Text [Majority Text] reads ‘Get behind me’” (NKJV).

The Greek word *opiso*, translated “behind” in the AV’s terminology, “Get thee behind me,” comes from *opisthen* meaning *from the rear* i.e., *at the back*; so that *opiso* carrying the connotation, of being *to the back*, is well translated by the AV as “behind” in the terminology, “Get thee behind me” (Matt. 16:23; Mark 8:33; Luke 4:8). At Matt. 4:10, the NIV shows a critical usage of the NU Text, since it adopts the longer reading found in the Western and Byzantine Texts *et al.*, and placed in a footnote reading of the NU Text. However, in doing so, it uses a loose dynamic equivalent that fails to convey the idea in “*opiso*” of *to the back*, and thus misleading fails to highlight an important element of why this is not a textually admissible reading. The NIV reads, “Away from (*upage opiso*) me (*mou*), Satan!” (Matt. 4:10, NIV). The NIV’s usage of the longer reading constitutes confusion. The NIV’s usage of this misleading dynamic equivalent confounds its initial error. The NIV’s reading of Matt. 4:10 is confusion confounded.

#### **Matt. 4:12** “Jesus” (TR & AV) {B}

The TR’s Greek, “*o Iesous* (Jesus),” in the words, “Now when Jesus had heard” (AV), is found in the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It also appears as Latin, “*Iesus*,” in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen in one citation (d. 254), and Eusebius (d. 339); and the ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367) and Gaudentius (d. after 406).

However, it is omitted in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), d (5th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century); and the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron

(9th century). It is also omitted in one citation, by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

There is no good stylistic textual reason to doubt the representative Byzantine Text, which must therefore stand as the correct reading. Its omission by Origen, who possibly was the originator of its removal, may have reflected a desire to prune the text, possibly on the basis that “Jesus” is mentioned by name in Matt. 4:10, and so it was considered to be “unnecessarily repetitious.” Alternatively, the reading in Manuscript Washington helps us understand how it may have been omitted accidentally. Here “Jesus (*IECOUC*)” is abbreviated to the first and last letters, i.e., “*IC*” with a bar placed over the top, in W 032 and Lectionaries 2378 (lower case, *os*) and 1968 (upper case, *OIC*). The subsequent formation of “*O*” (“the,” which is redundant in English translation,) and “*IC*” (Jesus), followed by “*OTI* (that),” if either the bar over “*IC*” was a bit too low, or if the scribe did not look too carefully, coupled with a poorly formed “*C*”, could in a continuous script, therefore look something like “*OTIOTI*,” with what the scribe wrongly took to be the “first *OTI*” (which was actually the *OIC*) falling out due to ellipsis. Clearly if accidental, the scribe was not looking too closely, and so such an accidental omission cannot be ruled out. Was this omission deliberate or accidental? Either way, Jerome, probably unaware of what had happened, used a manuscript with this earlier omission, and simply copied the error into his Latin Vulgate.

There is no good textual argument against the representative Greek Byzantine reading at Matt. 8:29. The TR’s reading is also well attested to in the Latin, so that notwithstanding its omission in the Vulgate, it was included in the Clementine. It thus has good support in both the Greek and Latin. Moreover, textual analysis shows its omission due to ellipsis clearly understandable. Taking into account these factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “Jesus” in Matt. 4:12 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 4:12, “Jesus,” is also found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; some Coptic Bohairic Version manuscripts (3rd century); and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

“Jesus” is omitted by the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further omitted by the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century); and some Coptic Versions in the Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), some Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries). It thus came to be omitted in the NU Text *et al.*

Though like the NASB’s parent ASV, brother RSV, and nephew ESV, the Greek “*o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)” was omitted at Matt. 4:12 in the NASB’s first and second editions, it was included from the NU Text’s footnote reading in the NASB’s third edition. It was also included from the same source in the NIV. The NRSV includes it in the main text, but claims in a footnote that the Greek actually supports the variant.

**Matt. 4:18** “Jesus” (TR & AV) {C}

The TR’s Greek, “*o (-) Iēsous* (Jesus),” in the words, “And Jesus, walking by the sea,” (AV) is a minority Byzantine reading, found in e.g., Codex E 07 (8th century; Basel, Switzerland), or a later undated correction of Codex Omega 045 (9th century; Athos, Greece); as well as (abbreviated as “*o is*” with a bar on top of the “*is*”) in Lectionaries 2378 (11th century; Sydney University, Australia) and 1968 (1544 A.D.; Sydney University, Australia). It is also supported as Latin, “*Iesus*,” by old Latin Versions a (4th century), h (Rome, 5th century), aur (7th century), m (Munich 9th century), and c (12th / 13th centuries). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, these words are omitted in the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). They are also omitted in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century); and old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th centuries), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writers, Eusebius (d. 339) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

Matt. 4:18-22 forms a distinct section, which in modern terms constitutes a paragraph. The surrounding sections, which in the AV are given the modern stylistic form of paragraphs, always start their narrative with specific reference to “Jesus” (Matt. 3:13-17; Matt. 4:1-11; Matt. 4:12-17; Matt. 4:23-25). While St. Matthew starts a nearby section without specific reference to the name of “Jesus” in Matt. 5:1, to this must be added the qualification that it flows immediately on from Matt. 4:25, when we read, “And seeing the multitudes, he went up into a mountain” (Matt. 5:1). Therefore, since Matt. 4:18-22 depicts a distinctive scene of Christ “walking by the sea of Galilee” (Matt. 4:18), the more expected stylistic reading for Matt. 4:18-22; which sandwiches Matt. 4:18 between sections beginning with “Jesus” in Matt. 3:13; 4:1,12,23; is that Matt. 4:18 will in fact also so start with reference to the name of “Jesus.” Thus a stylistic tension is created by the absence of “Jesus” in the representative Byzantine Text of Matt. 4:18, where it would surely be expected. Thus the minority Byzantine reading of “Jesus” seems to be correct.

Notably, the words of Matt. 4:18, “walking (*peripaton*) And (*de*) Jesus (*o Iēsous*) by (*para*) the (*ten*) sea (*thalassan*) of the Galilee (*tes Galilaias*),” i.e., “And Jesus, walking by the sea of Galilee” (AV); are strikingly similar to those in the account of Mark 1:16, “walking (*peripaton*) now (*de*) by (*para*) the (*ten*) sea (*thalassan*) of the Galilee (*tes Galilaias*),” i.e., “Now as he walked by the sea of Galilee” (AV). Did the similarity of Matt. 4:18 to Mark 1:16, lead to an assimilation of the two passages, in which a scribe considered “the unnecessary use of” “Jesus” should be omitted from Matt. 4:18 in order to make it more like “the crisp and concise” reading of Mark 1:16?

However, “*O* (‘the’) *IC* (abbreviated from *IECOYC*, ‘Jesus’)” with a bar over the “*IC*,” may have dropped out accidentally. E.g., if the bar over the “*IC*” was too low, it could easily look like the Greek letter Pi (Π), which may have a slight curve to the right at the bottom of the second parallel line i.e., like the bottom of a “*C*,” though not as long. (This Greek letter may be familiar to the reader unfamiliar with Greek, in various mathematical formulas as the fraction  $\frac{22}{7}$  e.g., the volume of a cylinder is Pi times the radius squared times the height.) A scribe

whose finger marked the place, getting up to this “OIC,” whose finger moved forward with the left of his finger on the “O” and the right of his finger on the “IC” that looked like a Pi, might look up, and think, “I’m up to the letter Pi.” Looking forward, and after some momentary distraction in which his finger moved slightly forward, looking back, he might have seen the Pi starting the next word, “*para*” (“by”), and kept writing.

Alternatively, “Jesus” may have dropped out due to paper loss, and not been detected if at the end of a line, since “O (‘the’) IC (abbreviated from *IECOYC*, ‘Jesus’)” was only three letters “OIC” (see preliminary textual discussion at Matt. 1:25). While manuscripts were in continuous writing, Manuscript Washington shows that sometimes spacing was present for stylistic reasons, and so if e.g., “OIC” was lost due to a paper fade, its omission may have gone unnoticed by a scribe, who thought the three letter’s blank space was a stylistic gap. By contrast, if “Jesus” was added at Matt. 4:18, then why was it not also added at Mark 1:16? These factors thus further testify in favour of the reading, “Jesus” at Matt. 4:18.

Thus on the one hand, textual analysis strongly favours the unrepresentative Byzantine reading, “Jesus” at Matt. 4:18. Firstly, immediate contextual stylistic analysis of Matt. 4:18-22 inside Matt. 3:14-4:25, shows that “Jesus” is the expected reading at Matt. 4:18. Secondly, the variant omitting “Jesus” can be reasonably explained as an assimilation to Mark 1:16. Thirdly, the possibility that “Jesus” was added at Matt. 4:18 seems unlikely, given that no such “addition” was then made at Mark 1:16. When to this is added the support of such old Latin Versions as a (Vercelli, 4th century) and h (Rome, 5th century), the reading of the TR is sure. But on the other hand, we cannot ignore the fact that the representative Byzantine reading, Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, and two ancient church writers in their Homilies on St. Matthew’s Gospel, all omit “Jesus” at Matt. 4:18. Weighing these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, *prima facie* I would give the TR’s reading, “Jesus” in Matt. 4:18, a solid “C” (in the range of 60% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading, but has a lower level of certainty. But when is added to this the knowledge of, and accessibility of this reading over time, through reference to the writings of the early mediaeval western church doctor, St. Gregory the Great of Western Europe, I would increase this rating, so that on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading in Matt. 4:18, a high level “C” (in the range of 63% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading, but has a lower level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading Matt. 4:18, “Jesus,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (Paris, 8th century); and a minuscule that shows a significant degree of independence from the Byzantine tradition, namely, Minuscule 1071 (Mt. Athos, 12th century). It is also followed in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); and the Armenian Version (5th century).

However, “Jesus” is omitted by the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It was also omitted in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries). From the earlier of these faulty sources, it was omitted in the NU Text *et al*, which does not even give it a footnote reading.

The omission is also found at Matt. 4:18 in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). Like the NASB's parent ASV, brother RSV, and nephew NRSV and ESV, the TR's "Jesus" (AV) at Matt. 4:18 was omitted in the NASB 1st ed. & 2nd ed. . However, it was included in the NASB's 3rd ed., as well as in the NIV. Thus while the NASB (3rd ed.) and NIV translators included in their thinking sources outside the closed class, with the consequence that they found in favour of the reading "Jesus" partly for the wrong reasons; they evidently also found in favour of the reading "Jesus" partly for the right reasons i.e., textual considerations and sources inside the closed class.

**Matt. 4:23** "Jesus ... all Galilee" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek words, "*olen* (all) *ten* (the) *Galilaian* (Galilee) *o* (the) *Iesous* (Jesus)" i.e., "Jesus ... all Galilee" in the words, "And *Jesus* went about *all Galilee*" (AV), are supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). Though manifesting a slightly different word order that does not affect their translation into English, either as a consequence of translation into Latin, or as a consequence of using a Greek manuscript with the words in the same order as Eusebius (see below), they are also found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), as "*et* (and) *circumibat* (he went around / about) *Iesus* (Jesus) *totam* (all) *Galilaeum* (Galilee)" i.e., "and Jesus went about all Galilee." So too, they appear in the same Latin form in old Latin Versions b (Verona 5th century & Budapest 8th / 9th centuries), d (5th / 6th centuries), and l (7th / 8th century); and with the same basic meaning using Latin "*universam*" rather than "*totam*" in old Latin Version h (Paris 5th century & Rome 5th century); and with the same basic meaning, using Latin "*circuibat*" rather than "*circumibat*" in old Latin Versions a (4th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592), which here follows Jerome's Vulgate. The ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339), either himself rearranged the order of these words, or used a manuscript that had previously rearranged the order of these words. Though it makes no difference to the English translation, these words appear in Eusebius in the word order, "*o* (the) *Iesous* (Jesus) *olen* (all) *ten* (the) *Galilaian* (Galilee)" i.e., "And *Jesus* went about *all Galilee*."

However, "Jesus" (Latin, *Iesus*) is omitted in old Latin Version k (Africa, 4th / 5th centuries) (*Variant I*) i.e., "And he went about all Galilee." In W 032 (in upper case letters) and Lectionaries 2378 (in lower case letters) and 1968 (in upper case letters), "*o* (the) *Iesous* (Jesus)" is abbreviated to "*o Is*" with a line on top of the "*Is*." Did the loss in the underpinning Greek of "*O* ('the') *IC* (abbreviated from *I**E**COYC*, 'Jesus')" i.e., "*OIC*," came about from a paper fade of "*OIC*"? If so, its omission may have gone unnoticed by a scribe, who thought the three letters' blank space was a stylistic gap, such as one finds in Manuscript Washington.

There is no textual reason to doubt the representative Byzantine reading. In the absence of any such textual concerns, and good attestation from both the Greek and Latin, the reading cannot be reasonably doubted. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading, "Jesus ... all Galilee" in Matt. 4:23 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 4:23, “Jesus ... all Galilee” is also found at Matt. 4:23 in e.g., the Eusebius word order, in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); and by a second undated corrector of one the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century).

But five more clearly aberrant variants also exist. *Variant 2*, “*en* (in) *ole* (all) *te* (the) *Galilaia* (Galilee),” i.e., “in all the Galilee,” making the reading, “And *he* went about *in all Galilee*,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as the independent Minuscule 157 (Rome: 12th century); the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), and Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century). It is the reading adopted in the NU Text, which thus adds “in” (*en*) and omits “Jesus” (*o Iesous*). It is followed by Moffatt as, “Then he made a tour through (*en*) the whole (*ole*) of Galilee (*te Galilaia*)” (Moffatt Bible).

*Variant 3*, “in (*en*) all (*ole*) the (*te*) Galilee (*Galilaia*) the (*o*) Jesus (*Iesous*)” i.e., making the reading, “And *Jesus* went about *in all Galilee*,” is found by a third undated later “corrector” of (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century).

*Variant 4*, “*o* (the) *Iesous* (Jesus) *en* (in) *olen* (all) *te* (the) *Galilaia* (Galilee),” i.e., “Jesus in all the Galilee,” making the reading, “And *Jesus* went about *in all Galilee*,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century), Syriac Harclean h (616), and Palestinian Syriac (c. 6th century) Versions. It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) Version; the Armenian Version (5th century); and the Ethiopic Version (c. 500).

*Variant 5*, “*o* (the) *Iesous* (Jesus) *en* (in) *te* (the) *Galilaia* (Galilee),” i.e., “Jesus in the Galilee,” making the reading, “And *Jesus* went about *in Galilee*,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century).

The addition of “in” (*en*) in *Variants 2,3,4*, and *5*, was a stylistic “improvement.” It appears to have come from a desire to create a stylistic assimilation with such terminology elsewhere in St. Matthew’s Gospel. Thus we read, “in (*en*) all (*pasi*) the coasts” (Matt. 2:16); “in (*en*) all (*ole*) that country (Matt. 9:31); and “in (*en*) all (*ole*) the world” (Matt. 24:14). The omission of “Jesus” (*o Iesous*) in *Variant 2*, was likewise probably a stylistic “improvement,” as “unnecessary wordage,” quite possibly influenced by Mark 1:16 which reads, “Now as he walked by the sea of Galilee.” *Variant 5*, was probably an Alexandrian pruning of the conflated reading, “in all Galilee” found in *Variants 4* and *5* (and found without “Jesus” in *Variant 2*).

*Variant 1* is found in the RSV and ESV. *Variant 2*, is found in an ASV footnote, as “And he went about in all Galilee;” as well as in Moffatt’s Bible. *Variant 2* is also found in the NU Text, and was followed by the NASB’s 1st & 2nd editions, which placed the TR’s “Jesus” (AV) in italics as an added word. However, the NASB’s 3rd edition adopted the TR’s reading, but like the Alexandrian scribes of old, decided to make their own so called “stylistic improvement,” by trimming down the Word of God. The NASB translators omitted the “And” (*kai*) at the beginning of the sentence, thus making Matt. 4:23 to read, “Jesus was going throughout all Galilee” (NASB, 3rd ed.). *Variant 3* is found in the ASV’s main text.

The NIV translators adopted *Variant 5*, but they too decided to prune away the “And” (*kai*) at the beginning of the sentence. Thus their Matt. 4:23 reads, “Jesus (*Iesus*) went (*periegen*) throughout (*en*) Galilee (*te Galilaia*)” (NIV). At Matt. 4:23, the NRSV main text also reads, “Jesus (*Iesus*) went (*periegen*, literally, ‘he went’) throughout (*en*) Galilee (*te Galilaia*),” but a footnote says at “Jesus” that this is “G[ree]k ‘He’.” This indicates that the NRSV has done a “reconstruction” of this verse, in which they follow the general reading of *Variant 5* in London Sinaiticus, but then follow *Variant 2* found in Rome Vaticanus by regarding “*Iesus*” as added later. But the fact that in their main text the NRSV follows London Sinaiticus in what they regard as adding *Iesus*, means they think this is “a good stylistic addition.”

**Matt. 4:24** “Syria” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek, “*Curian / Surian* (Syria),” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is further supported as Latin, “*Syriam* (Syria),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th / 7th century), q (6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However a variant, Greek, “*sunorian* (bordering / neighbouring county),” is a minority Byzantine reading, found in Gamma 036 (10th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is therefore correct. The origins of this variant are speculative. But if in a continuous script manuscript, the “SY” of “SYRIAN” was at the end of one line, followed by a paper loss, and the “RIAN” of “SYRIAN” was at the start of the next line, a scribe may have thought “Syria” sounded “too far away.” In fact, “Syria” refers to the immediate area that is north-east of Galilee, and so it is quite reasonable to believe that in this earlier part of Christ’ ministry (before the Matt. 10:5 commission), that Christ’s work included the fact that “his fame went throughout all Syria,” and they came to him in the Galilee and “he healed” people there (Matt. 4:24). Indeed, in the very next verse we read that “Galilee” was one of the areas Christ was working in (Matt. 4:25).

Nevertheless, a not so knowledgeable scribe, may have thought “‘Syria’ can’t be right,” and so reconstructed this from *sunoria* as “*sunorian*” (singular accusative, first declension feminine noun). If so, he was quite possibly assimilating the reading to Mark 1:28, where we read that Christ’s “fame spread abroad through all the region round about (*perichoron*) Galilee.”

The TR’s reading is well supported by the Greek and Latin, and has no good textual argument against it. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “without a cause” at Matt. 4:24 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 4:24, “Syria,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th

century). It is further found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and Minuscule 157 (12th century, independent). It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), in Ciasca's Latin as, "*Syriae*."

The variant "bordering / neighbouring county," has no further support. Its strong support in the Alexandrian Texts *et al*, led to the adoption of the correct reading at Matt. 4:24 in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott & Hort (1881), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952), Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). Hence it reads "Syria," in the ASV. The correct reading was also followed by the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

However, Moffatt's Bible follows the variant, and reads, "the surrounding country (*sunorian*)" (Moffatt). A footnote at Matt. 4:24 claims, "that *Surian* is a corruption of *sunorian* (Mark 1:28), which is actually read by one uncial manuscript Gamma" (Moffatt). With no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, that one should follow a lone 10th century manuscript on the basis of such a whimsical claim, is in my opinion, quite fatuous. It should remind us of the folly of religious liberalism, which blinds the eyes of men like Moffatt to the truth of God.

We ought not to be surprised then, when in the next chapter, Moffatt rearranges the clause order of Matt. 5:21,22; so that Matt. 5:21 is followed by Matt. 5:22b; and then Matt. 5:22a.. In a footnote at Matt. 5:21, Moffatt claims he is, "Restoring the second and third clauses [Matt. 5:22b] to their original position" (Moffatt). There is absolutely no serious grounds, whatsoever, for Moffatt's claim. Sadly, this type of thing is typical of his translation overall. As with Matt. 4:24 *et al*, the religiously liberal mind of Moffatt sometimes found it hard to distinguish between fact and his own fleeting fantasies. After all, a man who can portray the prophet Daniel back in sixth century B.C., hearing the musicians of Babylon playing on Irish or Scottish "bagpipes" (Dan. 3:5,10,15, Moffatt Bible), can probably believe just about anything. Anything that is, except the truth of God!

**Matt. 5:4,5** "(4) Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted. (5) Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's verse order is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Codices W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53,) and the purple parchment, Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century). It is further supported by old Latin Versions b (Verona, 5th century & Budapest 8th / 9th centuries), f (Brescia, 6th century & Cambridge 9th century), and q (Munich 6th / 7th centuries & Munich 7th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is also supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Macarius / Symeon (4th / 5th century), and Chrysostom (d. 407); and also by the ancient church Latin writers, Tertullian (d. After 220) and Chromatius (d. 407).

However, verses 4 and 5 are reversed, so that after verse 3, comes verse 5, then verse 4, and then verse 6, in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), h (Paris 5th century & Rome 5th century), d (5th / 6th centuries), f (6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the

Clementine Vulgate (1592). This rearrangement of the verses is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), the Eusebian Canons (4th century), and Chrysostom (d. 407); and by the ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367), Ambrose (d. 397), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430).

There is no textual reason to doubt the representative Byzantine Text, which must therefore stand as the correct reading. The logical progression from those who first recognize their poverty of “spirit” and enter “the kingdom of heaven” (Matt. 5:3), to those “that mourn” for the saints and “shall be comforted” (Matt. 5:4) when reunited with them, to the saints who with resurrection bodies “shall inherit the earth” (Matt. 5:5), is greatly distorted by reversing the order of verses 4 and 5.

The reason for this rearrangement is speculative. Possibly it was accidental. Did a copyist’s eye jump from the “*Makarioi* (Blessed) *oi* (the) *p*” of “*Makarioi* (Blessed) *oi* (the) *penthountes* (mourning[ones])” of verse 4, to the “*Makarioi* (Blessed) *oi* (the) *p*” of “*Makarioi* (Blessed) *oi* (the) *praeis* (meek)” of verse 5; and so have first written verse 5; did he then realize his mistake, and write verse 4 on the basis that “changing the order of these verses does not matter”? Alternatively, was the change deliberate? If so, was the motive for this rearrangement a desire to create a strong “heaven” (Matt. 5:3) and “earth” (Matt. 5:5) dichotomy? If so, this was a superficial analysis which failed to link the transitory nature of those that “mourn” for the death of saints in Matt 5:4, with the words of Matt. 5:5 since they will be reunited, and together “inherit the” new “earth” after the Second Advent.

On the one hand, the textual argument strongly favours the verse order of the TR, and it enjoys support from the representative Byzantine Text, some old Latin Versions, and a number of ancient church writers. But on the other hand, the reverse order of these verses, is supported by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, a number of old Latin Versions, and a number of ancient church writers. Taking into account these competing factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s verse order Matt. 5:4,5 a “B” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct order of the verses at Matt. 5:4,5 is also found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century). It is also followed in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); the Ethiopic Version (c. 500); the Georgian Version (5th century); Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries). With strong Alexandrian Text support, and on this occasion, a good textual argument in its favour recognized by the NU Text Committee, it entered the NU Text *et al*, and so the correct verse order is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV, as it was in the earlier ASV based on Westcott and Hort.

However, the incorrect reading which reverses the order of the two verses, is supported by the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also followed by the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); and further appears in a manuscript of the

Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century). An ASV footnote at Matt. 5:4, says “Some ancient authorities transpose ver. 4 and 5.”

**Matt. 5:11a** “all manner of evil” (TR & AV) {C}

The TR’s Greek reading, “*pan* (all) *poneron* (manner of evil),” is supported by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), which likewise reads, Latin, “*et* (and) *dixerint* (they will speak) *omne* (all) *malum* (manner of evil) *adversum* (against) *vos* (you) *mentientes* (falsely) *propter* (for sake) *me* (my).” So too, it is followed in old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), h (Paris 5th century & Rome 5th century), f (Brescia 6th century & Cambridge 9th century), l (Leon 7th century & Berlin 8th century) l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, the Apostolic Constitutions (3rd or 4th century), Eusebius (d. 339), Didymus (d. 398), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); ancient church Latin writers, Tertullian (d. after 220), Hilary (d. 367), and Lucifer of Cagliari (d. c. 370/1); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604). A similar reading is found in the Byzantine Text Minuscules 411 (10th century) and 952 (14th century).

But the addition of “*rema* (word),” making the reading, “every (*pan*) evil (*poneron*) word (*rema*),” is found in Scrivener’s Text (see Appendix 1, Vol. 1). It is supported by the majority Byzantine Text, e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is also found in old Latin Version q (Munich 6th / 7th centuries); and followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

Textual analysis within the closed class of three sources is required where there is a textual problem with the representative Byzantine reading that requires resolution. The reading of the representative Byzantine Text at Matt. 5:11a, “every (*pan*) evil (*poneron*) word (*rema*),” poses such a textual problem. In the terminology of Christ, though not necessarily another person, it would be uncharacteristic to add “word (*rema*)” after “shall say (*eiposi* from *epo*).” Thus “and shall say every evil word against you” (representative Byzantine Text) is not consistent with the type of terminology used elsewhere by Christ. Let us consider Christ’s usage of *epo* (“say”) elsewhere. Nearby at Matt. 5:22, we do not read, “and whosoever shall say (*eipe*) to his brother, *the word*, Raca, ... but whosoever shall say (*eipe*) *the word*, Thou fool” etc., but rather, “whosoever shall say (*eipe*) to his brother, Raca, ... but whosoever shall say (*eipe*), Thou fool” etc. The reader may find other examples of this, where our Lord’s terminology is always to use “say” (*epo*), without the addition of “word” (or “words”), at Matt. 9:5 (twice), 15:5; 21:3; 23:39; 24:48; 26:18; Mark 7:11; 11:3; 13:2; 14:14; Luke 5:23; 10:10; 11:5,7; 12:11,45; 13:35; 14:10,17; 20:41; John 12:27,49; 20:17.

By contrast, Christ sometimes used the combination of words, *pas* (every) and *rema* (word), when it did not follow the usage of *epo* (say). In Matt. 4:4 we read, “It is written (*gegraptai*), Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every (*panti*) word (*remati*) that proceedeth out of the mouth of God” (cf. the same usage of these words in Luke 4:4). Or in Matt. 12:35,36, with the addition of the word *poneros* (“evil”) which is also found at Matt. 5:11a, we read, “an evil (*ponera*) man out of the evil (*ponerou*) treasure bringeth forth evil (*ponera*) things. But I say (*lego*) unto you, That every (*pan*) idle word (*rema*) that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof” etc. And in Matt. 18:16, we also read, “that in the mouth of two or three

witnesses every (*pan*) word (*rema*) may be established.” Thus it would appear that the addition of *rema* (“word”) at Matt. 5:11a, to create the reading, “every (*pan*) evil (*poneron*) word (*rema*),” was a stylistic assimilation to Matt. 4:4; 12:35,36; 18:16.

Was this a deliberate assimilation springing from a desire to “standardize” the “relevant” terminology of the text? Was this an accidental alteration of assimilation? We know from e.g., in Manuscript Washington that abbreviations were sometimes used. E.g., in Manuscript Washington at Matt. 5:45, “*patros*” (Father) is abbreviated to “*prs.*” Did a scribe looking at a lower case damaged form of “*poneron*” i.e., “*πονηρον*” as “...π:v:ρ:v:”, work out “*poneron* (*πovηpov*)” from context? Did the manuscript have a crease or marking that could be misunderstood for a bar-line (since when an abbreviation is used there is generally a bar line above it)? If so, did he then speculate that a former scribe had abbreviated “*poneron* (*πovηpov*)” to “*prn* (*πpν*)”, and that the damaged “*v*” (Greek “*n*” / nu) was in fact a damaged “*u*” (Greek “*m*” / mu), i.e., so “the original” abbreviation “must have been ‘*prm*’ (*πpμ*)”? Did he then “reconstruct” this “*prm* (*πpμ*)” abbreviation as “*prnrema* (*πpνpεμα*)”? If so, did he then decide to “jettison the abbreviation ‘*prn*’ (*πpν*),” by “expanding it out to its fuller meaning of ‘*poneron*’ (*πovηpov*) in order to get “the fuller reading” of “*poneron rema*”? Was this stylistic assimilation to Matt. 4:4; 12:35,36; 18:16 deliberate or accidental? We cannot be sure.

Therefore, on the one hand, stylistic textual factors favour the reading of the TR, on the basis that the addition of “word” at Matt. 5:11a, creates a stylistic tension as it is uncharacteristic terminology for Christ to use “word” (*rema*) (Matt. 5:22 *et al*) after “say” (*epo*). Moreover, it may be understood as assimilation to the terminology of Matt. 4:4; 12:35,36; 18:16. Significantly, the TR’s reading has strong support from St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, a number of the old Latin Versions, and ancient church Greek and Latin writers. But on the other hand, the addition of “word” is found in the representative Byzantine Text, an old Latin Version, and some ancient church Greek and Latin writers. Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “all manner of evil” in Matt. 5:11a a high level “C” (in the range of 63% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading, but has a lower level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 5:11a, “all manner of evil,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and with minor differences in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further followed by the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the incorrect reading, “every evil word,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The correct reading entered the NU Text for partly the right reasons (stylistic factors) and partly the wrong reasons (strong support from the Alexandrian Text). The correct reading is

found at Matt. 5:11a, as “all manner of evil” in the ASV. It is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

The Scriptures teach us, “Study to shew thyself approved unto God” (II Tim. 2:15), and correspondingly condemn the sin of sloth (Prov. 15:19; Matt. 25:26). The Burgonites’ *New King James Version* translators, who worked on the slothful principle of avoiding textual analysis and simply following a majority text count *no matter what*, were on this occasion too slothful to even place a footnote in their apparatus stating that the Majority Text here differs from the Received Text at Matt. 5:11a. As the Burgonites yawned and gazed at their *Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text*, they reminded us that their sleepy-eyed Majority Text textual apparatus is only a very small sample of the much greater number of differences in the New Testament Text that their Burgonite principles actually result in. “Orrrrrr well,” yawned one NKJV Burgonite translator to another, “maybe next time we’ll put a footnote in.” “Orrrrrr” yawned the other NKJV Burgonite translator back at him, “Don’t strain at it too much mate, Orrrrrr, if I wanted to work hard, I’d have become one of ’em textual analysts.”

**Matt. 5:11b** “falsely” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek reading, “*pseudomenoi* (falsely),” is found in the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is also found as Latin, “*mentientes*,” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions f (6th century), q (Munich 6th / 7th centuries and Munich 7th century) aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Basil the Great (d. 379), the Apostolic Constitutions (3rd or 4th century), Gregory of Nyssa (d. 394), Didymus (d. 398), Epiphanius (d. 403), Chrysostom (d. 407), Cyril (d. 444), Hesychius (d. after 450), and Theodoret of Cyrus (d. 460); the ancient church Latin writers, Chromatius (d. 407), Rufinus (d. 410), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, “falsely” is omitted in old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), h (Paris 5th century & Rome 5th century), d (5th / 6th centuries), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and the ancient church Latin writers, Tertullian (d. after 220), Hilary (d. 367), Lucifer of Cagliari (d. c. 371), Ambrosiaster (d. after 384), Ambrose (d. 397), Chromatius (d. 407), Augustine (d. 430), and Speculum (d. 5th century).

There is no good textual argument against the reading of the Byzantine Text, which must therefore stand as the correct reading. The origins of its omission are speculative. What is accidental, resulting from a paper fade / loss? Was it deliberate, possibly stemming from the desire of a scribe labouring under the error of “parallel readings” in the synoptic gospels, wishing to assimilate Matt. 5:11b with Luke 6:22? With no textual reason to doubt the representative Byzantine reading, which is supported by St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate and a number of ancient church writers, together with an early mediaeval church writer, the reading of the TR is sure. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “falsely” at Matt. 5:11b an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 5:11b, “falsely,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century). It also appears in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Version (c. 500); Georgian Version (5th century); and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The incorrect reading which omits “falsely,” is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); and also the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century).

With the two major Alexandrian texts in disagreement, the neo-Alexandrians are in some befuddlement. The correct reading was included in the main text of Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), and Nestle’s 21st edition (1952). However the NU Text found in Nestle-Aland 27th edition (1993) and UBS 4th revised edition (1993), places “falsely” in square brackets, indicating uncertainty as to its place in the text, and regards its inclusion or omission as optional.

Nevertheless, the correct reading, “falsely,” was included at Matt. 5:11 in the father ASV, its two sons, the RSV and NASB, and its two grandsons, the NRSV – which has a footnote giving the variant as an alternative, and the ESV. It is also followed in the NIV.

The Western Text was recognized as a corrupted Greek NT Text by the great neo-Byzantine textual scholars of the *Textus Receptus* in the 16th and 17th centuries, who rightly excluded it from their closed class of sources. Even the neo-Alexandrians accept the obvious reality that the Western Greek Text is notoriously unreliable. This stems from the fact that under the Latin Church, the best scribes were made Latin scribes, and the dross that was left was usually moved to non-scribal activities, but occasionally became the odd Greek scribe. Hence while not wishing to deny the providential protection of the Latin Text, the Western Latin Text is very good i.e., in terms of its transmission history (though not without some inaccuracies), and the Western Greek Text is very bad (though not without some accuracies).

The religiously liberal textual critic, James Moffatt, had a two-armed pincer methodology in which he would usually employ Alexandrian text based pincer arm principles, but sometimes employ non-Alexandrian text based pincer arm principles. While all neo-Alexandrian do this to some extent, Moffatt’s non-Alexandrian text based pincer arm was employed far more than is normative for neo-Alexandrians, and he also applied it on an even wilder form of “textual criticism” than the type of wild folly most neo-Alexandrians run to. He is thus best classified as a semi neo-Alexandrian rather than a neo-Alexandrian Proper. As part of this Moffatt madness, he was such an exceedingly bad textual analyst that he thought far more favourably of the Western Greek Text than a neo-Alexandrian Proper would. I do not doubt that had he lived in the days of the Latin Church’s dominance in the West, the more talented Latin scribes being desirous to distance themselves from such an obvious fool, would probably have simply moved Moffatt to non-scribal activities. But as very occasionally occurred, they may with an unfortunate disdain for the Greek that I do not share, and a smile on their Latin loving faces, have redeployed him as a Western Greek scribe; saying to Moffatt, “Get thee to a wee Greek text

monastery” (in order to produce something like Minuscule 614, *Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan*, in the 13th century). And so it was, that no doubt influenced by the Western Greek Text’s reading here at Matt. 5:11b, the semi neo-Alexandrian Moffatt set aside his neo-Alexandrian pincer arm, and followed the variant that omitted “falsely.” In harmony with Western Greek Text, his translation at Matt. 5:11 thus simply reads, “all manner of evil against you for my sake” (Moffatt Bible).

**Matt. 5:13** “to be cast out, and” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek, “*blethenai* (to be cast) *exō* (out), *kai* (and),” in the words, “it is thenceforth good for nothing, *to be cast out, and* to be trodden under foot of men,” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is further supported as Latin, “*mittatur* (it may be cast) *foras* (out) *et* (and),” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century); and old Latin versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), d (5th / 6th centuries), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); and as Latin, “*proiciatur* (it may be thrown forth) *foris* (out) *et* (and),” in old Latin Versions b (5th century) and h (Paris 5th century & Rome 5th century). From the Latin support for the former Vulgate reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further found in the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

The reading was also preserved in the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century) which reads, “*proiciatur* (to be thrown) *foras* (out) *et* (and),” and so differing slightly from the Vulgate’s “*mittatur* (to be cast) *foras* (out) *et* (and),” appears to have preserved the correct reading from an earlier old Latin Diatessaron.

However, the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254), reads Greek, “*blethen* (being cast) *exō* (out),” thus making the reading, “it is thenceforth good for nothing, *being cast out* to be trodden under foot of men.”

There is no good textual argument against the reading of the representative Byzantine Text, which must therefore stand. The origins of this variant are speculative. Possibly due to a paper fade, the original “... *blethenai exō kai*...” looked something like, “... *bleth::: exō:::...*” and this was a scribal “reconstruction.” Alternatively, this may have been a deliberate “stylistic improvement” at the hands of Origen.

The TR’s reading poses no textual difficulties, is supported by the representative Byzantine Text, St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, a host of old Latin Versions dating from the 4th to 13th centuries, together with St. Gregory. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “to be cast out, and” at Matt. 5:13 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 5:13, “to be cast out, and,” is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); as well as the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century), Syriac Harclean h (616), and Palestinian Syriac (c. 6th century). It is further found in the Armenian Version (5th century); the Ethiopic Version (Rome, 1548-9 & later Pell Platt editions) (c. 500); and the Georgian Version (5th century). It is also

found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, which includes the Latin words, "*mittetur* (to be cast) *foras* (out) *et* (and)" (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the incorrect reading, "being cast out," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and (the mixed text type) C 04 (5th century). The NU Committee split on this reading. A minority preferred the TR's reading, "to be cast (*blethenai*) out, and (*kai*) to be trodden under foot (*katapateisthai*)," which links two infinitives (*blethenai* and *katapateisthai*) with "and" (*kai*). The resultant terminology, "*to be* cast out, *and to be* trodden under foot," was regarded by them as more "Semitizing." But Metzger says the NU Committee "majority were impressed by the weight of testimony supporting" the variant; and then refers to the leading Alexandrian Texts, Rome Vaticanus and London Sinaiticus; the mixed text type *Paris Ephraemi Rescriptus* C 04; the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed in the Gospels, Alexandrian text Acts-Jude) and 892 (9th century, mixed text type), as well as Origen (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 13). This is a stereotypical neo-Alexandrian argument, in which a sound TR reading, for which there is no good textual argument against, is jettisoned essentially on the combined strength of the leading Alexandrian Texts, to which is then added some relatively minor additional support from elsewhere. Thus largely on the basis of an invalid presupposition with respect to the Alexandrian Text, "being cast (*blethen*) out (*exo*)" entered the NU Text. The TR's reading was totally removed by Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and reduced to a footnote in Nestle-Aland (27th edition) and UBS (3rd edition corrected). Then in the UBS (4th revised edition), the earlier position of Westcott-Hort and Nestle's 21st edition was reverted to, as even the footnote alternative was dropped.

Yet for all that, the NASB, RSV, ESV, and NIV adopted the NU Text's footnote reading found in the Nestle-Aland (27th edition) and earlier UBS (3rd edition corrected) texts. Thus like the ASV, which reads, "to be cast (*blethenai*) out (*exo*), and (*kai*)" (ASV), they follow the correct reading at Matt. 5:13. However, the incorrect reading is followed in the NRSV as, "is thrown (*blethen*) out (*exo*)" (NRSV).

**Matt. 5:22** "without a cause" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*eike* (without a cause)," in the words, "whosoever is angry with his brother *without a cause*," is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*sine* (without) *causa* (a cause)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), h (Paris 5th century & Rome 5th century), d (5th / 6th centuries), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); and further supported by one ancient church writer's variant text of Jerome's Latin Vulgate. It is followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin manuscript according to Origen (d. 254); Eusebius (d. 339), Basil the Great (d. 379), a manuscript of the Apostolic Constitutions (3rd or 4th century) according to Apollinaris (d. c. 390), Pseudo-Justin (d. 4th / 5th century), Chrysostom (d. 407), Cyril (d. 444), and Theodoret of Cyrus (d. 460); the ancient church Latin writers, Cyprian (d. 258); Hilary (d. 367), Lucifer of Cagliari (d. c. 370) in a manuscript according to Jerome (d. 420),

Augustine (d. 430); and Speculum (d. 5th century); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

But “without a cause” is omitted in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), old Latin Version aur (7th century); and the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, its omission is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is likewise omitted by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) in a manuscript according to Apollinaris (d. c. 390), Theodore-Heraclea (d. 355), and Theodore (d. c. 466) in a manuscript according to Apollinaris (d. c. 390); the ancient church Latin writers, Chromatius (d. 407), Jerome (d. 420), Augustine (d. 430); in a Greek manuscript according to Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

There is no good textual reason to doubt the reading of the representative Byzantine Text at Matt. 5:22, which must therefore stand as the correct reading. One the one hand, the Biblical teaching of verbal inspiration, requires that God chose the very words that a Bible writer was to use. God did not say to Jeremiah, “I’ll give you an idea, and you put it in your words, and I’ll supervise to make sure you get it right.” But rather, “whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak” (Jer. 1:7). Thus “the testimony of the Lord is sure” (Ps. 19:7). But on the other hand, it is clear that God chose words and terminology from the vocabulary and writing style of the inspired writers. Thus as a man can blow through many wind instruments and they all produce a different sound, whether e.g., the pipe, the recorder, the trumpet, or the mouth-organ; so God the Holy Spirit blew through many men to produce his Word through them with a different sound or writing style. God also sometimes tailored different emphases to different writers. E.g., John’s Gospel has some different emphases to the Synoptic Gospels. So too, within the Synoptic Gospels, there are some differences of emphasis.

In St. Matthew’s Gospel, we find that Divine exceptions to a general law tend to be stated. Thus ten verses later in Matt. 5:32, as in Matt. 19:9, we read that “whosoever shall put away his wife, *except it be for fornication*, and shall marry another, comitteth adultery” (Matt. 19:9). By contrast, in St. Mark’s Gospel (Mark 10:11) or St. Luke’s Gospel (Luke 16:18), we read of the Divine precept, but without reference to any exception. This same stylistic contrast between Matt. 5:32; 19:9 on the one hand, and Mark 10:11; Luke 16:18 on the other hand, is also relevant to Matt. 5:22. It is stylistically characteristic for St. Matthew to mention the exception to the general rule. Thus as seen by internal comparison even within the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5-7) from Matt. 5:32, the teaching, “That whosoever is angry with his brother *without a cause* shall be in danger of the judgement” (Matt. 5:22), is typically Matthean in terms of its selected inclusion of words dealing with the Divinely granted exception to the Divinely given general rule.

It is further more in keeping with the Divine character of God, which allows for *holy* or *righteous* anger (e.g., Isa. 1:4; Jer. 23:20; Zeph. 2:2,3), as opposed to *unholy* or *unrighteous* anger (e.g., Eph. 4:32; Col. 3:8). Christ himself clearly showed holy anger in the Gospels (Mark 3:5), e.g., when he “went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the moneychangers, and seats of them that sold doves” (Matt. 21:12). Unfortunately, there is a well known tendency, for people to take a very superficial view of Scriptures like Col. 3:8, “now” “put off” “anger,” and to wrongly conclude that “all anger is sin.”

While the origins of this omission are speculative, possibly this type of superficiality was behind the desire of copyists to deliberately prune away the words of Matt. 5:22, “without a cause.” Alternatively, “*eike* (without a cause)” may have been lost in a paper fade / loss, but for this reasons of superficiality, not regarded by later scribes as posing a textual problem, and so absorbed into an incomplete and corrupted text which omits “without a cause.”

This kind of thing, also finds a sequel in the unBiblical doctrine of marital indissolubility, in which men sometimes engage in “forbidding to marry” divorcees (I Tim. 4:3), where the divorce is in accord with Scripture. That is because they stubbornly refuse to except the plain teaching of marital dissolubility in the words, “saving for the cause of fornication” (AV), or “sexual immorality” (NKJV) in Matt. 5:32. It is not for us to tamper with the Word of God, but to submit unto it. If we do not like what it says, then we need to seek God’s grace in humble prayer so that we change, rather than trying to change the Word of God. We should not countenance the practice of some, to criticize a man because “he divorced his wife of twenty years, and married another woman,” but should first check if that divorce was or was not Biblically sound. We should not countenance the practice of some, to criticize a man because “he lost his temper and got very angry with so and so,” but should first check if that anger was or was not Biblically sound. The failure to impose this type of godly discipline, appears to lie behind the copyist’s pruning of “without a cause” at Matt. 5:22, as they arrogantly sought to create what they regarded as “a higher” or “better standard” than the one here stated by our Lord.

On the one hand, the inclusion of the words, “without a cause” at Matt. 5:22, are supported by the representative Byzantine Text, and there is no good textual argument against its inclusion, and indeed a good argument in its favour by comparison with the divorce teaching of Christ in the Synoptic Gospels. It is supported by a host of old Latin Versions (4th to 13th centuries), and a host of ancient church writers. But on the other hand, it is omitted in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, and a number of ancient church writers. Both readings were known to St. Gregory the Great. Were it not for the fact that there is strong textual argument specifically in favour of these words, then in balancing out these considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would have given the TR’s “without a cause” at Matt. 5:22 a “B” i.e., I would have said that the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty. However, the fact that there is such a strong textual argument in favour of this reading in my opinion produces a greater level of certainty, i.e., comparison with the Matthean writing style and emphasis evident in comparative analysis of Matt. 5:32; 19:9 with Mark 10:11; Luke 16:18, shows that it is typically Matthean to include a relevant exception clause to a general rule. In Matt. 5:27-32, Christ as recorded by St. Matthew does so in discussing the 7th commandment (Exod. 20:14) at Matt. 5:32; and so it is contextually consistent that in Matt. 5:21-26, Christ as recorded by St. Matthew will do so in discussing the 6th commandment (Exod. 20:13) at Matt. 5:22. Thus, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “without a cause” at Matt. 5:22 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 5:22, “without a cause,” is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (c. 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian

Version (5th century); Ethiopic Version (Takla Haymanot *c.* 500); Georgian Version (5th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), which reads in Ciasca's Latin, "*sine* (without) *causa* (a cause)."

The incorrect reading which omits "without a cause (*eike*)," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); Anglo-Saxon Version (8th to 10th centuries); and Ethiopic Versions (Hackspill, Paris, *c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

From here it entered the NU Text *et al.* Hence the incorrect reading is followed at Matt. 5:22 in the NASB and NIV. It is also found in the ASV, RSV, NRSV, and ESV, all three of which have a footnote stating the TR's reading; although the NRSV does great violence to Greek, translating the masculine *adelpho* (brother) in a painfully non-gendered way. While the NASB's 1st and 2nd editions also had such a footnote, as does the NIV; the NASB's 3rd edition removes this footnote. The semi neo-Alexandrian Moffatt, was predominantly a neo-Alexandrian. On this occasion, Moffatt followed his usual neo-Alexandrian principles, favouring the Alexandrian Text against e.g., the Western Text, so that the Moffatt Bible also has the variant with no footnote alternative. The NASB reader, like the Moffatt Bible reader, now has no remedy by which he might find the true reading. Now it here happened to the Moffatt Bible and the NASB's 3rd edition, according to the true proverb, "He, that being often reprov'd hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without remedy."

**Matt. 5:25** "deliver thee" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek words, "*se* (thee) *parado* (deliver)" in the words, "and the judge *deliver thee* to the officer" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). They are also found as Latin, "*tradat* (he may deliver) *te* (thee)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), h (Paris 5th century & Rome 5th century), d (5th / 6th centuries), f (6th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420).

However, the TR's words, "deliver thee," are omitted in old Latin Version k (4th / 5th centuries). They are also omitted by the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin manuscript (*c.* 395), Clement of Alexander (d. before 215), and Chrysostom (d. 407); and the ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367), Augustine (d. 430), and Arnobius (d. after 455).

Since there is no good textual reason to doubt the words, "deliver thee" found in the representative Byzantine Text, it follows that they must stand. Their impressive support in the Latin tradition is further evidence of their authenticity. Notably, some similar words occur in Luke 12:58, "When thou goest with thine adversary to the magistrate, as thou art in the way, give diligence, that thou mayest be delivered from him, lest he hale thee to the judge, and the judge deliver (*parado*) thee (*se*) to the officer, and the officer cast thee into prison." Were Matt. 5:25 an assimilation to Luke 12:58, we might reasonably expect that e.g., the words, "with (*met*) him (*autou*)" in Matt. 5:25 in the reading, "Agree with thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him," would be either pruned from Matt. 5:25, or added in at Luke 12:58. Though the

evidence is against assimilation, the witness of Luke 12:58 which was clearly said at a different time and in a different context, is that it was typically within the terminology of Christ to say the words, “deliver thee” in the reading, “and the judge *deliver thee* to the officer” (Matt. 5:25; Luke 12:58).

The origins of this variant are speculative. Since the passage still makes sense without them, did a scribe deliberately prune them away as being “redundant” and “unnecessary wordage”? Alternatively, was “*se* (thee) *parado* (deliver)” lost in a paper fade, and the fact that the passage still make sense without these words mean that a scribe thought that the space at the point of the paper fade was simply a “stylistic paper space break,” so that he did not realize that a loss had occurred?

On the one hand, the inclusion of the words, “deliver thee” at Matt. 5:25, are supported by the representative Byzantine Text, and there is no good textual argument against their inclusion. Indeed, there is a good argument in their favour by comparative analysis with the terminology of Jesus in Luke 12:58. They have strong support from the Latin tradition with Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, a host of old Latin Versions, and a quote by Jerome. But on the other hand, they are omitted by an old Latin Version and a number of ancient church writers. However, this omission can be reasonably explained as a pruning “refinement,” on the basis that they were regarded as “redundant” since the passage makes sense without them. Given the stylistic literary arguments in their favour, and their strong support in both the Greek and Latin, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “deliver thee” at Matt. 5:25 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 5:25, “deliver thee,” is found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Gothic Version (4th century); Georgian Versions “1” and “A” (5th century); and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the incorrect reading which omits “deliver thee,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in the Palestinian Syriac (c. 6th century); the Armenian Version (5th century); the Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries); and the Georgian “B” Version (5th century).

From such sources, it entered the NU Text *et al.* The TR’s reading was reduced to a footnote in Nestle-Aland (27th edition) and UBS (3rd edition corrected), and then in the UBS (4th revised edition) even the footnote alternative was dropped at Matt. 5:25.

The ASV has the correct reading at Matt. 5:25 in the main text, but a footnote says, “Some ancient authorities omit ‘deliver thee.’” However, the parent ASV’s incorrect footnote reading omitting these words, was followed in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV. The NIV lacks the simple beauty of our AV’s formal equivalence in “deliver (*parado*) thee (*se*),” and the immediate clarity of “thee” as “you” singular. Nevertheless, the NIV preserves the correct underpinning Greek reading, in its usage of “hand ... over (*parado*)” and “you [singular] (*se*),” i.e., “hand you over,” in the reading, “the judge may hand you over to the officer” (Matt. 5:25, NIV).

**Matt. 5:27** “by them of old time” (TR & AV) {B}

The TR’s Greek words, “*tois archaiois* (to the) *archaiois* (‘olden [ones],’ dative plural adjective, from *archaios-a-on*),” i.e., “by them of old time” (AV), is a minority Byzantine reading, found in Codex M 021 (9th century); and Minuscules 399 (9th / 10th century), 262 (10th century), 880 (11th century), 1187 (11th century), 21 (12th century), 119 (12th century), 120 (12th century), 217 (12th century), 245 (12th century), 485 (12th century), 1010 (12th century), 2127 (12th century, Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles); 477 (13th century), 232 (14th century), 578 (14th century), 70 (15th century), 287 (15th century), 288 (15th century), 745 (16th century).

These words are also found as Latin, “*antiquis* (‘to the olden ones,’ dative plural second declension noun, from *antiquus-i*),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions h (Paris 5th century & Rome 5th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century); and as Latin, “*ab* (by) *antiquis* (‘the olden ones,’ ablative plural second declension noun, from *antiquus-i*),” in old Latin Version c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for “*antiquis*,” it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). They are further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation (c. 395), Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation, Eusebius (d. 339), and Chrysostom (d. 407); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, they are omitted in the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). They are also omitted in old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), m (Munich 5 & 9th centuries), and f (6th century). They are also omitted by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

Stylistic analysis of Matt. 5:27 strongly favours the inclusion of these words. In Matt. chapter 5 first we find a trilogy centring around the Decalogue. Firstly, in Matt. 5:21 we read, “Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time,” followed by the sixth commandment (Exod. 20:13), “Thou shalt not kill.” Secondly, in Matt. 5:27 (TR & AV) we read, “Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time,” followed by the seventh commandment (Exod. 20:14), “Thou shalt not commit adultery.” In Matt. 5:31, in an expansion of Matt. 5:27, we read, “It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife,” and ending with, “whosoever shall marry her that is” unlawfully “divorced, committeth adultery” (Matt. 5:32,32) i.e., this section is clearly a sub-category of the larger Matt. 5:27-32 on the seventh commandment. Thirdly, in Matt. 5:33 we read, “Again, ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time,” followed by an application of the third (Exod. 20:7) and ninth (Exod. 20:16) commandments manifested in the Mosaical civil law of Lev. 19:12; Num. 30:2; Deut. 23:23.

Then we read this doublet dealing with punishments. Firstly, in Matt. 5:38, “Ye have heard that it hath been said,” followed by the punishment of Exod. 21:24,25; Lev. 24:20; Deut. 19:21. Secondly, in Matt. 5:43, “Ye have heard that it hath been said,” followed by the Neighbour Principle of Lev. 19:18, and what the Jews being addressed thought was the implied punishment of Lev. 19:17 to non-brethren i.e., the Jews Christ was addressing, considered the opposite of “thou shalt not hate thy brother” (Lev. 19:17), was Thou shalt “hate thine enemy” (Matt. 5:43) who is not thy brother.

If the TR's reading of Matt. 5:27 is correct, it follows that stylistically, Christ's usage of "by them of old," was present in the Decalogue trilogy of Matt. 5:21,27,33; but not in the subsection expansion of adultery in Matt. 5:31,32; nor in the punishments doublet of Matt. 5:38,43. Such stylistic completeness certainly favours the TR's inclusion of, "by them of old time" in Matt. 5:27. Its omission in the majority Byzantine text seems to create a stylistic jarring that acts as a witness testifying to its removal. Moreover, if the Latin witnesses and ancient church writers such as Origen and Eusebius had added, "by them of old time" in Matt. 5:27 in order to assimilate it to Matt. 5:21,33, one might reasonably expect that they would also have added these words at Matt. 5:31,38,43, in order to assimilate these verses as well. This in fact does not occur. The improbability of just one such assimilation i.e., at Matt. 5:27, amidst a group of similar statements which have not been so assimilated i.e., the retention of "It hath been said" (Matt. 5:31), rather than, "It hath been said *by them of old time*" at Matt. 5:38,43, strongly suggests that in fact no such assimilation occurred at Matt. 5:27. Thus the textual evidence indicates that the TR's longer reading, "by them of old time" in Matt. 5:27, is original.

How then did, "by them of old time" at Matt. 5:27, come to be omitted in the representative Byzantine text? This is speculative. Was it accidental? Was it lost in an undetected paper fade, or a paper loss in which the subsequent scribe saw a hole in his manuscript page and simply did not know what to do? Or did a scribe write down, "it was said" at Matt. 5:27, then scanning ahead by first reading over, "*tois archaiois* (τοις αρχαιοις, 'by them of old') *ou moicheuseis* (ου μοιχευσεις, 'Thou shalt not commit adultery')" etc., and remembering in his mind he was up to the word with a middle "chi" (*ch / χ*) ending with "iota" "sigma" (*is / ις*), did he then glance back (i.e., *archaiois / αρχαιοις*), and seeing "*ou moicheuseis* (ου μοιχευσεις)" which also has a middle "chi" (*ch / χ*) and ends with "iota" "sigma" (*is / ις*), did he then think was the word, and glancing back in a continuous script manuscript and also seeing the connected "*ou(ου)*," did he then write wrongly down "*ou moicheuseis* (ου μοιχευσεις)" and keep writing? If so, the omission probably occurred quite early in one transmission line, and so entered the Byzantine Text in this corrupted state.

Was the omission deliberate? Did a scribe consider that he did not object to the words, "by them of old time" at Matt. 5:21 because contextually a Jewish "council" established under Jewish civil law is then referred to in Matt. 5:22? Did he not object to the words, "by them of old time" at Matt. 5:33 because a Jewish civil law is then quoted as a manifestation of the Decalogue? But upon coming to Matt. 5:27 because there is no specific reference to any Jewish civil law in the section from Matt. 5:27-30, did this cause a scribe some concern on the basis that he thought people might take this to mean that "adultery" itself was an "old time" offence, no longer applicable to the Christian? Alas, the standard of scribes sometimes left something to be desired. For if this was his thinking he need not have worried since wider context clearly shows the binding nature of adultery for the Christian, and any concern that Matt. 5:27 might have this connotation when quoted in isolation i.e., as, "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery," is both unduly negative and supercilious, since a heretic or unbeliever can always misquote a Scripture, e.g., the sniggering God-hating foolish atheist whose stupidity leads him to "jestingly" say, "The Bible says, 'There is no God' in Psalm 14."

Thus it is unclear if the words, "by them of old" in Matt. 5:27 were omitted by accident or by design, but is clear that they were omitted. On the one hand, stylistic factors of textual analysis strongly favour the reading, "by them of old time." This has the impressive support of Jerome's Latin Vulgate, a number of old Latin Versions, ancient church writers, and the church

doctors St. John Chrysostom and St. Gregory the Great. But on the other hand, the words are omitted in the representative Byzantine Text, a number of old Latin Versions, and ancient church writers. Balancing out these competing considerations on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading "by them of old" in Matt. 5:27 a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 5:27, "by them of old," is found in the independent Codex Delta 037 (9th century); the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) Version; and in the text enclosed between critical signs i.e., not constituting the translator's representative copy, the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version.

However, the incorrect reading which omits these words are found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). They are further omitted in the Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); the Syriac Version (1708, Schaafius); and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

These words are absent in the NU Text *et al*, and so like the ASV following Westcott and Hort, at Matt. 5:27 the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV omit these words. They are omitted in the majority text of Burgon & Miller (1899), and thereafter also by Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). A footnote in the Burgonite NKJV says both the NU Text and Burgon's Majority Text omit these words. For there is sometimes "honour among thieves," and both the neo-Alexandrians and Burgonites seek to rob the Scriptures of these words.

**Matt. 5:30** "should be cast into hell" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek reading, "*blethe* (it should be cast)," in the words, "and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Codices W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53,) and the purple parchment, Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century). It is also found in a Latin Vulgate manuscript with independent readings; and as Latin, "*mittatur* (may be cast)," is supported in old Latin Version f (6th century). It further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

A variant, Greek, "*apelthe* ('it go,' aorist subjunctive active, 3rd person singular verb, from *aperchomai*)," making the reading, "go into hell," may be reconstructed from the Latin, being found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century) as Latin, "*eat* ('it may go,' present subjunctive active, 3rd person singular verb, from *eo*) in (into) *genhennam* (hell)." This Latin reading is also found in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), h (5th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Latin writer, Lucifer of Cagliari (d. c. 370). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as correct. The usage of *ballo* (*blethe*, from *ballo*) meaning "cast," is also

found at Matt. 5:13 (“to be cast out,” *blethenai*, present active infinitive from *ballō*); 5:25 (‘thou be cast,’ *blethesē*, indicative passive future, 2nd person singular verb from *ballō*); and 5:29 (‘should be cast,’ *blethe*, from *ballō*); and here in Matt. 5:30 Christ says, “And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast (*bale*, imperative active aorist, 2nd person singular verb, from *ballō*) it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast (*blethe*, subjunctive passive aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *ballō*) into hell.” It is therefore stylistically congruous that “should be cast (*blethe*)” is used here.

Thus it is less stylistically unexpected to say, “go (*appelthe* from *aperchomai*) into hell” which lacks the force of “cast” (*ballō*); whereas it is more stylistically expected to say “should be cast (*blethe*) into hell,” given the usage of “cast” (*ballō*) four other times in Matt. 5:13,25,29,30. Moreover, we know that this is the type of terminology Jesus would usually use in such contexts, since he also says, “be cast (*blethenai* from *ballō*) into everlasting fire” (Matt. 18:8), “be cast (*blethenai*) into hell fire” (Matt. 18:9), “be cast (*blethenai*) into hell” (Mark 9:45), and “be cast (*blethenai*) into hell fire” (Mark 9:47). However, Christ says in Mark 9:43 “go (*apelthein*, active aorist infinitive from *aperchomai*) into hell.” Thus while “should be cast into hell” is more stylistically expected in Matt. 5:30; one cannot totally rule out the possibility that Christ might have said, “go into hell” at Matt. 5:30, on the basis that he did so in Mark 9:43.

The origins of the variant are speculative. Was “*blethe* (should be cast),” lost in a paper fade / loss, or looked something like, “*...:the*,” and was “reconstructed” by a scribe as “*apelthe* (go),” possibly with some reference to Mark 9:43? Was this a deliberate change? Did a scribe seek to “harmonize” the “Gospel Greek theology” of Matt. 5:30 with Mark 9:43?

On the one hand, since “cast (*blethe*) into hell” is the representative Byzantine Text, and since there is no good textual argument against it we cannot doubt that it is the correct reading. Moreover, there is a clear textual argument in its favour as being the more expected reading in Matthean Greek. Thus “go (*apelthe*) into hell” is clearly incorrect. But on the other, Mark 9:43 shows “go into hell” is a possible reading, and it has the support of Jerome’s Latin Vulgate. Taking into account these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading “cast (*blethe*) into hell” at Matt. 5:30 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 5:30, “cast (*blethe*) into hell” in Matt. 5:30, is found in the independent text type Codex Delta 037 (9th century); Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); Gothic Version (4th century); and Armenian Version (5th century). The incorrect reading is also found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect Alexandrian reading, “go into hell,” was followed by the NU Text *et al.* Hence at Matt. 5:30 the reading found in the ASV, based on Westcott and Hort, namely, “go into hell,” is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

**Matt. 5:31a** “It hath been said,” (Matt. 5:31a, TR & AV) {C}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

Does the TR include “*de*” here or not? Scrivener takes the view that it does, and was simply left untranslated by the AV translators, (and they certainly sometimes do treat such conjunctions as redundant in English translation,) whereas I take a different view of the TR here. Certainly the matter is not one that necessarily affects English translation. I have nevertheless included discussion of it here. See Appendix 3, Vol. 1, “The conjunctions, for instance, ‘*de*’ (and) and ‘*oti*’ (that).”

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

The AV’s TR of Matt. 5:31a which reads in the Greek, “*errethe* (It hath been said)”, if understood to not include the “*de* (and)” after “*errethe*,” is a minority Byzantine reading. It is found in Byzantine Codices K 017 (Paris 9th century) and Pi 041 (St. Petersburg, 9th century); as well as Byzantine Minuscules 127 (11th century), 1010 (12th century), 280 (12th century), 998 (12th century), 1355 (12th century), 291 (13th century). It is further found in von Soden’s Kr group. This contains *c.* 189 manuscripts which are exclusively Byzantine inside a wider K group that has 914 exclusively Byzantine manuscripts<sup>40</sup>. Therefore this minority Byzantine reading is supported by *c.* 21% of manuscripts, and allowing a 10% error bar for von Soden’s generalist groups, we can still say it has the support of *c.* 19% of manuscripts, or in rounded numbers, *c.* 20% or one-fifth of manuscripts. The broad figure for all *c.* 980 manuscripts in von Soden’s Kr group on a generalist count represents *c.* 18-20% or about one-fifth of the 914 exclusively Byzantine text manuscripts in von Soden’s K group; or on a more precise count of Gospel manuscripts in the K group *c.* 22.5-25% of the Gospel manuscripts<sup>41</sup>. Therefore this is a sizeable

---

<sup>40</sup> See Textual Commentary, Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), at Matt. 20:15c.

<sup>41</sup> See Textual Commentary, Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) at Matt. 5:31a & 12:29, & Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), at Matt. 20:15c.

minority Byzantine reading. This reading i.e., that lacks the Greek “*de*” or Latin “*autem*,” is with qualification, also supported by old Latin Version h (5th century), which in a variant adds, “*Audistis* (You have heard<sup>42</sup>) *qui* (that),” before these words (*dictum est*), and so reads, “*Audistis* (You have heard) *qui* (that) *dictum est* (it hath been said).”

By contrast, the majority Byzantine Text includes “*de*” meaning “and” or “also,” thus making the reading either, the same as the AV, i.e., regarding the “*de*” here as redundant and so not translated, thus “It hath been said” (AV); or “And (Greek, *de*) it hath been said,” or “it hath been said also (*de*).” The inclusion of the Greek “*de*” is supported by e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). This is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407). This “*de*” is also found in Scrivener’s Text (see Appendix 1, Vol. 1). Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century) also reads “And” or “Indeed” (Latin, *autem*); as do old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), f (6th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is also found in the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century), which like the Vulgate, adds “*autem* (and),” after “*Dictum est*.” From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

The AV’s reading was followed by Tyndale in 1526 and 1534 (“It is said, Whosoever” etc.), Cranmer in 1539 (“It is said, whosoever” etc.), and the Geneva Bible in 1557 (“It is said, whosoever” etc.); although this raises the same questions as to whether or not they simply regarded it as redundant in English translation. But reflecting the textual difficulties presented by this verse, the revised Geneva Bible of 1560 (which is not always an improvement on the 1557 edition), followed the representative Byzantine reading, translating “*de*” as “also,” i.e., “It hath been said also (*de*), Whosoever” etc. . But with these known alternatives, the AV translators reverted back to the reading of the earlier Geneva Bible of 1557 *et al.* Did they think that the Greek *de* did not form part of the original text, or did they think that it did form part of the original Greek text, but was redundant in English translation? The matter is one of dispute, and is a finely balanced textual argument; but makes no *necessary* impact on English translation.

Stylistic analysis of Matt. 5:31a in its immediate context, favours the minority Byzantine reading that omits “and” (*de*). Let the reader consider the following terminology.

---

<sup>42</sup> The active indicative perfect, 2nd person plural verb from *video*, is *audivistis*. However, the syncopated perfect may drop the “v,” and as here, quite often additionally contract the vowels, so that its shortened form becomes, *audistis*.

“Ye have heard that it was said ..., Thou shalt not kill” etc. (Matt. 5:21);  
 “But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother” etc. (Matt. 5:22)

“Ye have hear that it was said ..., Thou shalt not commit adultery” (Matt. 5:27);  
 “But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust” etc. (Matt. 5:28).

“It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife” etc.  
 (Matt. 5:31);

“But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife” etc. (Matt. 5:32).

“Again (Greek *palin*, Latin, *iterum*), ye have heard that it hath been said ...,  
 Thou shalt not forswear thyself” etc. (Matt. 5:33);

“But I say unto you, Swear not at all” etc. (Matt. 5:34).

“Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye” etc. (Matt. 5:38);

“But I say unto you,” (AV) “Resist not ” (literal translation) “evil” (AV) (Matt. 5:39a)  
 [The AV’s translation of Matt. 5:39a is discussed below at Matt. 5:39a].

“Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour” etc. (Matt. 5:43);

“But I say unto you, Love your enemies” etc. (Matt. 5:44).

Stylistically, the quotation terminology starts in Matt. 5:22. There are then *two quotes*, in which there is no “And / Also (*de*)” (Matt. 5:27,31). Then at Matt. 5:33 we find the addition of the word, “Again (*palin*)” i.e., “Again, ye have heard that it hath been said.” There are then *two quotes*, in which there is no “And / Also (*de*)” (Matt. 5:38,43). In the first place, the omission of “And / Also (*de*)” at Matt. 5:31a is thus stylistically consistent with a wider style of an initial quote followed by two quotes in which there is no “And / Also (*de*).”

In the second place, when after each two initial quotes, a word is added as a stylistic division at Matt. 5:33, that word is “Again (*palin*),” and so if there was a comparable division at Matt. 5:31a, the usage of “Again (*palin*)” would be more expected than “And / Also (*de*).” Although by comparison between Matt. 5:31a and Matt. 5:33, one could not definitely rule out the possibility that Christ used “And / Also (*de*),” if original, it would nevertheless be more expected that “Again (*palin*)” would be used than “And / Also (*de*)” at Matt. 5:31a.

In the third place, if “And / Also (*de*)” at Matt. 5:31a were original, this would form a style *not* of a quote followed by two quotes without “And / Also (*de*),” but rather, a pattern of a quote followed by *one quote* without “And / Also (*de*).” If this were original, then one would reasonably expect that Matt. 5:38 would not have “And / Also (*de*),” but that Matt. 5:43 would likewise have “And / Also (*de*).” But no such reading exists at Matt. 5:38. Although by comparison between Matt. 5:31a and Matt. 5:38, one could not definitely rule out the possibility that Christ used “And / Also (*de*),” if original, it would nevertheless be more expected that “And / Also (*de*)” would also be used at Matt. 5:38 if “And / Also (*de*)” was original at Matt. 5:31a.

Though the matter is finely balanced, the combination of these three factors, means that on the balance of probabilities, the reading that lacks “*de*” is to be favoured over the one that does not. The issue of how the Greek “*de*” came to be added at Matt. 5:31a is necessarily speculative. But it is a common Greek conjunctive, found in e.g., Matt. 5:1,28,29,32,39; 6:1 *et*

*al*; and was perhaps introduced here from the “precedent” of the immediately surrounding verses 29 and 32.

Thus on the one hand, the reading at Matt. 5:31a which lacks “And / Also” (*de*) is favoured as the more likely reading by textual analysis. But on the other hand, this is an unrepresentative Byzantine reading, and the inclusion of “And / Also” (*de*) is supported by the representative Byzantine Text, as well as Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, a number of old Latin Versions, and the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407). If the only manuscript support for the TR’s reading were the minority Byzantine Text, then I would have given the TR’s reading a “D” i.e., the evidence for the TR reading would have been about equally divided with the alternative reading, so that we could not have been entirely certain as to which was the better reading (50% certainty). But taking into account its further support in the old Latin Version h (5th century), tips the balance of probabilities in favour of the TR’s reading. On the one hand, it is clear that the earlier part of this verse is corrupted in this old Latin Version by the addition of the words “You have heard that” (*Audistis qui*). But on the other hand, in the section of the verse in question, there is no compelling evidence of corruption in the reading, “it hath been said (*dictum est*),” i.e., without the Latin *autem* for the Greek *de*. The manuscript could easily have read, “You have heard that it hath indeed (*autem*) been said,” and so the absence of *autem* from this old Latin Version, is a rock solid reference for this reading from ancient times.

Were this old Latin Manuscript without any corruption in Matt. 5:31a, I would consider that its testimony would tip the balance of probabilities in the TR’s favour to a middling “C” (in the range of 56% +/- 2%). But recognizing that some corruption has occurred in old Latin Version h at this verse; whilst also recognizing that there is no compelling reason to maintain that corruption has occurred at the point of the verse in question, means that I think the testimony of old Latin h, moves the balance of probabilities for the TR’s reading from a “D,” to a low range “C” Therefore, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading which lacks the Greek “*de*,” in “It hath been said,” at Matt. 5:31a, a low level “C” (in the range of 52% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading, but has a lower level of certainty. But it must be said, that this is clearly a matter that neo-Byzantines may disagree over.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources, what I consider at Matt. 5:31a to be the TR’s reading, “It hath been said,” is followed by a first “corrector” of one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent) and 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); and Arabic Version (9th century); and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), which reads in Ciasca’s Latin, “*Dictum est* (It hath been said): *Quicumque* (Whosoever).”

The alternative reading, that Scrivener considers to be the TR’s reading, i.e., that includes “And / Also” (Greek *de*, or Latin *autem*) is followed by one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); a second “corrector” of the other leading Alexandrian text, London Sinaiticus (4th century); and also the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). From such sources it entered the NU Text *at al*.

The same NU Text reading at Matt. 5:31a, is followed in the NASB’s first and second

editions as, “And (*de*) it was said” etc. (NASB 1st ed. & 2nd ed.), thus maintaining its presence which is found in the parent ASV as, “It was said also (*de*), Whosoever,” etc. . However, this was changed in the NASB’s third edition to, “It was said, Whoever” etc. (NASB 3rd ed.), whether because they thought it was lacking in the Greek, or whether they thought it was present in the Greek but redundant in English, we cannot be sure, but probably the latter. While the nature of the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV as being, in varying degrees, non-literal translations, means we are even more unsure as to whether they was following a neo-Alexandrian text but simply omitting “And” for stylistic reasons, or following the TR reading; nevertheless, in harmony with the TR they too do not read “And” or some other word for *de*.

Following in the footsteps of their leader, Dean John Burgon, a 19th century *Church of England* Dean of Chichester Cathedral in England, the Burgonites do not believe in the type of textual analysis, *supra*. (And it must be admitted, that in this particular instance the arguments are quite finely balanced, and neo-Byzantines may disagree on the matter.) Rather, the Burgonites maintain one should simply undertake a count of all Greek manuscripts, (which in practice means a representative sample of them,) and since most Greek manuscripts are Byzantine, they end up supporting the majority Byzantine Text in practice, although they support the overall Greek majority text in theory. With so much hanging on textual analysis here in Matt. 5:31a, for what is both a minority Byzantine Greek reading, and a minority Latin reading (the Burgonites do not recognize any Latin manuscripts in their text count), the NKJV, adopted Scrivener’s Text and the Majority Text reading here. Thus the Burgonite Majority Text reading at Matt. 5:31a, is found in the NKJV’s “Furthermore (*de*) it has been said.”

**Matt. 5:32a** “whosoever shall put away” (TR & AV) {B}

The TR’s Greek words, “*os an* (whosoever) *apoluse* (from *apoluo*, ‘shall put away’),” in the words, “whosoever shall put away his wife,” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text. It is further supported as Latin, “*Quicumque* (‘Whoever,’ from *qui* = who + *cumque* = -soever),” in old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), h (Paris 5th century & Rome 5th century), g1 (8th / 9th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254), and the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

However, in the place of these words, an alternative reading, Greek, “*pas* (every) *o* (the [one] [who]) *apoluon* (from *apoluo*, ‘putteth away’)” i.e., reading, “*everyone who putteth away his wife*,” is a minority Byzantine reading, found e.g., in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century<sup>43</sup>) and E 07 (8th century). It is also found as Latin, “*qui* (for) *omnis* (every [one]) *qui* (who),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions f (6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). It also has support from the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

In Matt. 5:21,22, “whosoever (*os ... an*) shall kill” (Matt. 5:21), is followed by “Whosoever (*pas o*) is angry” and then, “whosoever (*os ... an*) shall say” (Matt. 5:22). In Matt. 5:28 we read “whosoever (*pas o*) looketh on a woman to lust.” This is followed in Matt.

---

<sup>43</sup> Harnack records that Sigma 042 contains “*pa*” followed by a space, which contextually requires that this originally read, “*pas o*” (Harnack, *Die Uberlieferung*, *op. cit.*, p. 8).

5:31,32, with “It hath been said, Whosoever (*os an*) shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement” (Matt. 5:31); and then, “But I say unto you, That whosoever (*os an*) shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery; and whosoever (*os ean*) shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery” (Matt. 5:32). Thus in the style of Hebraic or Aramaic parallelism we find “Whosoever (*os an*) shall put away his wife” in Matt. 5:31,32 are in synonymous parallelism. But Jesus then develops Matt. 5:32 differently to Matt. 5:31. Given this synonymous parallelism, it is quite likely, though purely on the basis of stylistic analysis, not absolutely certain, that Jesus used exactly the same words i.e., repeating “Whosoever (*os an*),” to strengthen this point. This argument is not conclusive since synonymous or near synonyms are sometimes used in Hebraic or Aramaic synonymous parallelism.

Nevertheless, there is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, “whosoever (*os an*) shall put away (*apoluse*)” at Matt. 5:32, which must therefore stand as correct. Therefore, a scribe not sensitive to the underpinning Aramaic synonymous parallelism, which in this instance evidently did use the same words “whosoever (*os an*),” in all likelihood noting that in Matt. 5:21,22 the trilogy is, “whosoever (*os ... an*),” then “Whosoever (*pas o*), and then, “whosoever (*os ... an*), then made Matt. 5:31,32 conform to this same pattern, and hence Matt. 5:32 was changed from “*os an*” to “*pas o*,” with the declension of *apoluo* also being changed from “*apoluse*” to “*apoluon*.”

It is possible that a scribe made this change as a “stylistic improvement,” since it then conformed to the trilogy of Matt. 5:21,22, which may be expected, *were it not for the fact that this was an instance of synonymous parallelism* which was a fact lost on any such scribe. Alternatively, the change may have been accidental. It is notable that there are the same number of letters in “*os an*” as “*pas o*,” and the same number of letters in the changed declension of *apoluo* i.e., the original ending “*se*” was changed to “*on*.” Therefore, it is possible that due to a paper / parchment loss, the original “*os an apoluse*,” was seen by the scribe as “*..... apoulu:::*,” and so he deduced from the context of Matt. 5:32 as well as Matt. 21:22, that the most likely reconstruction was “*pas o apoluon*” (“everyone who putteth away”).

We cannot be sure whether the change was deliberate or accidental. In either instance, if, as is quite possible, the scribe first making this alteration was following *Variant 1* at Matt. 5:32b (see commentary at Matt. 5:32 below,) which is an ancient variant probably originating with Origen (d. 254), then the usage of the terminology, “everyone who (*pas o*) putteth away (*apoluon*)” (Matt. 5:32a), may also have originated in a desire to make this parallel with Origen’s earlier alteration of “whoso (*o*) [her] that is divorced (*apolelumenen*) marrying (*gamesas*)” at Matt. 5:32b. If so, the error of Origen in changing Matt. 5:32b to Variant 1, was then compounded by this later associated error of Matt. 5:32a.

While there is a stylistic textual argument in favour of the TR’s reading, this is not conclusive, given that Hebrew or Aramaic synonymous parallelism could still use synonyms or near synonyms i.e., “*os an*” and then “*pas o*.” On the one hand, no good textual argument can be adduced against the representative Byzantine Text, which is further supported by various old Latin Versions and ancient church writers. But on the other hand, the alternative reading is supported by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, a number of old Latin Versions, and an ancient church writer. Taking into account these different considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “whosoever shall put away” at Matt. 5:32 a “B”

i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources at Matt. 5:32 the correct reading, “whosoever shall put away,” is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); as well as the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); and an Egyptian Coptic Version (Memphitica).

However, the incorrect reading, “everyone who putteth away,” is followed in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with the Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries). From here it entered the NU Text *et al.*

Given that in Matt. 5, the AV translates both “*os an*” (Matt. 5:21,31) and “*pas o*” (Matt. 5:22,28) as “whosoever,” it is possible to translate both variants the same. The ASV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and Moffatt, all follow the variant. Hence as seen by the contrast at Matt. 5:32a between “Whoever (*os an*) divorces (*apoluse*) his wife” (TR & NKJV) and “everyone who (*pas o*) divorces (*apoluon*) his wife” (NU Text & ESV), or less literally, “anyone who (*pas o*) divorces (*apoluon*) his wife” (Moffatt); the neo-Alexandrian translations have wanted to make a difference in their translation to the neo-Byzantine *Textus Receptus* translation, which they have based on the fact that the Greek “*pas*” may be translated as “every” (ASV) or less literally, “any” (Moffatt).

**Matt. 5:32b** “and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery” (TR & AV) {A}

The Greek words of the *Textus Receptus* (TR), “*kai* (and) *os ean* (whosoever) *apolelumenen* ([her] that is divorced) *gamēse* (‘he shall marry,’ aorist active subjunctive, 3rd person singular) *moichatai* (committeth adultery)” i.e., “and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery” (AV), are supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). They are also supported as Latin, “*et* (and) *si qui* (if anyone<sup>44</sup>) *dissmissam* ([her] that is dismissed<sup>45</sup>) *nupserit* (‘he shall marry,’ literally, ‘he may have married,’ perfect active subjunctive, 3rd person singular) *moechatur* (he committeth adultery),” i.e., “and if anyone shall marry her that is dismissed he committeth adultery,” by old Latin Version h (5th century). They are further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Basil the Great (d. 379) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

There are two variants. *Variant 1* found in the ancient Greek writer, Origen (d. 254), reads, “*kai* (and) *o* (he / whoso) *apolelumenen* ([her] that is divorced) *gamēsas* (marrying) *moichatai* (committeth adultery)” i.e., “and whoso marrieth her that is divorced committeth

<sup>44</sup> Literally “if” (*si*) + “who” (*qui*), but *si qui* = “if anyone / anything,” here the former.

<sup>45</sup> From prefix *dis* (apart) + verb participle *missam* (from *mitto*, ‘to send’).

adultery.” Either the TR reading or Variant 1 could be the underpinning Greek translation that was used in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). This Latin reading which may be derived from either the TR or Variant 1, is also supported by the ancient church Latin writers, Tertullian (d. after 220), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

*Variant 2* omits these words, and is found in some old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), and d (5th century). It also appears in a Greek manuscript according to Origen (d. 254), a bi-lingual Greek and Latin manuscript according to Augustine (d. 430); and is followed by the ancient church Latin writers, Zeno (d. 4th century), Chromatius (d. 407), Augustine (d. 430), and Speculum (d. 5th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine Text, which therefore constitutes the correct reading. *Variant 1* probably originated with Origen, and appears to be an assimilation with Matt. 19:9 where we also read, “*kai* (and) *o* (he / whoso) *apolelumenen* ([her] that is divorced) *game<sub>s</sub>as* (marrying) *moichatai* (committeth adultery)” i.e., “whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery” (AV). Did this change occur after a paper fade / loss, or was this a “stylistic improvement”? Was Origen’s assimilation of Matt. 5:32b to Matt. 19:9 a key factor giving rise to the further subsequent changing of Matt. 5:32a (see commentary above at Matt. 5:32a)?

*Variant 2* appears to be too long to have been a paper fade / loss, although one cannot be sure, since the details are lost to us in unrecorded history. It may have arisen as a deliberate “stylistic improvement” on the basis that it was “redundant” to say, “and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery,” after having first said, “whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery [when she remarries].” If so, the scribe had an incomplete knowledge of the words, “whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery.” E.g., a single woman who commits fornication, thereby commits adultery against a man she later seeks to marry (other than the man with whom she committed fornication,) so that upon discovery his bride is not a virgin, a man may divorce her for fornication. Hence among other things, Matt. 5:32 teaches that the NT Christian law is the same on this point, as the OT Jewish law (Deut. 22:13-21; Matt. 1:18-20).

But the words of Jesus in Matt. 5:32, “causeth her to commit adultery,” are emphatic; and so apply as much to a woman *when she remarries* after an unBiblical divorce, as they do to a woman *who does not remarry* after an unBiblical divorce. Active adultery exists were there is an act of extra-marital sex with another, and is a ground for divorce and remarriage in Matt. 5:32<sup>46</sup>. Passive adultery exists where there is a persistent and wilful denial of conjugal rights.

---

<sup>46</sup> On the one hand, orthodox Protestants historically agree that “at pleasure” or “cheap divorce” is immoral. They agree that for remarriage to be valid in God’s law, a divorce must have had a Biblically sound cause. On the other hand, orthodox Protestants historically agree that (active) adultery by a woman (husband’s divorce petition) i.e., simple adultery, is a cause for divorce and remarriage of a man; and (active) adultery with aggravated enormity by a man (wife’s divorce petition) i.e., adultery coupled with desertion, or adultery coupled with cruelty, or a particularly repulsive form of adultery e.g., incest or sodomy, is a cause for divorce allowing

Thus when a woman deserts her husband, Scripture says she has “played the whore against him” (Judges 19:2) i.e., she is guilty of passive adultery by a denial of conjugal rights. A constructive desertion may also occur, where a man and wife are still living under the same roof, but there is a persistent and wilful denial of conjugal rights by one of them. Thus both constructive desertion in the form of a persistent and wilful denial of conjugal rights, and actual desertion which thus also constitutes a persistent and wilful denial of conjugal rights, are grounds for divorce and remarriage under NT Christian law (Matt. 5:32; I Cor. 7:2-5,15), just as they were under OT Jewish law (Judges 19:2).

In marriage, a man and woman are “one flesh” (Gen. 2:24); and this is a symbol of the union between Christ and the church (Eph. 5:31,32). But “he that is cruel troubleth his own flesh” (Prov. 11:17). Mal. 2:13-16 teaches that cruelty in which “one covereth violence with his garment,” destroys the marital basis on which a couple are “one.” I.e., it results in the termination of consensual sexual relations between a man and his wife, since sexual intimacy between a man and his wife, and cruelty, are alien to one another, so that they cannot co-exist together for long. Since cruelty instigates the termination of sexual relations i.e., passive adultery, it is a divorce cause for “putting away” (Mal. 2:16). Of which we have (in allegorical form,) a single instance in the NT, namely, Christ’s “divorcement” of the Jews (Isa. 50:1). For he was taken “by wicked hands,” “crucified and slain” (Acts 2:23), and the Jews declared, “His blood be on us, and our children” (Matt. 27:25). Thus Christ divorced Lady Judaism, and made Lady Christianity his bride. This shows that the instigation of passive adultery as a result of cruelty, is a ground for divorce and remarriage under NT Christian law, just as it was under OT Jewish law.

Lord Devlin says that historically, adultery, desertion, and cruelty, were the three most common divorce causes<sup>47</sup>. It is therefore notable, that in Scripture, the latter two of these are connected with passive adultery.

Were the Romish doctrine of Mary’s “perpetual virginity” true, it would, unless she had e.g., divorced Joseph for cruelty before Matt. 1:25, not as the Romanist’s claim make her *more pure*, but rather *less pure*, since she would then be an adulteress, guilty of passive adultery i.e., a persistent and wilful refusal of conjugal rights to her husband Joseph. Such a claim by the Roman Church, is a slander against the character of St. Mary, whom Scripture says was sexually pure (Matt. 1:22,23). Thus as a sexual pure wife, after Christ’s birth, she entered sexual

---

remarriage for a woman. But they disagree as to what else, if anything, constitutes a valid divorce cause. E.g., some allow simple adultery (wife’s petition), some do not. Some allow desertion, some do not. Some allow cruelty, some do not. My own views are broadly the same as those of e.g., Thomas Cranmer, the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury (i.e., divorce for a series of weighty causes, Cranmer’s *Reformed Laws*). I consider any divorce cause must be for a weighty cause in which marital “hate” (Deut. 24:3) occasions “uncleanness” (Deut. 24:1) in the form of active or passive adultery (Matt. 5:32; 19:9). When such laws are in place the three most common divorce causes have historically been: adultery (Exod. 20:14; Matt. 19:9), desertion (Judg. 19:1,2; I Cor. 7:15), and cruelty (Mal. 2:14-16). See my letter, “The Myth of the Anglican Indissolubilist View,” *English Churchman*, 29 Nov. & 6 Dec. 2002, p. 2.

<sup>47</sup> Devlin, P., *The Enforcement of Morals*, Oxford University, UK, 1965; Reprint: 1970.

relations with Joseph (Matt. 1:25). Christ was her “firstborn” (Matt. 1:25), and so she had other children also (Matt. 12:47). The Roman Catholic doctrine of marital indissolubility, which will not allow divorce with remarriage for such Biblical causes as e.g., adultery (i.e., active adultery) or desertion (i.e., passive adultery), therefore promotes adultery (i.e., passive adultery) contrary to the seventh commandment, “Thou shalt not commit adultery” (Exod. 20:14; Rom. 13:9).

The Roman Church’s teaching of Mary “ever-virgin” and marital indissolubility are therefore intertwined concepts. But the true and Biblical Christ will have none of it! He says here plainly, “whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery” (Matt. 5:32). Thus any scribe omitting the latter clause i.e., “and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery,” on the basis of redundancy with the former clause, i.e., “causeth her to commit adultery,” has not properly understood the fuller meaning of the former clause. Christ first refers to passive adultery, i.e., the fact that a woman is forced to deny conjugal rights to her husband after an unBiblical divorce, and so he “causeth her to commit adultery;” and contrast this with active “adultery,” such as occurs if after an unBiblical divorce a man “shall marry her that is divorced” (Matt. 5:32).

*Variant 2* may also have been an accidental change. The copyist’s page (using English rather than Greek letters, *infra*,) may have looked something like this. Either the TR’s reading:

*logou porneias poiei autēn moichasthai  
kai os ean apolelumenen gamese moichatai*

or Origen’s *Variant 2* reading,

*logou porneias poiei autēn moicheuthenai  
kai o apolelumenen gamesas moichatai*

The loss due to ellipses if the first line ended with “*poiei* (causeth) *autēn* (her) *moichasthai* (to commit adultery)” (TR & representative Byzantine Text with support from Basil the Great); or if the first line ended with, “*poiei* (causeth) *autēn* (her) *moicheuthenai* (to commit adultery)” (Origen on *Variant 2*) (for these two variants, see Appendix 3, Vol. 1); and the second line ended with “*game~~se~~* (shall marry) *moichatai* (committeth adultery)” (Byzantine Text & St. Basil) or “*gamesas moichatai*” (Origen on *Variant 2*), then the scribe having copied out the first line, and seeing the “*ai*” ending of the first line from “*moichasthai*” or “*moicheuthenai*” respectively; then glancing back and remembering he was “up to the *moich* word ending with *ai*,” may have quickly glanced back to “*moichatai*” at the end of the second line, and then kept copying Matt. 5:33. Thus we cannot be sure as to whether the loss of this last clause in Matt. 5:32 was accidental due to paper loss / fade (possible but unlikely in this instance), due to ellipsis, or deliberate as a “stylistic improvement.”

The TR’s reading at Matt. 5:32b, “and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery,” has the support of the majority Byzantine Text and a number of ancient church writers. There is no good textual argument against it. It is possible to see how *Variant 1* arose due to assimilation with Matt. 19:9, probably by Origen; and how *Variant 2* arose either by deliberate or accidental omission. Thus the TR’s reading here stands sure. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery” at Matt. 5:32b an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct

reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 5:32b, “and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (c. 500).

*Variant 1*, “and whoso marrieth her that is divorced committeth adultery,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as the Slavic Version (9th century). Either the TR’s reading or *Variant 1* could be the underpinning translation that was used in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), which has the same Latin reading as the Vulgate. *Variant 2*, which omits the TR’s word, is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).

Partly for the right reasons (some textual considerations), and partly for the wrong reasons (the support of London Sinaiticus), the TR’s reading was adopted in the NU Text *et al.* As in the Westcott-Hort based ASV, which reads, “whosoever shall marry her when she is put away comitteth adultery” (ASV); the correct reading is found at Matt. 5:32 in NU Text, the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV (which varies their exact words between their 1st and 2nd editions).

**Matt. 5:37** “let ... be” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s declension of the Greek verb, *eimi* (to be), found as Greek, “*estō* (‘let ... be,’ imperative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *eimi*),” in the words, “But *let* your communication *be*, Yea, yea; Nay, nay,” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53). From the Latin verb, *sum, esse* (to be), it is also supported as Latin, “*sit* (‘let ... be,’ subjunctive active present, 3rd person singular verb, acting as a jussive subjunctive<sup>48</sup>),” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Justin Martyr (d. c. 165), Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation (c. 395), and Clement of Alexandria (d. before 215); the ancient church Latin writers, Tertullian (d. after 220), and Cyprian (d. 258); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However, an alternative declension of the Greek verb, *eimi* (to be), found as Greek, *estai* (‘will be’ / ‘shall be,’ future indicative, 3rd person singular)” in the words, “But your communication *shall be*, Yea, yea; Nay, nay,” is a minority Byzantine reading, found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and the ancient church Greek writers, Clement of Alexandria (d. before 215) and Eusebius (d. 339).

---

<sup>48</sup> Wheelock’s *Latin Grammar*, p. 188.

There is no good textual reason to doubt the representative Byzantine Text, which must therefore stand as the correct reading. The origins of the variants are speculative. Possibly it was a “reconstruction” following a paper fade / loss that made “*esto*” look something like, “*est:*”.

Alternatively, it may have been a deliberate “stylistic improvement.” Either way, the scribe may have been influenced by the usage of *estai* at Matt. 5:21; 6:21 *et al.*

With the further support of the Latin witness, and both ancient and early mediaeval church writers, the reading is certain. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “let ... be” at Matt. 5:37 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 5:37, “let ... be,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; as well as the Gothic Version (4th century); the Ethiopic Version (c. 500); and the Georgian Version (5th century).

However, the incorrect reading, “shall be,” is further found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), Harclean h (616), and Palestinian (c. 6th century) Versions. We are here reminded yet again, that the Alexandrian scribes, in this instance of Rome Vaticanus, were prepared to make gratuitous “stylistic improvements.”

Its wide diversity of support, meant that partly for the right reasons (its wide support in the closed class of three), and partly for the wrong reasons (its wide support outside the closed class of three), the correct reading was adopted in the NU Text *et al.* It is found in the parent ASV as “let ... be,” in “But *let* your speech *be*” (ASV); although an ASV footnote says, “Some ancient authorities read ‘But your speech shall be’.” The parent ASV’s main reading at Matt. 5:37, “let ... be” (ASV) is continued in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV. Additions to, and subtractions from, God’s Word, are an irreducible part of the NIV’s translation style of dynamic equivalence. But if the reader looks beyond the needless additions of “Simply” and the second “your,” or the gratuitous omissions of “But” and “conversation;” then he will find the correct reading of “let ... be” in, “Simply *let* your ‘Yes’ *be* ‘Yes,’ and your ‘No,’ ‘No’ (Matt. 5:37, NIV).

**Matt. 5:39a** “But I say unto you, That ye resist” (AV) {-}

The Received Text’s Greek, “*ego* (I) *de* (but) *lego* (say) *umin* (unto you), *me* (not) *antistenai* (do resist) *tou* (the) *ponerou* (evil); might be literally translated, “But I say unto you,” (AV) “Resist not” (literal translation) “evil.” It is translated in the AV as, “But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil” (Matt. 5:39a, AV).

The AV is both a great translation and a great piece of English literature. The infinitive form of “resist” (i.e., the simple uninflected form of this verb, which expresses action without reference to tense, person, or number,) i.e., “But I tell you not to resist” “evil” (NKJV), sounds too weak in English, especially in the context of the terminology of Matt. 5. For such English

stylistic reasons, it would never have been acceptable to the AV translators. The more robust imperative (i.e., a command or order) was necessary, “Resist not evil.”

But the AV translators recognized a serious problem with so literal a translation as, “Resist not evil” in Matt. 5:39a. Specifically, would “Resist not evil” be understood by the reader to be in “you” singular i.e., “Thou shalt not resist evil,” or in “you” plural i.e., “That ye resist not evil.” In the context of Matt. 5, the matter is a serious concern because in e.g., Matt. 5:33, we find a plural address, “Again ye (“you” plural) have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, “Thou (“you” singular) shalt not forswear thyself” etc., and in the elucidation the “you” singular is also used, “Neither shalt thou (“you” singular) swear by thy (“you” singular) head” (Matt. 5:36). By contrast, in Matt. 5:43-48, the plural address, “Ye (“you” plural) have heard that it hath been said,” is then followed by the singular, “Thou (“you” singular) shalt love thy neighbour” etc.; and then in the elucidation “you” plural is used, “But I say unto you (“you” plural), Love your (“you” plural) enemies” etc. (Matt. 5:43,44) and this continues down to Matt. 5:48.

Under these circumstances, it was necessary to clarify the imperative, “Resist not evil” in Matt. 5:39a with the “you” singular or plural. Since Christ first says, “But I say unto you” (*umin*, you plural), the immediately following words must be in “you” plural i.e., “That ye resist not evil.” This then changes to an individual address with, “whosoever shall smite thee (*se*, “you” singular) on thy (*sou*, “you” singular) cheek” etc. . Thus the AV translators translated Matt. 5:39a as, “But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil” etc. In doing so, they employed a limited usage of dynamic equivalence, since we do not find “that ye” placed in italics.

The AV translators policy was to use a dynamic equivalent only where required in order to translate something into intelligible English, and Matt. 5:39a is therefore an example of this. Thus in making an intelligible and great sounding English translation, the AV translators found it desirable to use the dynamic equivalent, “That ye resist” in Matt. 5:39a.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

“But I say unto you, That ye resist” (Matt. 5:39a, AV). This is not a textual issue since the manuscripts are in agreement. But the matter is discussed here since it includes reference to the ASV, NKJV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV, and such translations are normally discussed in this section.

On the one hand, e.g., the ASV is *prima facie* more literal than the AV at Matt. 5:39a, for its reads, “But I say unto you, Resist not ... evil” (ASV). The ASV translation “Resist not,” is the same as that used in the stylistic analysis undertaken above at Matt. 5:31a. But while the literal translation of Matt. 5:39a as, “Resist not,” is an important starting point in the wider stylistic analysis of Matt. 5:31, it must not be the finishing point at which a translation of Matt. 5:39a ends, as does the ASV. The ASV leaves the reader wondering whether “Resist not” is addressing “you” singular or plural. The result? Confusion.

Unlike the great clarity and power of the AV translation, “But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil” (Matt. 5:39a), we are left with a flat and weak sounding Matt. 5:39a in the NKJV, “But I tell you not to resist” “evil” (NKJV). But is the original “you” singular or plural? The NKJV does not tell us. The result? Confusion.

So too, we are left up in the air, and in a state of confusion by the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. In none of these translations are we told if the initial *you* is singular or plural? Hence how are we to know if the subsequent, “resist no evil” is addressed to a corporate *you* plural, or to an individual *you* singular? Such modern translations which do away with the “you” singular forms of “thee,” “thou,” and “thy,” and “you” plural forms of “ye,” “you,” and “your,” make it impossible to know the answer. Far from clarifying the meaning of Scripture, such modern translations as the NKJV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV which refuse to employ moderate archaisms such as “thee,” “thou,” and “thy,” greatly blur the meaning of Holy Writ. The primary object of translation for those who believe in the verbal inspiration of Scripture is literal accuracy. In many languages, this goal can be achieved by following the NT pattern of common Greek i.e., a translation in the contemporary language of the people; but in English, this can only be accomplished by following the OT pattern of Hebrew speakers having to learn a similar though not identical tongue in Aramaic, and also master certain poetical Hebrew forms, so as to understand all of OT Scripture. E.g., the usage of Hebrew metre in e.g., Job 14:1,2, or acrostic poetry in Lam. 1, was anything but the common language of the people.

What other translation can match the AV’s clarity and force of expression at Matt. 5:39a, “But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil”? The AV is in a class of its own, far above these other translations when it comes to accurately translating the meaning of the Greek into our mother tongue of English. Let us thank God for our AVs!

**Matt. 5:39b** “thy” (TR & AV) {C}

The TR’s reading, Greek, “*sou* (‘thy,’ literally, ‘of thee’),” in the words, “*ten* (-, word 1a, literally ‘the,’ redundant in translation) *dexian* (‘right,’ word 1b) *sou* (‘thy,’ word 2) *siagona* (‘cheek,’ word 3) i.e., “But whosoever shall smite thee on thy (*sou*) right cheek;” is supported by about half of the Byzantine Texts, e.g., Codices E 07 (*Codex Basilensis*, 8th century), G 011 (*Codex Seidelianus*, 9th century), and K 017 (*Codex Cyprius*, 9th century). It is found as Latin, “*dextera* (the right) *maxilla* (cheek) *tua* (thy),” i.e., “thy right cheek,” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century); and “thy” (either as singular adjectives, “*tua*” or “*tuam*,”) is also found in old Latin Versions b (5th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); and with a minor spelling variant within normative Latin Codices variations, “*dextra*” not “*dextera*,” in the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592) as “*tuam*.” It is further supported, (with “*sou*” / “thy” after “*siagona*” / “cheek,” rather than before “*siagona*” / “cheek” as in the TR<sup>49</sup>), by the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339).

However, Greek, “*sou* (thy),” is omitted i.e., making the reading, “But whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek,” in about half the Byzantine Texts e.g., Codices W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (*Codex*

---

<sup>49</sup> Such difference of word order is of no consequence in this, and most instances. In an era before the ink-eraser, in which parchments were expensive, if a copyist remembered some words in his head, and here e.g., wrote down *siagona* first by accident, he could then add *sou* after it, as evidently occurred on this occasion, without changing the meaning of the text.

*Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), and Minuscule 127 (11th century). It is also omitted in, for instance, old Latin Versions a (4th century) and f (6th century). It is further omitted by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation, Basil the Great (d. 379), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

Matt. 5:39 is part of a sub-section in Matt. 5:38-42, which moves in transition from the plural “you” to the singular “you.” I.e., in Matt. 5:39, “But I say unto you (plural, *umin*), That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee (singular, *se*) on thy (*sou*) right cheek” etc. . In the following verse, we read at Matt. 5:40, “And if any man will sue thee (*soi*) and take away thy (*sou*) coat” etc. The stylistic similarity between Matt. 5:39,40, in which “smite thee (singular, *se*)” (Matt. 5:39) parallels “sue thee (*soi*)” (Matt. 5:40); “thy (*sou*) right cheek” (Matt. 5:39) parallels thy (*sou*) coat;” and “the (*ten*) other also” (Matt. 5:39) parallels “the (*to*) cloak also” (Matt. 5:40, the AV adds “thy,” shown in italics before “cloak,” which is a valid English translation); means that on the balance of probabilities, it is minimally more probable than not, that “thy (*sou*)” in Matt. 5:39b is original, since its inclusion makes it part of a two verse linguistic stylistic unit (Matt. 5:39,40), uniting comparable ideas with the thread of a comparable literary style, which incorporates as one of its features a comparable usage of “you” (singular).

The origins of the variant are speculative. Was this a deliberate “stylistic” pruning of a “redundant” word? Or was this an accidental omission due to a paper loss / fade? Its probable origins with Origen may suggest the former is more likely, but we cannot safely rule out the latter. We only know for sure that this omission was made.

On the one hand, stylistic features indicate that on the balance of probabilities, it is more likely than not, that the TR’s reading is correct. The reading, “thy” has the support of about half the Byzantine Texts, St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate and most of the old Latin Versions, together with an ancient church writer. But on the other hand, the textual argument only minimally favours the TR’s reading, and the omission of “thy” has the support of about half the Byzantine Texts, a small number of old Latin Versions, and several ancient church writers. Balancing out these considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 5:39b, a middling “C” (in the range of 56% +/- 2%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading, but has a lower level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 5:39b, “thy,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century; although the word order is reversed to the same as that of Eusebius, *supra*), and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century, although this lacks “right” / *dexian* i.e., reading simply “thy cheek”). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); (the independent text type) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and the (mixed text type) Codex Theta (9th century); as well as (the independent text type) Minuscule 565 (9th century), (the independent text type) Minuscule 700 (11th century), and (the mixed text type) Minuscule 579 (13th century). It is also found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is also found in the Gothic Version (4th century).

However, the incorrect reading, which omits “thy,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London: Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also omitted in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed in the Gospels, Alexandrian text Acts-Jude) 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1241 (12th century, independent in the Gospels), and Minuscule 157 (12th century, independent). It is further omitted in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

With the two leading Alexandrian Texts in disagreement on this reading, the neo-Alexandrians placed “*sou*” in square brackets in the NU Text, indicating uncertainty as to what the reading was. In this regard they are like the majority text Burgonites, Robinson and Pierpont (1991), who likewise placed “*sou*” in square brackets, albeit in their instance for the different reason of a divided majority text. “Thy [*sou*]” is omitted in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72); but placed in word order 1,3,2 i.e., “*ten* (-, word 1a,) *dexian* (‘right,’ word 1b) *siagona* (‘cheek,’ word 3) *sou* (‘thy,’ word 2)<sup>50</sup>,” in square brackets in Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle’s 21st edition (1952), and the contemporary NU Text’s Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993).

Amidst such lack of option clarity, at Matt. 5:39a the correct reading was adopted in the parent ASV, based on Westcott-Hort, which correctly reads, “thy right cheek.” However the ASV’s more liberal descendants, the RSV, NRSV, and ESV, all omit “thy;” whereas the ASV’s more conservative child, the NASB, retains it as “your.” However, the fact that the NASB has “modernized” the English to remove the distinction between “you” singular (thee, thou, thy) and “you” plural (ye, you, your), means that the transition evident in our AV’s from “you” plural in Matt. 5:38,39a to “you” singular in Matt. 5:39b,40, is completely lost on the NASB reader; and so the Word of God is less clear, not more clear, as a consequence of so called “modernization.” Like the RSV, the NIV exercised the alternative NU Text option, and omits “thy” altogether.

Those of the Burgonite Majority Text School are thrown into some consternation when the texts are fairly evenly divided and so their majority count methodology produces an ambiguous result. Burgon & Miller (1899) thought “thy (*sou*)” should here be omitted. But then Hodges & Farstad (1985) disagreed with Burgon & Miller and put the TR’s “thy (*sou*)” reading in their main text, although they include a footnote stating that the majority text is here seriously divided. But then Robinson & Pierpont (2005) disagreed with Hodges & Farstad, following the view of Burgon & Miller in omitting the TR’s “thy (*sou*)” in their main text, but disagreeing with Burgon & Miller’s dogmatism on the matter by putting the TR’s reading as a footnote alternative indicating a significantly divided text. *In fairness to the Burgonites whose constant chopping ’n’ changing manifests the fact that they are very uneasy with this verse, “What does one do on Majority Text principles when there isn’t a clear majority?”*<sup>51</sup>

<sup>50</sup> This may have occurred when a scribe accidentally omitted word 2, then realizing his mistake after he had written word 3, added back in word 2 after word 3, on the basis that the meaning was the same irrespective of the location of word 2 before or after word 3.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Burgon & Miller on Matt. 5:48b, *infra*.

We Christians of the holy Protestant faith who uphold the neo-Byzantine *Textus Receptus* undertake textual analysis of the Greek text in order to recognize the Received Text of the New Testament; and only avail ourselves of the lesser maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, when it is warranted from textual analysis of the Greek, thus subordinating this lesser maxim to the greater maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. While we do not agree with the Douay-Rheims type Roman Catholic methodology of undertaking textual analysis of the Latin text in order to determine the NT text; nevertheless, on this occasion, its strong attestation in the Latin, meant that for the wrong reasons, the Clementine Vulgate *retained the correct reading from Jerome's Vulgate*, which is also found in the Roman Catholic Rheims-Douay Version as, “thy right cheek” at Matt. 5:39b. The fact that the Douay-Rheims Version maintains the distinction between “you” singular and plural, means that the relevant transition here has been preserved through this Latin translation. How sad, that in its translation, “thy right cheek” at Matt. 5:39b, a Roman Catholic Bible, based on the Latin, would be more accurate, more succinct, and more clear, than so called “Protestant” Bibles, translated from the so called “Greek” text, such as the NASB, RSV (which has a Roman Catholic edition), NRSV, ESV, and NIV. Let us thank God for our AVs, which are not only based on the best Greek Text, but are also the clearest English translation!

**Matt. 5:44a** “bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you” (TR & AV) {B}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

The words of Matt. 5:44, are found in Manuscript Washington (*Codex Freerianus*) at the page showing Matt. 5:38-48.

At Matt. 5:44, the TR (and majority Byzantine Text,) reads in the Greek, “*tous* (the) *echthrous* (enemies)” i.e., “enemies” in the words, “Love your enemies,” in which “*tous* (-)” is left untranslated in English. Manuscript Washington reads, “*tou* [sic.] *echthrous* (enemies).” The singular genitive, “*tou*,” i.e., “of the,” when coupled with the plural accusative, “*echthrous*” is against the rules of Greek grammar. The Greek root word, *echthros* - *a* - *on*, must be declined the same way in both its definite article (“the”) and noun (“enemies”) e.g., *tou echthrou* (singular genitive, “of the enemy”), *ton echthon* (plural genitive, “of the enemies”), or *tous echthrous* (plural accusative, “the enemies”). The accusative is used for the direct object, and so the terminology, “Love your enemies” here, requires that this be in plural accusative i.e., “*tous* (the) *echthrous* (enemies),” as found in the Received Text.

Since there is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine Text’s reading, “*tous* (the) *echthrous* (enemies);” and indeed a good argument in its favour based on Greek grammar; we cannot doubt that the TR’s reading is correct. Hence Manuscript Washington’s “*tou* [sic.] *echthrous* (enemies)” is clearly wrong.

Inspection of Manuscript Washington at Matt. 5:44, shows that at the end of one line, we read in capital letters in continuous script, “TOYEXTHPOYC” (*touechthrous*). However the letter epsilon or “E” following the letter upsilon or “Y” (in lower case, “u”), is the shape of a “C” with a bar in the middle. Inspection of the page, shows that sometimes the scribe’s letter “E” was a more squarish figure, and sometimes a more roundish figure. Evidently, the scribe originally and correctly wrote, “TOYC” (*tous*). Possibly he was distracted for a moment, e.g., he may have moved his oil lamp as he wrote by night to the right of the page. He kept thinking in

his mind, “EXTHPOYC,” “EXTHPOYC,” and then went to write “EXTHPOYC.” Perhaps the flickering flame of a repositioned lamp meant the left part of the page was more darkened. Whatever the details, we cannot be sure. But he then quickly glancing at the “C” ending on “TOYC,” thought he was looking at the “E” beginning of “EXTHPOYC,” and so he “completed” the “E” by putting a cross-bar in the middle of the “C” to make it an “E,” and then kept writing. On this occasion he did not detect his error at a later point in time.

We thus find at this page, a fascinating “snap-shot” of a scribal mistake; that helps us to better understand how scribal errors could sometimes occur. We are also reminded, that God always preserved the correct reading for us over the ages; on this occasion in the representative Byzantine Text. “For ever, O Lord, thy Word is settled in heaven” (Ps. 119:89).

What a contrast we here see between human frailty, and God’s perfection! We sinful fallen men are all frail and all make mistakes. God alone is infallible (Job 11:7-10; Ps. 145:3). We can only be “perfect,” “as” our “Father which is in heaven is perfect” (Matt. 5:48), if, first we recognize our spiritual poverty as “the poor in spirit,” and “mourn” our sins. Only if we are “filled” with God’s “righteousness,” having obtained “mercy” from him, and been regenerated to receive a new “heart,” so that we become “the children of God” (Matt. 5:3-9), because of the sacrificial death (Matt. 20:28; 26:2,26-28) and resurrection (Matt. 28) of Christ. Unlike the rich young ruler, we must recognize that we are sinful to our core, and we can never keep God’s law perfectly (Matt. 19:16-20). Thus our only hope is to “obtain mercy” from God (Matt. 5:7). As a consequence of the fall, we have “hardness of” “hearts” (Matt. 19:8). We are slain by the Decalogue’s just requirements (Matt. 19:18,19); e.g., so much as to be “angry with” one’s “brother without a cause,” violates the 6th commandment, “Thou shalt not kill” (Matt. 5:21,22; Exod. 20:13); or “whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her,” violates the 7th commandment, “Thou shalt not commit adultery” (Matt. 5:27,28; Exod. 20:14); or the first (Exod. 20:1-3; cf. Philp. 3:19), second and tenth commandments (Exod. 20:4-6,17; cf. Col. 3:5), mean we “cannot serve God and mammon” (Matt. 6:24; 19:20-22). To keep the Ten Commandments perfectly, which “good thing” is required of those seeking to “have eternal life” (Matt. 19:16), is thus an impossibility, and a hopeless case for we fallen, sinful, men. Our only hope is substitutionary atonement through Christ (Matt. 20:28; 26:26-28). Hence, heeding the call to, “Repent” (Matt. 4:17), and recognizing that Jesus Christ is “the Son of God” (Matt. 27:54) and “Lord” (Matt. 22:41-46); we receive forgiveness of our sins (Matt. 9:2) and eternal life (Matt. 5:5) through him. We claim to be “perfect” (Matt. 5:48), through imputation typed in the OT sacrificial system as fulfilled in Christ (Matt. 26:2,17-29), based on the “ransom” paid by “the Son of man” (Matt. 20:28); obtained for us by nothing but the grace or mercy of God (cf. “mercy” and “grace” in Titus 3:5,7 & Rom. 11), who has mercy upon us who are spiritually blind and sick (Matt. 9:27; 17:15). We accept this “mercy” or grace by “faith” alone (Matt. 8:10; 9:2,22,29; 17:20; 21:21,22); for the “weightier matters of the” Divine revelation in the Bible are “judgement, mercy, and faith” (Matt. 23:23).

The frailty of man, here seen in this scribe’s error at Matt. 5:44, thus reminds us of our own imperfections. It also reminds us of the corresponding perfection of our holy God, “Father,” “Son,” and “Holy Ghost” (Matt. 28:19), “one” “God” (Matt. 19:17) in a perfect Trinity (Matt. 3:3, n.b., the Baptist prepares “the way of the Lord,” who contextually is Christ, but in Isa. 40:3 this same “Lord” is Jehovah; Matt. 3:16,17 n.b., the Divinity of the Son in Matt. 3:3 and the Divinity of “the Spirit of God” in Matt. 3:16; Matt. 22:43,44, n.b., “David in Spirit” from the Third Person of the Trinity, refers to the two other Divine Persons of the Trinity as “Lord” and

“Lord”).

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt 5:44a, the Greek words, “*eulogeite* (bless) *tous kataromenous* (them that curse) *umas* (you), *kalos* (good) *poiete* (do) *tois misousin* (to them that hate) *umas* (you),” are supported by the majority Byzantine Text (see Appendix 1, Vol. 1, on Scrivener’s Text) e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, with a localized “*ai*” suffix rather than “*e*” suffix for “*poiete*”) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported in a variety of Latin forms by old Latin Versions d (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), and c (12th / 13th century). This basic reading is also supported by the ancient Greek writers, the Apostolic Constitutions (3rd or 4th century) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, there are three variants. *Variant 1*: “bless (*eulogeite*) them that curse (*tous kataromenous*) you (*umas*);” is found in the ancient church Greek writers, Clement of Alexandria (d. before 215) and Eusebius (d. 339); and the ancient church Latin writer, Tertullian (d. after 220).

*Variant 2*: “good (Greek, *kalos*) do (*poiete*) to them that hate (*tois misousin*) you (*umas*),” is found as Latin, “*benefacite* (do good) *his* (to them) *qui* (who) *oderunt* (hate) *vos* (you),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Eusebius (d. 339) and Arsenius (d. 445); the ancient church Latin writers, Ambrose (d. 397), Chromatius (d. 407), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604)<sup>52</sup>.

*Variant 3* omits these words completely, and is followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Theophilus (d. after 180), Origen (d. 254), and Adamantius (d. 4th century); and ancient church Latin writers, Cyprian (d. 258) and Faustus-Milevis (d. 4th century).

There is no good textual reason to doubt the representative Byzantine reading which must therefore stand. That this is the type of thing Christ taught is evident from comparative analysis with Luke 6:27,28, where clause 1 of Matt. 5:44 is found, and the idea of clause 2. The fact that the first clause in these words are preserved in Variant 1, and the second clause is preserved in Variant 2, acts as a further witness to their antiquity. It is possible that the omissions of Variants 1,2, and 3, occurred due to perturbation at the idea that Christian love meant one should, “bless them that curse you” (omitted in Variants 2 and 3), and “do good to them that hate you” (omitted in Variants 1 and 3).

However, it is also possible that these were accidental omissions from ellipsis. Copyists pages may have looked something like the following.

---

<sup>52</sup> Gregory has “*his* (‘to these [ones]’ = ‘to them,’ word 2)” in Migne 75:1262, 1284; 76:472; 79:34, 1206; and “*iis* (‘to them,’ word 2)” in Migne 79:334.

*umin agapate tous echthrou<sup>s</sup> um<sup>o</sup>n  
 eulogeite tous karar<sup>o</sup>menous umas  
 kal<sup>o</sup>s poieite tois misousin umas  
 kai proseuchesthe uper ton  
 epereazount<sup>o</sup>n umas kai oiokont<sup>o</sup>n  
 umas op<sup>o</sup>s gen<sup>e</sup>sthe ui<sup>o</sup>i tou patros  
 um<sup>o</sup>n tou ... etc. .*

In the case of Variant 1, reading, “*eulogeite* (bless) *tous katar<sup>o</sup>menous* (them that curse) *umas* (you)” (line 2, above), the copyist’s eye, having written the “*umas*” at the end of line 2, looked back quickly at the “*umas*” at the end of line 3, and thinking that is what he had written, kept writing line 4. Thus the words, “*kal<sup>o</sup>s* (good) *poiete* (do) *tois misousin* (to them that hate) *umas* (you),” were omitted. In the case of Variant 2, reading, “*kal<sup>o</sup>s* (good) *poiete* (do) *tois misousin* (to them that hate) *umas* (you)” (line 3 above), the copyist writing down the “*um<sup>o</sup>n*” at the end of line 1, and remembering in his mind that the next line ended with “*umas*,” looked up and when his eye spotted the “*umas*” at the end of line 3, looked back to the beginning of line 3 and started writing “*kal<sup>o</sup>s*” etc., and so the words of line 2, “*eulogeite* (bless) *tous katar<sup>o</sup>menous* (them that curse) *umas* (you)” came to be omitted.

In the case of Variant 3, the copyist may have written the “*um<sup>o</sup>n*” at the end of line 1, remembering in his mind he was up to the ending “*on*” (in “*um<sup>o</sup>n*”), followed by “*umas*” twice at the end of the next lines. Was e.g., Theophilus of Antioch momentarily distracted e.g., by the grunting of a camel? Then looking up and seeing the ending “*on*” in “*ton*” at the end of lines 4 and 5, and the “*umas*” at the end of line 2 and 3, his brain became befuddled, and he thought he was up to the line ending in “*on*” from “*ton*” following after “*umas*” twice at the end of lines 2 and 3, and so he started to write line 4, “*kai proseuchesthe*” etc. Thus lines 2 and 3 came to be omitted i.e., “bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you.”

It might be remarked at this point, that if such accidental omission is the origin of Variants 1,2, and 3, then the copyists in question were rather slipshod. Sadly, the evidence seems to indicate that good copyists were sometimes hard to find, particularly in Alexandria. The fact that *Variant 1* first appears with Clement of Alexandria (d. before 215), reflects this Alexandrian problem. While *Variant 2* first appears with Eusebius in one quote, the fact that in another quote he follows Variant 1 from Alexandria, shows that he sometimes followed corrupted Alexandrian readings, and so this was also quite possibly the origins of the *Variant 2* he quoted. *Variant 3* first appears in Theophilus of Antioch. It was adopted shortly later by Origen, whose influence on, and influence by, the Alexandrians cannot be reasonably doubted.

Whether Variants 1,2, and 3 came about due to deliberate pruning by perturbed unregenerate copyists who found Christ’s words of Matt. 5:44 simply too much to stomach; or whether they came about by clumsy accident due to ellipsis; or some combination thereof; are matters they we cannot be sure about; though I think accidental omission the more likely possibility in this instance. However, we can be sure that the reading of Matt. 5:44 stands certain, “bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you.” On the one hand, the TR’s basic reading has the support of the representative Byzantine Text, a number of old Latin Versions dating from the 5th century, and some ancient church writers. It is consistent with the type of thing Christ said in Luke 6:27,28. The origins of its rival Variants 1,2, and 3 can be

reasonably explained either on the basis of deliberate or accidental omission. But on the other hand, a number of ancient church writers support Variants 1, 2, and 3, and Variant 2 in particular has good Latin support. Weighing out these competing considerations on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading, "bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you" at Matt. 5:44a a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 5:44a, "bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you," is found in e.g., a similar though not identical form in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century), which changes the first "umas (you)" to "umin (to you)," but which would still be translated the same into English i.e., "eulogize (bless) tous kataromenous (them that curse) umin (to you)" etc., would still become, "bless then that curse you," etc. . The TR's reading is further followed in e.g., the Gothic Version (4th century); a manuscript of the Armenian Version (5th century); the Ethiopic Versions (Takla Haymanot c. 500; Pell Platt, 1548-9; & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries); and the Georgian Version 2nd revision (5th century); and Syriac Harclean h Version (616). It is found in Ciasca's Arabic Diatessaron, according to Hogg as, "pray for those that curse you, and deal well with those that hate you;" although in the Latin of Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), this is not "pray for" and "deal well" (Hogg), but "bless (*benedicite*)" and "do good" (*benefacite*).

*Variant 1*, "bless them that curse you," is found in a part of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; as well as the Georgian Version 1st revision (5th century).

*Variant 2*, "good do to them that hate you," is found in a manuscript of the Armenian Version (5th century).

*Variant 3*, omitting the TR's words completely, is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions; and also the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) Version, and a part of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) Versions. From here, *Variant 3* entered the NU Text *et al.* Thus it is omitted in the NASB, RSV, NRS, ESV, and NIV; as it earlier was in the ASV; although an NIV footnote refers to support for the TR's reading in some manuscripts.

Metzger makes the bizarre claim, "If the clauses were originally present," "their omission in early" "Alexandrian" (Rome Vaticanus & London Sinaiticus), "Western" (old Latin Version k, Irenaeus in a Latin Manuscript, and Cyprian), "Eastern" (Syriac Curetonian and Sinaitic), and "Egyptian" (Coptic Sahidic and Bohairic) "witnesses would be entirely unaccountable" (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1994, pp. 11-12). Metzger thinks that these are crushing arguments against the Received Text's reading. In fact, Metzger and the NU Text Committee are not good enough textual scholars to reasonably distinguish between different quality types of texts. For instance, he clearly makes no distinction between those inside and those outside the closed class of three.

Where then is the doctrine of the preservation of Holy Scripture? For the text God

preserved is the text God inspired. It is therefore necessary to use sources to reconstruct a text, that means it could have been determined in e.g., 500 or 600 A.D., 1000 or 1100 A.D., 1500 or 1600 A.D., and 2000 or (if the Lord does not come,) 2100 A.D. . Though Metzger is one of the darlings of religious liberals, he is one of those scorned by religious conservatives. If age and diversity were the criteria he claims, then we would have to also accept the OT Apocryphal Books. But who would be so crazy as to do that? While the falsehood of such modern textual critics shall endure only for a fleeting season; by contrast, “the truth of the Lord endureth for ever. Praise ye the Lord” (Ps. 117:2). “I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father: for so it seemed good in thy sight” (Matt. 11:25,26).

**Matt. 5:44b** “and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you” (TR & AV) {B}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

*The First Matter.* The words of Matt. 5:40,41,44, are found in Manuscript Washington (*Codex Freerianus*) at the page showing Matt. 5:38-48. A spelling variant is evident in *Codex Freerianus* (W 032) at Matt. 5:44b. A local dialect change, not affecting meaning occurs, in which the “e” suffix of Greek “*proseuchesthe*” (ye pray) becomes an “ai” suffix i.e., “*proseuchesthai*” (to pray). This same “ai” spelling variant is found in Lectionary 2378 (11th century).

Manuscript Washington is written in capital letters and in continuous script i.e., *usually* without spacing between the words. The type of exception to this continuous script is evident at Matt. 5:40,41. Here *Codex Freerianus* reads at the end of one line, “I,” and at the beginning of the next line, “MATION” i.e., “*imation*” or “cloak” in the words, “let him have thy cloak also” (Matt. 5:40). There is then a gap of about two letter spaces. Then begins the words of Matt. 5:41, “KAI (And) OCTIC (*ostis*, ‘whosoever’)” etc. . Why the scribe would leave a gap at the beginning of Matt. 5:41 is conjectural, but some paper spaces do sometimes occur, in what is more generally a continuous script without any spaces between words.

On the same page of *Codex Freerianus* as Matt. 5:40,41, *supra*, we read in Matt. 5:44 at the end of one line, “*tois mi*,” and then on the next line, completing the “*sousin*” ending of “*misousin*,” we read, “*sousin umas*.” There is then a blank space that one could fit three letters into. We then read, “*proseuchesthai*” (“to pray,” rather than the “ye pray” of *proseuchesthe*) etc. . Did the “*kai*” fade on *Codex Freerianus*? Alternatively, did the scribe of *Codex Freerianus* copy Matt. 5:44 from a more ancient Byzantine manuscript in which the “*kai*” had faded, and left a gap of three letters space here, thinking that as with the gap at e.g., the above Matt. 5:40 to Matt. 5:41, this was simply a stylistic paper space that he should, or at least would, replicate?

It is unclear whether *Codex Freerianus* originally read “*kai*” at Matt. 5:44, and it has now faded away; or whether the manuscript that the scribe of *Codex Freerianus* was copying from, originally read “*kai*” and it had faded away, so that he left a comparable paper space, thinking this was a stylistic gap such as occurred earlier on the same page at Matt. 5:40,41. But in either instance, *Codex Freerianus* here helps us to better understand how Greek words could sometimes disappear from the text, not by deliberate alteration, but simply due to fade, with a subsequent scribe then failing to realize that a fade had occurred. While the evidence for a fade remains in the paper space of *Codex Freerianus*, other scribes writing out other manuscripts and coming

across such a gap would more commonly not have replicated it, but eliminated what they thought to be simply a gratuitous stylistic paper space. Thus over time the type of manuscript evidence for a fade we have here in *Codex Freerianus* would be lost.

Indeed, this is probably what we see in Lectionary 1968. Here, after the “*kai* (and) *diokonton* (persecute)” the verse ends with a “+” i.e., a stylistic marker (which as in W 032 often shows verse divisions before Stephanus’s formally numbered verses in 1550). The “*umas* (you)” is missing, and then the next verse starts with “*opos* (that)” etc. . But because it was probably lost in the paper fade of an earlier manuscript, by the time the scribe of Lectionary 1968 came to copy down the corrupted text, the paper space evident in W 032 had either gone in scribe’s manuscript, or now went with this copying out into Lectionary 1968.

*The Second Matter.* Migne raises the question of whether the citation in Gregory’s writings at Migne 75:1262, is from Matt. 5:44 or Luke 6:27? But on this occasion it looks to me from the quote in its entirety, that Gregory is broadly following the Latin Vulgate (not that he always does so), and hence I consider this is a citation of Matt. 5:44 rather than Luke 6:27.

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 5:44b the TR’s Greek reading, “*kai* (and) *proseuchesthe* (pray) *uper* (for) *ton epeazonton* (them which despitefully use) *umas* (you), *kai* (and) *diokonton* (persecute) *umas* (you),” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century, which uses a variant spelling with an “*ai*” suffix rather than an “*e*” suffix for “*proseuchesthe*”). It is largely followed, by W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-24; Luke 8:13-24:53), which omits the first “*kai* (and)” (and like Lectionary 2378 further follows the variant spelling, “*proseuchesthai*” for “*proseuchesthe*”); and also largely followed by Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.) which omits the last word, “*umas.*” It is also supported by old Latin Versions f (6th century) and c (12th / 13th century). It is also supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Basil the Great (d. 379) and Arsenius (d. 445).

There are three variants we shall now consider. *Variant 1* is found in a Latin tradition (discussed below), and in the Latin Vulgate form, by the ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420).

*Variant 2* reads in the Greek, “*kai* (and) *proseuchesthe* (pray) *uper* (for) *ton epeazonton* (them which despitefully use) *umas* (you);” and is followed by the ancient Greek writers Theophilus (d. after 180), and Origen (d. 254).

*Variant 3* reads in the Greek, “*kai* (and) *proseuchesthe* (pray) *uper* (for) *diokonton* (them which persecute) *umas* (you);” and is supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and the ancient church Latin writers, Tertullian (d. after 220), Cyprian (d. 258) Lucifer of Cagliari (d. c. 370), Faustus-Milevis (d. 4th century), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 420).

*Variant 1.* It is possible to translate Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, (manifested in the Clementine Vulgate) as, “and pray for them which persecute and falsely accuse (*calumniantibus*) you.” If this is the meaning, then it would appear that Jerome made an interpretative translation of what was meant by “despitefully use” (Matt. 5:44), with reference to the Latin, “*et* (and) *dixerint* (shall say) *omne* (all) *malum* (manner of evil) *adversum* (against) *vos* (you) *mentientes*

(falsely)” in Matt. 5:11. If so, I think this still implies an underpinning usage of the Greek text, although Jerome adds to it an unwarranted interpretative translation. But while the UBS textual apparatus *et al* consider the Latin Vulgate is a variant reading, i.e., translating “*calumniantibus*” as “falsely accuse,” this word can also mean “depreciate,” and so may have equated in Jerome’s mind a dynamic equivalent for what he understood by “despitefully use” you. If so, the representative Byzantine reading is supported by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), (even though the first “you” is pruned for “stylistic” reasons), “*et (and) orate (pray) pro (for) persequentibus (them which persecute) et (and) calumniantibus (depreciate) vos (you);*” as well as the old Latin Versions following the reading in this form, namely, old Latin versions *aur* (7th century), *l* (7th / 8th century), *g1* (8th / 9th century), *g2* (10th century), and *ff1* (10th / 11th century); and (in quotes omitting only the “*et*” / “and,” by) the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604). In either instance, I think Jerome’s usage of the Latin *calumniantibus*, highlights the undesirability of using either an unwarranted interpretive translation, or a gratuitous dynamic equivalent.

*Variants 2 and 3* may have been deliberate alterations of the text, by those who could not accept the teaching it contains. But I think it more likely that they were accidental omissions that came about through ellipsis. In the case of *Variant 2*, the copyists looking at “*kai (and) proseuchesthe (pray) uper (for) ton epereazonton (them which despitefully use) umas (you), kai (and) diokonton (persecute) umas (you),*” wrote down the first “*umas,*” and then looking up his eye caught the second “*umas,*” which is where he thought he was up to, and so he kept writing. Thus “*kai (and) diokonton (persecute) umas (you),*” came to be omitted. In the case of *Variant 3*, writing in an age when manuscripts were not standardized, and page and letter size varied, the second *umas kai* was probably on the next line, either directly underneath, or almost directly underneath, the first “*umas (‘you’ from ‘hate you’) kai.*” I.e.,

*umas kai proseuchesthe uper ton epereazonton  
umas kai diokonton umas opos genesthe uioi  
tou patros umon tou en ... etc. .*

Having written the first *kai* after *umas* on line 1, and perhaps tied as he worked late at night, and momentarily distracted, e.g., by the whistling of a Mid Eastern wind storm, and remembering he was up to the *kai* after *umas*, did his eye return to the second “*kai*” after “*umas,*” and did he then write “*diokonton (persecute) umas (you)*” etc.? Is this how “*proseuchesthe (pray) uper (for) ton epereazonton (them which despitefully use) umas (you), kai (and)*” came to be omitted in *Variant 2*?

On the one hand, the TR reading has the support of the representative Byzantine Text, as well as some old Latin Versions, and ancient church writers. It possibly has the support of Jerome’s Latin Vulgate and another associated group of old Latin Versions; although this is debatable. The other variant forms can be reasonably explained as the consequence of accidental omission. But on the other hand, it is not clear that the Latin “*calumniantibus*” means “depreciate,” and so equated in Jerome’s mind a dynamic equivalent for what he understood by “despitefully use;” and hence one can also reasonably argue that it means “falsely accuse,” and so is another variant. Moreover, Variants 2 and 3 have support from a number of ancient church writers. Taking into account these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you” in Matt. 5:44b a “B” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a

middling level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 5:44b, “and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you,” is found at the hand of undated corrector of the leading representative of the Western text, D 05; with the original Codex D 05 (5th century) reading the same as the TR except that it lacked the first “*umas* (you)” i.e., reading, “and pray for them which despitefully use and persecute you.” (Cf. the omission of the first “you” in the Latin Vulgate.) It is further supported by the Armenian Version (5th century); the Ethiopic Version (Takla Haymanot c. 500); Georgian Version 2nd revision (5th century); and Slavic Version (9th century).

*Variant 1* is followed by the Latin Church writer, Cassiodorus (d. c. 580). *Variant 2* “and pray for them which despitefully use you,” is found in the Gothic Version (4th century) and the Georgian Version 1st revision (5th century).

*Variant 3*, “and pray for them which persecute you,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) Version, a part of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) Version; a manuscript of Pell Platt’s Ethiopic Version (1548-9); and also Augustus Dillmann’s Ethiopic Version (18th / 19th centuries).

From such sources, *Variant 3* entered the NU Text *at al*; and thus it is found in NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV, as it was in the earlier ASV which reads at Matt. 5:44b, “and pray for them that persecute you” (ASV).

**Matt. 5:47a** “brethren” (TR & AV) {C}

The TR’s Greek, “*adelphous* (brethren, from *adelphos*),” in the words, “And if ye salute your brethren only,” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 924 (12th century). It is also supported as Latin, “*fratres*,” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Latin writer, Cyprian (d. 258). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However, the majority Byzantine Text reads Greek, “*philous* (friends),” e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). This reading is also found as Latin, “*amicos*,” in old Latin Versions h (5th century) and f (6th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Basil the Great (d. 379); and the ancient church Latin writer, Lucifer of Cagliari (d. c. 370).

A textual problem exists with the usage of “friends” (*philous* from *philos*) in Matt. 5:47. While “friend” (*philos*) is used in Matt. 11:19 in a quotation Christ refers to, where he is called “a friend (*philos*) of publicans and sinners,” the term is not found elsewhere on Christ’s lips in St.

Matthew's Gospel. But that in itself is not fatal, since it might be argued that this was the only time he used it in St. Matthew's Gospel, so that it was simply unusual; to which it might be also noted he did use the term in St. Luke's Gospel (Luke 11:5,6,8; 14:10). Thus its uniqueness in St. Matthew's Gospel at Matt. 5:47, can do no more than to draw attention to it.

However, it is notable that in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5-7), Christ uses the term "brother (*adelphos*)" in Matt. 5:22 (twice), 23,23; 7:3-5 (thrice) for the saints of God. This is part of a more general contrast Christ makes between saints and sinners, in which the saints are called "brother" or "brethren" (*adelphos*) (Matt. 12:49,50; 18:21; 23:8; 25:40; 28:10). "Publican (*telones*)" may be used as a simple description for a tax-collector (Matt. 10:3); but more commonly "publican (*telones*)" is used in St. Matthew's Gospel as a synonym for sinners (Matt. 9:10,11; 11:19); and in this way by Christ himself, who in addressing the Jewish "chief priests and the elders" (Matt. 21:23) says, "the publicans (*telonai* from *telones*) and the harlots go into the kingdom of heaven before you. For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not; but the publicans (*telonai* from *telones*) and the harlots believed him; and ye, when ye had seen it, repented not afterward, that ye might believe him" (Matt. 21:31,32). Most significantly, Christ contrasts saints and sinners in terms of a contrast between a "brother (*adelphos*)" (Matt. 18:15) and "an heathen man and a publican (*telones*);" (Matt. 18:17);" and also links being a "brother (*adelphos*)" to the fact that such a one has a "heavenly Father" (Matt. 18:35).

Matt. 5:47 is part of the subsection of Matt. 5:43-48; which is part of the wider Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5-7), in which Christ uses the term "brother (*adelphos*)" for the saints (Matt. 5:22, 23,23; 7:3-5). At Matt. 5:43 Christ commences this subsection by quoting Lev. 19:18, "Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour" etc. At Lev. 19:18 we read, "thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge *against the children of thy people*, but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" etc. . The language "children of thy people" makes it clear that the injunction Christ cites is addressed to *brethren* of Israel. His subsequent discussion is thus a contrast with how Christian *brethren* ought to conduct themselves. Therefore, one would therefore expect Matt. 5:47 to read, "and if ye salute your brethren (*adelphous*) only."

Both immediately before and after Matt. 5:47, Christ focuses on this as an address to Christian brethren, since he says "That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven" (Matt. 5:45); and "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect" (Matt. 5:48). This means it would seem contextually inadequate, and indeed even inappropriate, to isolate "friends (*philous*)" as opposed to "brethren (*adelphous*)." Thus on the basis of the type of language Christ uses in Matt. 18:35, one would therefore expect Matt. 5:47 to read, "and if ye salute your brethren (*adelphous*) only."

In Matt. 5:46,47, Christ draws a contrast between "the publicans" and the saints, saying, "For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? Do not even the publicans (*telonai*) the same?" (Matt. 5:46); and then "what do ye more than others? Do not even the publicans (*telonai*) so?" (Matt. 5:47). Therefore, on the basis of the type of language Christ uses in Matt. 18:15,17, we would expect to read in Matt. 5:47a, "And if ye salute your brethren (*adelphous*) only."

Therefore, stylistically speaking, through reference to the wider usage of "brother (*adelphos*)" by Christ in St. Matthew's Gospel; the more general context of the usage of

“brother” in the Sermon on the Mount; and the very specific context of Matt. 5:43-48, where Matt. 5:43 establishes teaching about brethren (cf. Lev. 19:18); Matt. 5:45,48 focuses specifically on brethren under “your Father which is in heaven” (cf. Matt. 18:35). Thus the contrast in Matt. 46,47 which refers before and after to the “publicans” is expected to be a contrast between brethren and publicans (cf. Matt. 18:15,17); and so it follows that the expected reading of Matt. 5:47 is, “And if ye salute your brethren (*adelphous*) only.”

Since the textual problem created by the representative Greek Byzantine Text which reads “friends (*philous*),” can only be remedied by following a Greek reconstruction of the Latin “*fratres* (brethren),” it follows that on stylistic grounds, the correct reading of Matt. 5:47 must be, “And if ye salute your brethren (*adelphous*) only.” Thus on this occasion, primarily the Latin text preserves the correct reading. However, to the extent that textual analysis of the Greek indicates the Latin preserves the correct underpinning Greek text that it was originally translated from, we are once again reminded that the veracity of the lesser maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, is contingent upon its perpetual subordination to the veracity of the greater maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*.

Did the alteration of “brethren (*adelphous*)” to “friends (*philous*)” in Matt. 5:47, come about as a deliberate “stylistic improvement” in order to reduce the wider scope of Christ’s focus on “brethren,” which would incorporate all Christians, and so be a number considered too large for the individual Christian to commonly “salute” or greet; down to a smaller circle of an individual Christian’s “friends,” that he might commonly “salute” or greet?

Alternatively, was the alteration accidental? Did a copyist’s page originally look something like the following transliterated letters (which would obviously have been in Greek rather than the following English letters)?

*kai oi telonai to auto poiou  
kai ean aspase~~sthe~~ tous adelphous  
um~~on~~ monon ti perisson poieite  
ouchi kai oi telonai outo  
poioisin ... etc. .*

But due to paper loss, did a scribe have seen something like the following?

*kai oi telonai to auto poiou  
kai ean aspase~~sthe~~ tous::::::::::ous  
um~~on~~ monon ti perisson poieite  
ouchi kai oi telonai outo  
poioisin ... etc. .*

Did the scribe have the paper letters “ph” (phi / φ) and “l” (lambda / λ) i.e., from the “*adelph* (αδελφ)” in “*adelphous* (αδελφους)” together with a fragment of one of the other letters that looked something like the bottom half of an “i” (iota / ι), on loose bits of small paper, so that he then used them as jig-saw pieces to try and reconstruct the text? Did he have the “φ” and “ι” from *adelphous*? Either way, in looking superficially at the context, did he conclude after insufficient thought and textual examination, that the word “*philous* (φιλους)” meaning “friend,” fitted the context? Did “*philous*” thus accidentally enter the text? Was the change from

“brethren” (*adelphous*) to “friends” (*philous*), deliberate or accidental? We cannot be sure.

On the one hand, textual analysis of the Greek strongly favours the TR’s reading, “brethren” (*adelphous*); and the change of “brethren (*adelphous*)” to “friends (*philous*),” can be reasonably explained as either a deliberate or accidental omission. The TR’s reading, “And if ye salute your brethren (*adelphous*) only,” is also supported by St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, a number of significant old Latin Versions; and the church father, St. Cyprian (d. 258). But on the other hand, the reading “friends (*philous*)” has the support of the representative Byzantine Text, some old Latin Versions, and a couple of ancient church writers. Weighing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “And if ye salute your brethren only,” at Matt. 5:47 a high level “C” (in the range of 63% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading, but has a lower level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 5:47a, “brethren,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century) and celebrated Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century); as well as all the extant Egyptian Coptic Versions (3rd century); the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries); Anglo-Saxon Version (8th to 10th centuries); and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century). From the Alexandrian base, it entered the NU Text *et al*, and so for the wrong reasons, the correct reading, is found in the NU Text *et al*, and hence the NASB, RSV, NRSV (which perverts the masculine gendering of the Greek here), ESV, and NIV; as indeed it was in the earlier Westcott-Hort ASV, which reads, “brethren” (ASV)

The incorrect reading, “friends,” is further found in the Gothic Version (4th century), Armenian Version (5th century); and the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version.

Burgon claimed, “the ‘*Textus Receptus*’ ..., calls for ... revision,” “upon the” basis of the “majority of authorities” (*Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, pp. 13,15); and thus Burgon’s proud boast was this, “Again and again we shall have occasion to point out ... that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction” (*Revision Revised*, p. 21). The majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005), all here following the incorrect reading. Following in the errors of the blundering Burgon, the NKJV thus finds it necessary to have a footnote reading at Matt. 5:47 stating, the “M[ajority]-Text reads ‘friends’” (NKJV fn).

**Matt. 5:47b** “publicans so” (TR & AV) {B}

The TR’s Greek, “*telonai* (publicans) *outo* (so),” in the words, “do not even the publicans so?” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text (with manuscript variation over whether or not to include the optional “s” at the end of *outos* e.g., Lectionary 1968 includes it, e.g., E 07 (*Codex Basilensis*, 8th century), K 017 (*Codex Cyprius*, 9th century), L 020 (*Codex Angelicus*, 9th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*).

Dividing it up into its two constituent words, Greek, “*telonai* (publicans),” is further

supported by W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and Lectionary 2378 (11th century); as well as old Latin Version h (5th century), which reads, as Latin, “*publicani* (publicans) *idem* (the same).” The second part, Greek, “*outō* (so),” is supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Basil the Great (d. 379).

However an alternative reading, Greek, “*ethnikoi* (Gentiles) *to* (the) *auto* (same),” thus making the reading, “do not even the Gentiles the same?” (ASV), is found in the ancient church Latin writers, Cyprian (d. 258), Lucifer of Cagliari (d. c. 370), and Augustine (d. 430). Dividing it up into its two constituent words, “Gentiles” is followed by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), together with old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). Like the Latin Vulgate, *supra*, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century), which is itself a Latin Vulgate Codex, reads, “*nonne* (not) *et* (even) *ethnici* (the heathens / Gentiles) *hoc* (this) *faciunt* (do)” i.e., “do not even the heathens (Gentiles) this?” From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592)<sup>53</sup>. It is further followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Basil the Great (d. 379); and the ancient church Latin writer, Chromatius (d. 407).

And the second part of this reading, Greek, “*to auto* (the same),” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), M 021 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), and Lectionary 2378 (11th century); as well as old Latin Version h, *supra*.

There is no good reason to doubt the representative Byzantine Text here, which must therefore stand as the correct reading. “Gentiles (*ethnikoi*, masculine plural nominative adjective from *ethnikos*; and *ethnikos* is etymologically derived from *ethnos*)” in Matt. 5:47b appears to be assimilation with the language of Matt. 6:32, “For after all these things do the Gentiles (*ethne*, neuter plural nominative noun, from *ethnos*) seek.” And “*to auto* (the same)” seems to have been substituted for “*outō* (so),” in order to increase the parallelism of this statement with the preceding verse, “do not even the publicans the same (*to auto*)” (Matt. 5:46).

The origins of the variant are speculative. Was this a “reconstruction” following a paper fade / loss of “*telonai outō*” at the end of a line, that made it look like “*::::nai ::t::::*”, so that it was then accidentally “reconstructed” as “*ethnikoi to auto*”? Or was this a deliberate change of the text, designed as a “stylistic improvement”?

Either way, there is a good likelihood, though not a definite certainty, that these two changes occurred at the same time, with the decision to link (and if deliberate, increase,) the parallelism with Matt. 5:46 by changing “so (*outō*)” (Matt. 5:47b) to “the same (*to auto*),” intended as a stylistic match (or if deliberate, compensation,) for the fact that the parallelism of “publicans (*telonai*)” in Matt. 5:46 and Matt. 5:47b was now lost with the change of “publicans (*telonai*)” in Matt. 5:47b to “Gentiles (*ethnikoi*).” Both changes appear in Cyprian (3rd century) and Lucifer of Cagliari (4th century); but if my conjecture is correct with regard to the

---

<sup>53</sup> The Clementine Vulgate follows Jerome’s Vulgate in reading, “*nonne* (not) *et* (also) *ethnici* (Gentiles) *hoc* (this) *faciunt* (do)” i.e., “do not also the Gentiles this?” However, “this (*hoc*),” is removed in the Sixtinam Vulgate (1590), i.e., “do not also the Gentiles?”

simultaneous origins of the words in this variant; then I would further speculate that with rival texts in existence, some scribes chose parts of the Cyprian-Lucifer text, and parts of the Received Text, hence the existence of hybrid texts i.e., “Gentiles (*ethnikoi*) so (*outo*)” (found in, though not necessarily originating with, Basil), or “publicans (*telonai*) the same (*to auto*)” (found in, though not necessarily originating with, W 032, Sigma 042, & old Latin h). But the pure text was preserved in the representative Byzantine Text.

On the one hand, the TR’s reading is supported by the representative Byzantine Text, with its constituent parts each receiving further ancient support from within the closed class of three witnesses. But on the other hand, the variant reading has the support of two ancient church writers; and its constituent parts are each followed by other sources inside the closed class of three sources. Balancing out these competing factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “publicans so” in Matt. 5:47b a “B” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 5:47b, “the publicans so,” is found in (the mixed text type) Greek Codex L 019 (8th century); (the independent text type) Greek Codex Delta 037 (9th century); as well as the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century). Dividing it up into its two constituent words, “publicans” (*telonai*) is further found in the Gothic Version (4th century); and “so (*outo* or *outos*)” is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; together with the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and the Syriac Harclean h (616) Versions. It is found in the NKJV as, “Do not even the tax collectors (*telonai*) do (*poiousin*) so (*outo*)?” (NKJV).

It is found in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), as the Latin, “*nonne* (not) *et* (even) *publicani* (the publicans) *hoc* (this) *faciunt* (do)” i.e., “do not even the publicans this?” Thus dividing it up into its constituent parts, the Arabic Diatessaron follows the TR’s “publicans,” but in the second part, it follows the same non-TR alternative reading as the Vulgate.

The alternative reading, “the Gentiles the same,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries). Dividing it up into its two constituent words, “Gentiles (*ethnikoi*)” is also found in the Syriac Palestinian (c. 6th century) Version; as well as the Egyptian Coptic Version (3rd century); and “the same (*to auto*),” is found in the Gothic Version (4th century); and Armenian Version (5th century).

With strong Alexandrian support, the incorrect reading entered the NU Text *et al.* It is found at the Matt. 5:47b in the ASV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, and Moffatt. It is translated more literally in the American Standard Version as, “do not even the Gentiles (*ethnikoi*) the (*to*) same (*auto*)?” (ASV). It is translated less literally in the looseness of unwarranted dynamic equivalence in the NIV and Moffatt’s Bible, e.g., the latter reads, “Do not the very pagans (*ethnikoi*) do as much (*to auto*)?” (Moffatt Bible).

**Matt. 5:48a** “even as” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*osper* (even as)" in the words, "even as your Father," is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), K 017 (9th century), M 021 (9th century), S 028 (10th century); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century). It is also found as Latin, "*sicut* (as) *et* (even)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions *aur* (7th century), *1* (7th / 8th century), *ff1* (10th / 11th century), and *c* (12th / 13th century); as well as the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

An alternative reading, Greek, "*os* (as)," is a minority Byzantine reading, found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is found as Latin, "*sicut* (as)," in old Latin Versions *a* (4th century), *b* (5th century), *d* (5th century), *h* (5th century), *f* (6th century), and *g1* (8th / 9th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Clement of Alexandria (d. before 215), Origen (d. 254), Eusebius (d. 339), and Athanasius of Alexandria (d. 373).

There is no good textual reason to doubt the representative Byzantine Text, which must therefore stand as correct. Was this variant a paper fade of "*osper*" to "*os:::*" in which the scribe took the space created to be a "stylistic paper break," and so "*os*" accidentally entered the text? Or is this a typical pruning to make a "more concise" text?

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading, "even as" in Matt. 5:48a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 5:48a, "even as," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, D 05 (*Codex Cambridge Bezae Cantabrigiensis*, 5th century), and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), which in Latin, like the Vulgate, reads "*sicut* (as) *et* (even)" i.e., "even as."

The incorrect reading, "as," is unsurprisingly followed by the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century).

And thus it entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 5:48. Thus we find "even" omitted in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV, in the same way as it was earlier omitted and translated simply as, "as (*os*)" in the ASV.

#### **Matt. 5:48b** "in heaven" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek, "*en* (in) *tois* (-) *ouranois* ('heaven,' literally 'heavens,' a plural dative second declension masculine noun, from *ouranos-ou*)," in the words, "your Father which is in heaven is perfect," is the majority Byzantine reading e.g., Codices K 017 (9th century), M 021 (9th century), Pi 041 (9th century), S 028 (10th century); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century). It is also found as Latin, "*in* (in) *caelis* ('heaven,' literally 'heavens,' a plural ablative second declension neuter noun, from *caelum-i*)," in old Latin Versions *k* (4th / 5th centuries), *b* (5th

century), d (5th century), h (5th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), c (12th / 13th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Clement of Alexandria (d. before 215); and the ancient church Latin writers, Tertullian (d. after 220) and Lucifer of Cagliari (4th century).

However, the reading, Greek, “*ouranios* (‘heavenly,’ a singular nominative second declension masculine adjective, from *ouranios-on*),” making the reading, “your heavenly Father is perfect,” is a minority Byzantine reading found in e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), E 07 (8th century), U 030 (9th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also followed as Latin, “*caelestis* (‘heavenly,’ a singular nominative third declension masculine adjective<sup>54</sup>, from *caelestis-e*),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), making the reading, “*sicut* (as) *et* (even) *Pater* (Father) *vester* (your) *caelestis* (heavenly) *perfectus* (perfect) *est* (is);” and old Latin Versions a (4th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g2 (10th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Clement of Alexandria (d. before 215), Origen (d. 254), Athanasius (d. 373), Basil the Great (d. 379), Chrysostom (d. 407); the ancient church Latin writer, Cyprian (d. 258); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

The terminology, “your Father which in (*en*) heaven (*tois ouranois*)” is Matthean, and in the *Sermon on the Mount* is found nearby in Matt. 5:16,45; 6:1,10; 7:11,21. So too, “your heavenly (*ouranios*) Father” is Matthean, and in the *Sermon on the Mount* is found nearby in Matt. 6:14,26,32. However, there is no good textual reason to doubt the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as the correct reading. Matt. 5:48b was evidently assimilated to Matt. 5:14,26,32. As noted above, Matt. 5:47, appears to have been assimilated to Matt. 6:32 and followed by Cyprian, and with Cyprian also following this change in Matt. 5:48b, it too may have therefore come from Matt. 6:32, as an outgrowth of the desire of a scribe to spread the stylistic influence of Matt. 6:32 around the *Sermon on the Mount* in further continuation of what he had already done in Matt. 5:47. If deliberate, the scribe no doubt regarded this as some kind of “stylistic improvement.” If accidental, it may have originated after a paper fade of “*en tois ouranois*” to “*:::o::ouranois*,” in which a scribe then “corrected” the “obvious spelling mistake” of the “*ois*” suffix to “*ios*.”

On the one hand, the TR’s reading has the support of the representative Byzantine Text, a number of old Latin Version, and some ancient church writers. It is clearly Matthean terminology found elsewhere nearby, and there is no good textual reason to doubt its veracity.

---

<sup>54</sup> *Prima facie* this declension could be masculine or feminine, but here it must be masculine so that this adjective matches the gender of the noun, which is masculine, *Pater*.

But on the other hand, the variant is a minority Byzantine reading, has the support of Jerome's Latin Vulgate and a number of old Latin Versions, together with a number of ancient church writers. It too is clearly Matthean terminology found elsewhere nearby. Taking into account these diverse considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading, "in heaven" at Matt. 5:48b a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 5:48b, "your Father which is in heaven." is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century).

However, the incorrect reading, "your heavenly Father," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It further occurs in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

On the basis of their limited "majority text" count, which included "every text under the sun," that they could find, e.g., the Alexandrian Text's Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus, the Western Text's D 05, the Syriac Pesitto Version, Syriac Curetonian Version, the Arabic Diatessaron, the Bohairic Version, Armenian Version, Gothic Version, Ethiopic Version, Slavonic Version, *et al*; Burgon & Miller (1899) concluded that the text here at Matt. 5:48b was seriously divided between these two readings. By contrast, the later Burgonites in both Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005) are Burgonite Revisionist in that they have adopted a *Greek manuscript priority* (and in the case of Robinson & Pierpont a specifically Byzantine Greek Text priority), basing their majority text counts on *Greek manuscripts alone* as collated by von Soden (1913). Thus neither Hodges & Farstad nor Robinson & Pierpont are in any doubt that the TR's reading is that of the majority text here at Matt. 5:48b.

No doubt due to its strong Alexandrian support, coupled with diversity of "external support" in the manuscripts containing the copyist's errors in following the wrong reading, it entered the NU Text *et al*. Hence we find the erroneous reading at Matt. 5:48b in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV; which in this respect are like the earlier ASV which reads, "as your heavenly (*ouranios*) Father is perfect" (ASV).

**Matt. 6:1a** "Take heed that ye" (TR & AV) {A}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

The scribe of Lectionary 2378 first wrote out the reading of Matt. 6:1-13 and then the reading of Matt. 6:15-21. Thereafter, before giving a combined reading from Mark 11:22-26 and Matt. 7:7,8; he gives rubric in which he first refers to the opening words of the Matt. 6:1-13, "*Prosechete* (Take heed that ye) *eleemosunēn* (alms)" (see commentary at Matt. 6:1b, *infra*), and then refers to the opening words of the Matt. 6:15-21 reading (see commentary at Matt. 6:15, *infra*). This means we have two references in this Lectionary to the word of Matt. 6:1a.

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 6:1a, the TR's Greek, "*Prosechete* ('Take heed that ye,' present imperative active verb, 2nd person plural, from *prosecho*)," is supported by the majority Byzantine Text, e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, twice in two different readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as Latin, "*Attendite* ('Take heed that ye,' present imperative active verb, 2nd person plural, from *attendo*, meaning, 'to mark' or 'to attend to')," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century); and as Latin, "*Observate* ('Take heed that ye,' present imperative active verb, 2nd person plural, from *observo*, meaning, 'to observe' or 'to attend to')," in old Latin Version k (4th / 5th centuries). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592) as "*Attendite*." It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, Greek, "*Prosechete* (Take heed that ye) *de* (but / and)," i.e., "But (or 'And') take heed that ye," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is further found as Latin, "*autem* (but)," in the old Latin Version g1 (8th / 9th century). It is also found in the early mediaeval church writer, Pseudo-Chrysostom in a Latin work (6th century).

There is no good textual reason to doubt the representative Byzantine reading which must therefore stand as correct. The addition of "But" was no doubt influenced by its common usage as a conjunctive, being found nearby at e.g., latter in Matt. 6:1, or in Matt. 6:3. Its origins may have been an accidental "reconstruction, if either a stylistic paper space existed after "*Prosechete*," or "*Prosechete*" came at the end of a line, followed by a paper loss, and a scribe "guessed" that something was missing under the paper loss when it was not. Alternatively, this might have been a deliberate "stylistic improvement," in order to make the passage "the same" as others that use this common conjunctive. Accidental "reconstruction" or wilful tampering of the text? We cannot be sure. We can only be sure that this variant is not original.

The TR's reading has solid support in the Greek and Latin. It enjoys the support of an eastern Greek writing bishop, St. John Chrysostom (Bishop of Caesarea, c. 329-379); and a western Latin writing bishop, St. Gregory the Great (Bishop of Rome, 590-604; before the formation of the Roman Papacy in 607). On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading, "Take heed that ye" at Matt. 6:1a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 6:1a, "Take heed that ye," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century), a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); Gothic Version (4th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The incorrect reading, which adds “And” or “But (*de*),” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and independent Codex Z 035 (6th century). It is further followed in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; together with the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century) and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect reading was included in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72) and the Nestle 21st edition (1952). Reflecting the same uncertainty evident in the split between the two leading Alexandrian Texts, “And” or “But (*de*),” was enclosed in square brackets in Westcott-Hort (1881) and the NU Text, thus making it optional in Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition and the UBS 4th revised edition. Choosing the option of not including it; it is not found in Matt. 6:1a in the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, or NIV; although one cannot be sure if the translators did or did not follow the reading “And” or “But (*de*),” since they may have omitted it on the basis of redundancy in English translation.

**Matt. 6:1b** “alms” (TR & AV) {B}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

The scribe of Lectionary 2378 first wrote out the reading of Matt. 6:1-13 and then the reading of Matt. 6:15-21. Thereafter, before giving a combined reading from Mark 11:22-26 and Matt. 7:7,8; he gives rubric in which he first refers to the opening words of the Matt. 6:1-13, “*Prosechete* (Take heed that ye) *eleemosunen* (alms)” (see commentary at Matt. 6:1a, *supra*), and then refers to the opening words of the Matt. 6:15-21 reading (see commentary at Matt. 6:15, *infra*). This means we have two references in this Lectionary to the word of Matt. 6:1b.

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 6:1b, the TR’s Greek, “*eleemosunen* (alms)” (AV) or “charitable deeds” (NKJV), in the words, “Take heed that ye do not your alms (*eleemosunen*) before men” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, twice in two different readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported by the old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries, Latin, *elemosinam*) and f (6th century, Latin, *aemosynam*). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, the reading, “righteousness (Greek, *dikaiosunen*, Latin, *justitiam*),” thus making the reading, “Take heed that ye do not your righteousness before men” (ASV), is found in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); the ancient church Latin writers Hilary (d. 367) and Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

There is no good textual reason to doubt the representative Byzantine Text, which must

therefore stand as the correct reading. In the context of Matt. 6:1-4, the same Greek word, *eleemosune* is found another three times, once in each of the successive three verses. This clearly shows that contextually Christ is discussing “alms.” The peculiar influence of Matt. 6:32 as a source for assimilations with Matt. 5:47,48b has been noted in the commentary, *supra*. Seemingly, the connected subsequent verse, “But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness (*dikaiousunen*)” (Matt. 6:33), also formed part of the expansive influence by assimilation of the teaching in Matt. 6:32,33. If deliberate, such “stylistic improvements” cannot be undertaken without arrogance and impiety.

But was this alteration actually accidental? Was the copyist’s page reading “*eleemosunen* (alms)” damaged either by paper loss or some substance spilt over it, so that only the last six letters were visible i.e., “:::::osunen”? Then because the missing five letters of “*eleem*” in “*eleemosune*” would take up the same space as the five letters of “*dikai*” in “*dikaiousunen*,” did a scribe “reconstruct” this as “*dikaiousunen* (righteousness)” after reading Matt. 6:33 and wrongly concluding that this same word should be supplied at Matt. 6:1b? Whether this change from “alms (*eleemosunen*)” to “righteousness (*dikaiousunen*)” was deliberate or accidental is a matter lost in the unwritten pages of unrecorded history. But that such a change did occur is clearly evident.

On the one hand, the TR’s reading “alms (*eleemosunen*),” is supported by the representative Byzantine Text, some old Latin Versions, and an ancient church writer. It poses no textual problems and so must stand as correct. But on the other hand, the variant reading, “righteousness (*dikaiousunen*),” has the support of Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, a number of old Latin Versions, and a number of ancient church writers. Taking into account these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “alms” in Matt. 6:1b a “B” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 6:1b, “alms” (AV), is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Z 035 (6th century). It is further found in the celebrated Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as the Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century); Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), as Latin, “*eleemosynam* (alms).”

The incorrect reading at Matt. 6:1b, “righteousness (*dikaiousunen*),” is also found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It entered the neo-Alexandrian NU Text *et al*.

It is found at Matt. 6:1 in the ASV as, “Take heed that ye do not your righteousness before men.” It was also followed in the RSV and NRSV, as “Beware of practicing your piety” (NRSV), as well as in the ESV, NASB, and NIV. However, in the NIV’s looseness of unwarranted dynamic equivalence, “righteousness (*dikaiousunen*)” (ASV) becomes “acts of righteousness (*dikaiousunen*)” (NIV). On this occasion probably influenced by the Syriac, Moffatt has the correct reading for the wrong reasons, “Take care not to practice your charity

(*eleemosunen*) before men.”

**Matt. 6:4a** “himself” (TR & AV) {B}

The TR’s Greek, “*autos* (himself),” in the words, “thy Father which seeth in secret himself shall reward thee openly” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and Lectionary 2378 (11th century). It is further supported as Latin, “*ipse*,” in old Latin Versions d (5th century), h (5th century), and q (6th / 7th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However, “himself” is omitted as a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further omitted by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), the Apostolic Constitutions (3rd or 4th century), Chrysostom (d. 407); the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore the correct reading. Was this an accidental loss due to a paper fade / loss? Notably, in Lectionary 2378 after one line ends with the word before, “*autos* (himself),” i.e., “*krupto* (secret),” there is then a paper space on the next line of about half a dozen letter spaces, and then this is followed by the next word after “*autos* (himself),” i.e., “*apodosei* (shall reward).” Such a paper space of this size, and inside a sentence, is irregular for Lectionary 2378, and so I asked, “Is this an example of such a paper fade?” or “Did the scribe copying it out preserve this size paper space from a manuscript he was copying which had the legacy of a such a paper fade, either on this manuscript itself or on one of its ancestors?” Looking purely at the photocopies from both the Sydney University Library positive and negative microfilms which I generally use, no writing is here apparent. But as is my custom in such instances, I inspected the original Lectionary at Sydney University, and I was able to make out a very light “*autos*.” We thus here have a good example of how if an entire word is subject to a paper fade, it may go undetected and be lost by a subsequent copyist; although in this particular instance, the location of the fade on the line raises the suspicions of a paper fade. But if the same word had been “squeezed in” at the end of a line, a paper fade of this type could much more easily go undetected.

Was this a deliberate change? Is this the typical type of pruning associated with Origen and the Alexandrian School? If so, it may have originated with Origen; who whilst not an Alexandrian School scribe himself, nevertheless, both influenced, and was influenced by, the Alexandrian School

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “himself” in Matt. 6:4a a “B” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 6:4a, “himself,” is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), as well as the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions.

The incorrect reading which omits “himself,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also omitted in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions; as well as the Coptic Version (3rd century); Armenian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries); and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

From its strong Alexandrian base, it is also found in the NU Text *et al*, and so is omitted in the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. The wording of Matt. 6:4a was changed from the NASB’s 1st ed. & 2nd ed., in the NASB’s 3rd edition. The NASB now reads, “your Father who sees *what is done* in secret will reward you” (NASB 3rd ed.), and the NIV reads, “your Father, who sees what is done in secret, will reward you” (NIV). Notwithstanding some punctuation differences, the wording of the NASB (3rd ed.) and NIV is the same. However, the NASB (3rd ed.) places the words, “*what is done*” in italics, indicating that they are added; whereas a reader of the NIV knows not whether these words come from the NU Text or the translators’ minds.

**Matt. 6:4b,6** “openly” (twice) (TR & AV) {B}

(Cf. commentary at Matt. 6:18.) The Greek of the *Textus Receptus* (TR) reads, “*en* (in) *to* (the) *phanero* (open)” i.e., “openly” (AV) in Matt. 6:4b,6. It is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Codices W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53,) and Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century); as well as Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is e.g., further supported as Latin, “*in palam* (openly),” by old Latin Versions a (4th century), h (5th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), c (12th / 13th century); and as Latin, “*in manifesto* (clearly / manifestly),” in old Latin Versions f (6th / 7th century) and q (6th century). It is also supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407). Its usage in Matt. 6:4b is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, the Apostolic Constitutions (3rd or 4th century), Basil the Great (d. 379), and Nilus (d. c. 430); and the ancient church Latin writers in a manuscript according to Augustine (d. 430), and *Speculum* (5th century). Its usage in Matt. 6:6 is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

However, “openly” is omitted at Matt. 6:4b,6 in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), d (5th century), aur (7th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and the ancient church Latin writers, Chromatius (d. 407) and Augustine (d. 430). From the Latin support for this reading, its omission is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further omitted in Matt. 6:4b by the ancient church Latin writer, Cyprian (d. 258). It is also omitted in Matt. 6:6 by the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339); ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367) and Ambrose (d. 397); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as the correct reading. It should also be noted that in terms of Aramaic (or Hebraic) parallelism, which is clearly present in this Greek text, stylistically, the statement “shall reward thee openly,” flows naturally as a contrast with, “seeth in secret” (Matt. 6:4b,6). If “openly” was not original, Christ could e.g., have said, “thy Father which knows everything, shall reward thee,” in which instance, the ending, “reward thee openly” would not be expected. But by first saying “seeth in secret,” an antithetical parallelism is naturally expected, so that the sentence falls flat if it ends abruptly with simply, “reward thee.” The TR’s ending also fits better with the sense of the passage, which looks to the open reward of the saints at glorification and after the Second Advent, in such *Sermon of the Mount* verses as, e.g., “Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth” (Matt. 5:5); “great is your reward in heaven” (Matt. 5:12; referring to both the saints at glorification, and also after the Second Advent).

The saints receive the “reward” “openly” (Matt. 6:4b,6), for Christ says at the Second Advent, “Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world” (Matt. 25:34). Was this a deliberate “stylistic” change by scribes who lost sight of this focus on the next life, and who failed to understand this quality of openness in the Father’s reward?

In Article 35 of the Anglican *39 Articles*, Book 2, Homily 11, “Of Alms doing” (Part 1) (emphasis mine), we read, “... Our Saviour Christ testifieth of poor men, that they are dear unto him, and that he loveth them especially: for he called them his ‘little ones’ [Matt. 10:42; 24:40]. ... Christ doth declare ... how much he accepteth our charitable affection toward the poor, in that he promiseth a ‘reward’ [Matt. 10:42; Mark 9:41] unto them that ‘give’ but ‘a cup of cold water’ ‘in’ his ‘name’ to them that have need thereof; *and that reward is the kingdom of heaven.* ... For he that promiseth a princely recompense for a beggarly benevolence declareth that he is more delighted with the giving than with the gift, and that he as much esteemeth the doing of the thing as the fruit and commodity that cometh of it ... .”

I.e., our good works e.g., “to” “give” a “drink unto one of these little ones ... in the name of a disciple” (Matt. 10:42), manifests, or is a fruit of, the fact that we are saved. Thus Christ says of such a saved person who clearly exhibits the fruits of Christian charity, “He shall in no wise lose his reward” (Matt. 10:42). Thus the “reward” we Christians receive is that which is procured for us by *Christ alone*. While we receive the “reward” of eternal life that Christ has procured for us when we go to heaven at death (Heb. 9:27; 12:23), unless of course we are alive on earth when Christ returns, either way, we receive the “reward” of a resurrection body, and any other “reward” that *Christ alone* has procured for us, solely through the merits of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. For “the” human “creature” (cf. “creature” in Mark 16:15, AV; Col. 1:23, AV) “was made subject to vanity” (Rom. 8:20) as a consequence of Adam’s sin (Rom. 5:12), so that “the whole” human “creation” (cf. “whole creation,” Mark 16:15, ASV) “groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now” (Rom. 8:22). Why do we so “groan”? Because we are “waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body” (Rom. 8:23). “Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth” (Matt. 5:5); “great is your reward in heaven” (Matt. 5:12).

Sadly man’s desire for works’ righteousness is so great, that in various ways it seeks to creep back into churches that profess to believe in justification by faith. One subtle way it does so is through a semi-Romanist teaching of heavenly “rewards,” which “reward” it is claimed, a man receives in addition to his justification as a consequence of his good works. The Biblical

position (Matt. 20:1-16; Luke 17:5-10) is well stated in Article 14 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*, “Voluntary works besides, over and above, God’s commandments, which they call Works of Supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety: for by them men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake, than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants.” (Luke 17:10).

Our Lord wants people who will do the right thing because it is the right thing to do. We do good works, not in order to be saved, or to receive some kind of “bonus reward,” but because we are saved. For “when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do” (Luke 17:10). “Brethren, be not weary in well doing” (II Thess. 2:13). “We love him, because he first loved us” (I John 4:19). Let us not look for some “bonus reward” for our good works, since to do so spits in the face of Jesus by denying that in Christ we have what Article 16 of the Anglican *39 Articles* calls, “forgiveness to such as truly repent;” or what the Presbyterian *Westminster Catechism* Answer 34 calls, “full remission of sin;” or in short, what Article 11 of the *Apostles’ Creed* calls, “the forgiveness of sins.” I.e., forgiveness of sins includes both sins of commission and sins of omission (Matt. 23:23).

Our Lord Jesus Christ died for us on a cross. *How dare any Christian man say to him, “Give me a bonus reward if you want me to do any good works for thee.” What arrogance! What ingratitude! What impiety! What a failure to understand the Biblical teaching found in the Anglican Communion Service which says, “Jesus Christ” did “suffer death upon the cross for our redemption,” and he “made there ... a FULL, PERFECT, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world”* (Anglican Book of Common Prayer, 1662, emphasis mine, cf. Col. 2:10; 4:12; Heb. 10:14)! “For” “Christ our passover is sacrificed for us” (I Cor. 5:7). When the angel of death saw blood and judgement on the “posts” “over the door” of the “houses” of the Israelites (Exod. 12:23) he “passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt” (Exod. 12:27). And so too, when the blood and judgement of “the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world” (John 1:29) is over us, *there is no second judgement, there is no loss of reward due to a sin of omission for which Christ’s blood did not atone.* Now when we come to judgement (Heb. 9:27), it is a sombre thing (II Cor. 5:10), and hence on the one hand, Christ may say to this or that Christian, “That which thou didst here was not subject to my Word and ordinance, thou shouldst not have done this, it ‘shall be burned’” (I Cor. 3:12-15), so that we should “be careful to maintain good works” (Titus 3:8), and “diligently obey the voice of the Lord” (Zech. 6:15). But on the other hand, the Christian “himself shall be saved” (I Cor. 3:15), and we need not “fear” for our souls or the full reward Christ hath procured for us “in the day of judgement” (I John 4:17,18).

For “ye are complete in” “Christ” (Col. 2:8,10) and “perfect” (Col. 4:12), and so there can be no *incompletion* or *imperfection* with a consequent “loosing out on a bonus reward.” Thus unlike those who think e.g., the keeping of this or that holy day, or the eating of this or that food, or abstaining from this or that food or drink, somehow makes a man *holier than thou* (Col. 2:16-23), the reality is that if we are “holding the Head” (Col. 2:19), “in” whom “dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily” (Col. 2:9), then we have a “full assurance” (Col. 2:2), not a “part assurance.” Thus while e.g., I would find value in the remembrance of *King Charles I’s Day* as a holy day on 30 January, and in remembering it as a red letter day in 2009 engaged in a partial fast by abstaining from certain foods, to wit, red meat on the 360th anniversary of Charles’

martyrdom in 1649 (although this was unusual for me since I would more normatively simply remember it as a black letter day), all in accordance with Rom. 14:5,6; if nevertheless, some benighted Puseyite were to do likewise, and think that by so doing he was in some way earning a “bonus reward” from God, I would repudiate his claim on the basis of the type of teaching we find in the Book of Colossians. And I would normatively remember Good Friday as a red letter day at Easter time, but entirely reject the claim of some benighted Papist that by his remembrance of this day, he was somehow earning salvation merit and / or some “bonus reward” from God.

Was this omission of “openly” at Matt. 6:4b,6 deliberate? Or was this an accidental loss due to a paper fade / loss? We cannot be sure, but the former seems more likely than the latter, since we here have a double omission.

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “openly” in Matt. 6:4b,6 a “B” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

None would dispute that the combination of the Latin preposition, “*in*” with the adverb, “*palam*” i.e., “*in palam*” means “openly.” But it might be reasonably asked, Why does the AV not translate the Greek, “*en (in) to (the) phanerō (open)*” literally as, “in the open” or “in open;” but rather, translates it in a manner that is harmonious with both the Latin and Greek? Certainly, we cannot doubt that this is a Greek translation, not a Latin translation in the AV. However, it must be remembered, that the AV is not simply a great translation, it is also a great piece of English literature. Part of its greatness, lies in its usage of e.g., alliteration and assonance. The word “open” here would remove any immediate assonance, and the sentence would fall flat, through lack of echo in a nearby word. However, the echoing of the “ee” sound in “thee” and the “y” sound in “openly” i.e., “reward thee openly,” is not only succinct and clear, but echoes the “ee” / “y” sound. Humbly relying upon the blessing of the Trinitarian God, the AV translators were not only past masters of the Greek and Latin, but also past masters of the English.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 6:4b,6, “openly,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions.

It is further found in the Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Slavic (Slavonic) Version (9th century); Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries). Its usage in Matt. 6:4b is also followed in the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) and Palestinian Syriac (c. 6th century); and its usage in Matt. 6:6 is further followed in a manuscript of the Palestinian Syriac Version.

The incorrect reading which omits “openly” at Matt. 6:4b,6, is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions. Its omission in Matt. 6:6 is further followed in the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), and a manuscript of the Palestinian Syriac;

together with the Egyptian Coptic Fayyumic Version (3rd century). This is a typical Alexandrian pruning, and its following in texts outside the closed class of three providentially protected over the ages, whether Alexandrian, Western, or Egyptian, led to its adoption in the neo-Alexandrian NU Text *et al.*

The NKJV translators say, “The real character of the Authorized Version does not reside in its archaic pronouns or verbs or other grammatical forms” (NKJV Preface). While generally following the TR in their main NT text (and in their footnotes, selections from the Majority Text which they claim in their Preface “corrects” the TR’s “readings which have little or nor support in the Greek manuscript tradition”), they change “thee” to you,” so that e.g., Matt. 6:4b reads, “your Father who sees in secret will himself reward you openly.” Do the NKJV translators really believe that by changing “reward thee openly” (AV, Matt. 6:4b,6) to “reward you openly” (NKJV), and thereby striking down the English assonance, that they do not affect the “real character of the Authorized Version”? Alas, these modern Burgonite translators who follow in the Majority Text errors of men like John Burgon or Jay Green Sr. in failing to distinguish between the Byzantine Greek in a closed class of three providentially protected sources and other Greek manuscripts outside this class, and in failing to engage in textual analysis where this Byzantine Greek text has an evident textual problem through reference to readings inside this closed class of three sources; have not only forgotten about the Latin, but have also forgotten about the English.

Following in the errors of men like Constantine Tischendorf, Brook Westcott, Fenton Hort, or Eberhard Nestle, the NU Text omits “openly.” Hence the ASV simply reads, “thy Father who seeth in secret shall recompense thee” (ASV). So too these words are omitted in the NASB, RSV, NRSV (which has a footnote referring to the TR’s reading), ESV, and NIV. The removal of the distinction between the “you” singular and plural forms in versions after the ASV, thus blurs the meaning of even what is left of the trimmed down verse.

The Moffatt Bible retains “openly” in Matt. 6:4, and a footnote says that “*en to phanero*, ... has powerful support in the Old Latin and Syriac versions.” This fuses together “the Old Latin” which are in the closed class of sources, with the “Syriac” which is outside the closed class of sources. Thus Moffatt’s here refers to a methodology which denies the Divine Preservation of Scripture. Nevertheless, the fact that he retains “openly” at Matt. 6:4, reminds us that the NU Text (or some other neo-Alexandrian text) may change its reading in the future, depending on who is on its Committee, i.e., followers of Tischendorf *et al* (opposed to this reading), or followers of Moffatt (in favour of this reading).

The NU Text Committees have changed over time, although three names remained constant over the “N” of Nestle-Aland’s 26th edition of 1979 and 27th edition of 1993, and the “U” of the United Bible Society’s 3rd edition of 1975, 3rd Corrected edition of 1983, and 4th Revised edition of 1993. Two of these names are “the bright lights” of the NU Text Committee, namely, Kurt Aland who died in 1994, and Bruce Metzger who died in 2007. But lurking in the blackness of their shadows, there was one other, to wit, a Popish Jesuit, Carlo Martini. (At the time of completion of this volume,) Cardinal Martini is still alive, although in all of these NU Text editions he cloaked the initials “S.J.” (signifying he is a Jesuit,) under the black robe of Jesuit secrecy. He and the NU Text Committee were evidently squeamish about declaring *openly* on the NU Text title pages Martini’s connections with the black robes of Jesuitry. We thank God that his Divine character is different to that of the NU Text Committee. For our God

did first inspire, and then preserve the Received Text, and his character is one that doth “reward ... openly” (Matt. 6:4b,6).

**Matt. 6:5a** (singular form) “thou prayest, thou shalt not be” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s singular Greek form, “*proseuche* (‘thou prayest,’ present middle subjunctive, 2nd person singular verb, from *proseuchomai*), *ouk* (not) *ese* (‘shalt thou be,’ future indicative, 2nd person singular of verb, from *eimi*),” in the words, “And when thou [‘you’ singular] prayest, thou [‘you’ singular] shalt not be as the hypocrites” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, “*oris* (‘thou prayest,’ present indicative active<sup>55</sup>, 2nd person singular verb, from *oro*), *non* (not) *eris* (‘shalt thou be,’ future indicative active, 2nd person singular verb, from *sum, esse*)” by old Latin q (6th century); and as Latin, “*adoras* (‘thou dost worship,’ present indicative active, 2nd person singular verb, from *adoro*), *non* (not) *erit* (‘it shall,’ future indicative active, 3rd person singular of verb *sum, esse*),” by old Latin Version k (4th / 5th centuries).

However, the plural form, Greek “*proseuchesthe* (‘ye pray,’ present middle subjunctive,

---

<sup>55</sup> The Greek middle voice, indicating that the subject is getting something, or doing something, in his own interest; and carrying with it the idea that the subject is participating in the results that flow from the action, does not exist in Latin. In Latin, there are simply the three moods, indicative (directly indicating the facts), subjunctive (contingency, possibility, wish, or subordinated in meaning to another idea), and imperative (command). Thus Latin could not use a middle voice anyway. However, while Greek, “*proseuche*,” and the variant, “*proseuchesthe*,” “are both middle voice, they are also deponents i.e., middle voice verbs with an active meaning. (In fact, most NT Greek verbs in the middle voice are deponents, which can also come from the passive voice.) The Latin for both the TR and variant is thus a more literal translation than it may at first appear to be. Most importantly for the purposes of the relevant textual analysis here, these Latin readings agree with the Greek in being 2nd person singular or plural verbs respectively.

2nd person plural verb, from *proseuchomai*), *ouk* (not) *esesthe* ('be ye,' future indicative middle, 2nd person plural verb, from *eimi*)," thus making the words, "And when ye pray, ye shall not be as the hypocrites," is found as Latin, "*Et* (And) *cum* (when) *oratis* ('ye pray,' present indicative active, 2nd person plural verb, from *oro*) *non* (not) *eritis* ('ye shall be,' future indicative active, 2nd person plural verb, from *sum, esse*)," i.e., "And when ye pray, ye shall not be," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and some of the old Latin Versions. From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

There is no good textual reason to doubt the reading of the representative Byzantine Text, which must therefore stand as the correct reading. Indeed, the fact that Matt. 5:6 is an immediate contrast with Matt. 5:5, and this is in singular form i.e., "But thou (*su*), when (*otan*) thou prayest (*proseuche*)," naturally requires that Matt. 5:5 would also be in the singular, as it is in the TR.

The origins of the plural variant are speculative. Possibly this was an accidental alteration. Stylistic paper spaces were sometimes made by scribes for no apparent reason. If such spaces existed after "*proseuche*" and "*es*" they may have been wrongly interpreted as a "paper fade," and a "reconstruction" made to the variant's "*proseuchesthe*" and "*esesthe*" respectively. Alternatively, this may have been a deliberate "stylistic improvement.

Either way, this variant's alteration from the singular to plural form, probably came about from an assimilation with Matt. 6:7, which has the plural form, "But when praying (*proseuchomenoi*) not (*ouk*) do you use vain repetitions (*baptologesete*)" i.e., "But when ye [you' plural] pray, use not vain repetitions" (AV). Such a scribal assimilation fails to properly understand the stylistic context in which Christ first uses the singular form with respect to prayer in Matt. 5:5,6; and then changes to the plural form for prayer in Matt. 5:7-9. Whether an accidental scribal error as a "reconstruction" filling in blank stylistic spaces, or a deliberate scribal change, such superficial analysis by the scribes changing Matt. 5:5 from the singular form to the plural form, left behind the testimony of the Aramaic (or Hebraic) antithetical parallelism of Matt. 5:6 in the singular, as a testimony against the change made to Matt. 5:5. Therefore on this occasion, stylistic analysis can be seen to offer a positive proof for the TR's Greek reading.

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading in the singular form, "thou prayest, thou shalt not be" at Matt. 6:5a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct singular form reading at Matt. 6:5a, "And when thou prayest, thou shalt not be," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); together with (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions, and some Syriac Harclean h (616) Versions.

As fudgers pushed and pulled at each other, this way and that at Alexandria, the reading of one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century), was greatly obscured,

and so is unclear due to scribal changes to it (see Tischendorf's 8th ed. and Nestle-Aland 27th ed.). The incorrect reading in the plural form, "And when ye pray, ye shall not be," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); and the independent Codex Z 035 (6th century). It is also followed in some Syriac Harclean h (616) Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); Gothic Version (4th century) Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries). From such sources, it entered the NU Text *et al.*

The change between the TR's, "And when thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites" (AV), is clear when contrasted with the ASV, since the NU Text follows the same incorrect reading as Westcott-Hort (1881), "And when ye pray, ye shall not be as the hypocrites" (ASV). However, let the reader consider the "new" translations, that make no distinction between singular and plural "you" forms, such as the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. At Matt. 6:5a, following the plural form of the NU Text, e.g., the *New American Standard Bible* reads, "When you pray, you are not to be like the hypocrites" (NASB 3rd ed.); or the *English Standard Version* reads, "And when you pray, you must not be like the hypocrites" (ESV). But at Matt. 6:5a, following the singular form of the TR in its main text, the *New King James Version* reads, "And when you pray, you shall not be like the hypocrites." Now what reader, comparing the NU Text NASB and ESV translations, with the TR's NKJV, would even be aware that such a significant difference existed in the underlying Greek Text? Let us thank God for our good old AVs, which not only follows the better text, but which unlike these bad "new" versions, distinguishes between "you" singular ("thee," "thou," and "thy") and plural ("ye," "you," and "your"), so that we can better understand the sacred words of Holy Scripture.

**Matt. 6:5c** "that they may be seen of men" (TR & AV) {A}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

This is the type of reading generally found in the Appendix 3, since the variant does not affect English translation. However, I have included it here, in part, to show the reader in greater detail the type of thing usually passed over in very brief detail for Matt. 1-10 in Appendix 3, or possibly not mentioned at all for Matt. 11ff. in Appendix 3. I have also included it here, in part, to remind the reader, that while the AV is a great translation, that does not mean it is absolutely perfect.

Infallibility of Scripture exists in the Divinely inspired autographs and Divinely preserved apographs of the *Textus Receptus*. But that is where Divine inspiration and preservation stops. While the AV is an excellent English translation, and by far the best available to us, infallibility is only to be found in the original Greek, Aramaic, and Hebrew Scriptures. Thus while we should jealously guard our King James Versions, we should not ever, and must not ever, claim for them the status of the infallible autographs and apographs. It also means, that from time to time, where no issue of text type is relevant, it may be that one of the new versions might bring out a shade of meaning better than the AV. E.g., at Hosea 6:7, "like Adam" (ASV) is a better rendering than "like men" (AV), i.e., "But they like Adam have transgressed the covenant" (AV). Or in Zech. 14 the ASV's "nations" is a better rendering than the AV's "heathen."

Nevertheless, as a broad general rule, our Authorized Versions will get us closer to the original languages than any other English translation.

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 6:5c, the Greek word of the *Textus Receptus* (TR), “*an* (may),” in the words, “*opos* (that) *an* (may) *phanosi* (they be seen) *tois* (-) *anthropois* (to men),” i.e., “that they may be seen of men” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.).

However, the Greek word, “*an* (may),” is omitted in a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex K 017 (9th century); and also by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

The Greek *an* sometimes indicates a contingency or possibility. (Cf. *osa an* “Whatsoever,” in “Whatsoever ye shall ask,” John 16:23, AV; *an tinon* “Whose soever,” in “whose soever sins ye remit,” and “whose soever sins ye retain,” John 20:23, AV, twice; or the NASB’s “if,” in “If you ask,” John 16:23, NASB; or “If you forgive the sins,” or “if you retain the sins,” John 20:23, NASB, twice).

The Greek, “*phanosi* (aorist passive subjunctive, 3rd person plural),” is here in the subjunctive mood. The subjunctive indicates contingency, possibility, or wish. It is often translated by using “may” (or “might”), however, it is not correct to do so in all instances (e.g., it might be used with *otan* or other words meaning “until”). Certainly without the preceding “*opos* (that),” for the “*an* (may)” followed by the subjunctive, the natural rendering is contingency, i.e., “they may (*an*) be seen (*phanosi*) of men,” in the sense that they *might* “be seen of men.”

However, when the subjunctive is accompanied with *ina* (‘in order that’ or ‘in order to’) or *opos* (‘that’ or ‘in order that’), it indicates *purpose* i.e., here making the clause to read, “in order that they be seen of men.” One finds this type of usage in Matt. 6:16, where we read, “*opos* (that) *phanosi* (they may appear) *tois* (-) *anthropois* (unto men) *nesteuontes* (fasting),” i.e., “that they may appear unto men to fast” (AV). (Cf. *opos* + subjunctive in e.g., *opos idosin* “that they may see,” Matt. 5:16; *opos doxasthosin* “that they may have glory,” Matt. 6:2.)

Even though Greek *an* may indicates a contingency or possibility; when, as here, it is found with *opos* and a subjunctive in a purpose clause, it is in fact a vestige in the NT koine Greek from the earlier classical Greek, and has no affect on English translation. The reading of the variant is thus the same as the Received Text.

The Latin also uses the subjunctive mood in “*videantur* (‘they may be seen,’ present passive subjunctive, 3rd person plural).” Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century) translates Matt. 6:5c as, “*ut* (in order that) *videantur* (they may be seen) *ab* (by) *hominibus* (men).” So too, the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430) uses the same Latin words as the Vulgate, and so indicates contingency (*Our Lord’s Sermon on the Mount, Works, Book 2, chapter 3:10*)<sup>56</sup>. From

<sup>56</sup> Schaff, P., (Editor), *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, [first series,] *op. cit.*, Vol. 6, p. 37 (English translation); Austin, *Santi Aurelii Augustini, De sermone Domini in monte libris duos / De sermone Domini in monte*, Typographi Brepols Editores Pontificii, Turnholti, Brepols, 1967, pp. 100-1 (Latin).

the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). But as in the Greek, so in the Latin. I.e., the Latin forms a *purpose* clause with “*ut*” and the subjunctive. Hence the Latin may be rendered, “that they may be seen by men,” or “in order that they may be seen by men.”

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as the correct reading. The origins of the variant are speculative. Was “*an* (may)” accidentally lost in a paper fade? Or was it deliberately removed as a “stylistic improvement” on the basis of redundancy because it was a relic of classical Greek? If the latter, it may also be an assimilation to the terminology of e.g., Matt. 5:16; 6:2, *supra*.

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 6:5c an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the contingency reading, Greek “*an*” at Matt. 6:5c, is found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in von Soden’s main text.

However, the reading which omits “*an*” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also omitted in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (independent) Codex Z 035 (6th century). From such sources it entered the NU Text *et al.*

At Matt 6:5c, the shorter reading is found in Westcott and Hort, but since this omission does not affect English translation, we find this translated in the ASV as, “that they may be seen of men” (ASV) i.e., the same English translation as one finds in the AV; and so the reader would not be aware that the Greek word, “*an*” has been omitted. This same translation appears in the RSV and ESV.

On the one hand, this type of translation found in the AV is certainly not incorrect. But on the other hand, an added complication in this English translation is that the English word “may” can be used for contingency, as opposed to purpose. Thus the English “may” in the sense of a possibility, could mean in English (though not in the Greek or Latin), “that they *might* be seen of men.” The AV thus has a certain ambiguity here, that was retained in the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV.

By contrast, a shade of greater clarity was brought to this verse in NIV and Moffatt Bible. This is an instance where Moffatt did not follow von Soden’s Text, but rather, Westcott-Hort’s Text. Moffatt uses “so as to,” in his reading, “*so as to* be seen by men” (Moffatt Bible).

These comments should not be taken to mean that as a package deal, either the NIV or Moffatt Bible are better than the AV. Certainly this is not so. But they remind us that English translation is a difficult art, and only the Divinely inspired autographs and their Divinely preserved *Textus Receptus* apographs are infallible. Thus while the AV remains the best English translation, this does not mean, that where there is not a textual issue at stake, that from time to

time a certain shade of meaning might sometimes be rendered better in one of these new versions. But good Christian reader, let us not throw the baby out with the bathwater. As a package deal the AV remains by far the best English translation. Let us retain our AV's and thank God for them!

**Matt. 6:12** “forgive” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek present tense, “*aphiemen* (‘we forgive,’ present indicative active, 1st person plural verb, from *aphiemi*),” in the terminology of the Lord's Prayer, “as we forgive our debtors” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Codices G 011 (9th century), K 017 (9th century), M 021 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), Pi 041 (9th century), S 028 (10th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as a present tense, Latin, “*dimittimus*” (‘we forgive,’ present indicative active, 1st person plural verb, from *dimitto*), by Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), l (7th / 8th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found with minor variation but the same basic meaning, as “*remitterimus*” (‘we remit,’ present indicative active, 1st person plural verb, from *remitto*) in old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), and h (5th century). It is also supported by the ancient church Greek writers of the Didache (2nd century), Origen (d. 254), the Apostolic Constitutions (3rd or 4th century), and Chrysostom (d. 407); the ancient church Latin writer, Cyprian (d. 258); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

A minority Byzantine variant also reads in the Greek present tense, “*aphiomen* (‘we forgive,’ present indicative active, 1st person plural verb, from *aphiemi*)” in Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), E 07 (8th century), and Pi 041 (9th century) (*Variant 1: spelling variant*).

Another variant, Greek, “*aphēkamen* (‘we have forgiven,’ aorist indicative active, 1st person plural verb, from *aphiemi*),” is found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Gregory Nyssa (d. 394), and Basil the Great (d. 379) (*Variant 2*). It is also found as Latin “*dimisimus*” (‘we have dismissed,’ perfect indicative active, 1st person plural verb, from *dimitto*) in Latin Codices J (6th / 7th century Cividale & 8th / 9th century Roma Vall.), Z (6th / 7th century London & 7th / 8th century London), B (8th / 9th century Paris & 9th century Bamberg), D (8th / 9th century Dublin), and Ep (9th century Paris).

It is also found in the future tense, as “*demitemus*” (‘we shall dismiss,’ future indicative active, 1st person plural verb, from *demitto*) in old Latin Version ff1 (10th / 11th century) (*Variant 3*).

No good textual argument can be raised against the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as the correct reading. The giving of the Lord's Prayer in Matt. 6:9-13 in the Sermon on the Mount, occurred in a different context, and at different time, to the giving of the Lord's Prayer in Luke 11:2-4, and Christ gave similar, though not identical forms of the Lord's Prayer on these two occasions. He makes similar adaptations to parables given at different times in the Gospels, a fact lost on those wrongly striving “parallel Gospel readings” (although on some occasions there are such parallel Gospel readings); and he may well have given the Lord's Prayer on yet other occasions not recorded in the Gospels, with

yet other comparable minor variations, although this is speculative. Nevertheless, it is notable that in Luke 11:4, our Lord used the same present tense with the words, “for we also forgive (*aphiemen*) everyone that is indebted to us” (AV); as we find in the TR of Matt. 6:12.

The change from “we forgive (*aphiemen*)” to “we forgive (*aphiomen*)” (*Variant 1: spelling variant*) does not affect the English translation. Was it a deliberate “stylistic improvement,” perhaps pandering to some localized dialect preference? Was it an accidental change? Due to paper fade / loss, or obscuration of the letter “e” (epsilon), did a scribe “reconstruct” this as the letter “o” (omicron) on the basis of “contextual reconstruction”?

Yet another possibility is seen through inspection of Manuscript Washington. At the page showing Matt. 6:7-17 one finds this verse. It reads, “*aphiomen*.” Yet the “o” (omicron) is quite untidy. It is even more untidy than the somewhat untidy “o” of “*opheilemata*” (“debts” in the terminology, “And forgive us our debts”) in the line above it; and stands in sharp contrast to some very clear nearby omicrons, e.g., two lines down, the “o” of “*peirasmon*” (“temptation,” in the terminology, “and lead us not into temptation”). If one started with an “E” (epsilon), and either by accident at the time, or later marking on the parchment, a line or line shape was made from the bottom right hand corner of the “E” up at an angle through the top left corner of the “E,” with a further protrusion of this line up and out of the top left corner of the “E” at the same angle, then one could get *the type of shape* one finds for the untidy “O” here in *Codex Freerianus*. Were the origins of the variant reading the result of such untidy writing, followed by an unintentional marking either at the time or later, so that the manuscript came to be later misread by a subsequent scribe as “*aphiomen*”?

The change from “we forgive (*aphiemen*)” to “we have forgiven (*aphekamen*)” (*Variant 2*) affects the English translation. Was it a deliberate “stylistic improvement”? The root Greek word, *aphiemi*, can mean “forgive” or “forsake.” Hence with a different meaning to *aphiemi*, St. Peter’s says in Matt. 19:27 (cf. Mark 10:28), “Behold, we (*emeis*) have forsaken (*aphekamen*) all, and followed thee” (AV). Did this stylistic usage of “*emeis* (we) *aphekamen* (have forsaken)” in Matt. 19:27; Mark 10:28; embolden a scribe to make a similar stylistic usage of “*emeis* (we) *aphekamen* (have forgiven)” in Matt. 6:12? Given that there are already stylistic differences between the *Lord’s Prayer* in Matt. 6 and Luke 11, was this also motivated by a desire to increase the pre-existent differences between these two forms in the belief that the scribe was thereby “more fully amplifying the meaning”? Since both the TR’s reading and Variant 2 are found in Origen, if Variant 2 was a deliberate change, Origen was quite possibly the originator of this variant, “as we have forgiven (*aphekamen*).”

Was this change accidental? E.g., due to paper loss, or obscuring substance, did a line which had ended, “APHIE,” with the next line starting, “MEN, now read at the end of the first line, “APH::”? If so, did a scribe then seek to “reconstruct” the text, and think that making “APHEKA” into “APHEKAMEN” was the most likely reconstruction? If so, was he influenced in this decision by Matt. 19:27?

*Variant 3* appears to be a variant limited to the Latin textual tradition. Did it arise when a Latin scribe was working from a Vulgate Codex in which due to a paper fade, Latin, “*dimittimus* (‘we forgive,’ present tense), looked something like, “*d:mit::mus*”? Did the scribe then “reconstruct” this as “*demittemus*” (‘we shall dismiss,’ future tense)?

We cannot be sure as to why the changes of Variants 1,2, and 3 were made. Were they deliberate, or accidental? We do not know. We can only know for sure, that changes were made.

With the support of the representative Byzantine Text, Jerome's Latin Vulgate and a number of old Latin Versions, together with a number of ancient church writers, and with no good textual argument against it, we cannot doubt the accuracy of the representative Byzantine Text's reading, "we (*emeis*) forgive (*aphiemen*)" in Matt. 6:12. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading, "we forgive" in Matt. 6:12 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

The *Lord's Prayer* should be translated in a manor fit for public prayer, since it is the example *par excellence*, given by our Lord himself, as to how we should pray. In the Greek, we read, "*kai* (even) *os* (as) *emeis* (we) *aphiemen* (we forgive)." Here we do not repeat the "we" twice, and we are not obligated to translate the "even (*kai*)" since "even (*kai*) as (*os*)" may be synonymous in meaning with "as."<sup>57</sup> While as a translation using formal equivalence, the AV is reluctant not to translate "even (*kai*)" in Matt. 6:12; it must also be remembered that the AV is also a masterpiece of English literature. There is there is an echoing of assonance, coupled with some rhyme, in the AV's, "(1a 'a' sound of 'and') And (2a) forgive (3a) us (4a) our (5a) debts, (1b 'a' sound of 'as') as (4b 'w' sound of 'our') we (2b) forgive (4b) our (5b) debtors." This would be impaired by the insertion of the unnecessary "even (*kai*)," and so for reasons of creating a form of the *Lord's Prayer* fit for public prayer, it was not followed.

So too, that other beautiful piece of English language, largely reproducing the great 16th century work of Cranmer, namely, the *Church of England's* Book of Common Prayer (1662), does the same thing. Let the reader consider the literary eloquence of the following assonance, coupled with some rhyme. "(1a) And (2a) forgive (3a) us (4a) our (5a) trespasses; (1b) as (4b) we (2b) forgive (6a+b alliteration on "th") them that (5b) trespass (7 see assonance with "day" and "daily" in previous clause; and also 3b, 5c, "s" sound" continue from "trespass" to "against" and "us") against (3c) us." Notably, in this form too, the "even (*kai*)" is omitted. Such grandeur of the English language is evidently lost on the modern translators, e.g., "And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors" (Matt. 6:12, ASV), would be unlikely to ever become an endeared form of the *Lord's Prayer* with those, who, though not understanding the English language in its technical details, nevertheless know that they "like the sound of the AV."

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 6:12, "we forgive (*aphiemen*, present tense)," is found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries). The alternative form which does not affect the English translation (*Variant 1: spelling variant*), "we forgive (*aphiomen*)," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century).

---

<sup>57</sup> See Appendix 2, "The conjunctions, for instance, 'de' (and) and 'oti' (that)."

The incorrect form, “we have forgiven (*aphekamen*, ‘past’ tense),” is followed in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and (the independent) Codex Z 035 (6th century). It is also found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions. From such sources, it entered the NU Text *et al.* Hence the incorrect translation of the ASV at Matt. 6:12, “as we also have forgiven” (ASV). This incorrect *Variant 2* is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

**Matt. 6:13** “For thine is the kingdom, and the power,  
and the glory, for ever. Amen” (TR & AV) {B}

The *Textus Receptus* (TR) doxology of the *Lord’s Prayer*, Greek, “*oti* (for) *sou* (‘of thee’ i.e., ‘thine’) *estin* (is) *e* (the) *basileia* (kingdom) *kai* (and) *e* (the) *dunamis* (power) *kai* (and) *e* (the) *doxa* (glory) *eis* (into) *tous* (the) *aionas* (ages) [‘into the ages’ means ‘for ever’]. *Amen* (Amen)” i.e., “For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also found as Latin, “*quoniam* (since) *tuum* (thine) *est* (is) *regnum* (the kingdom), *et* (and) *virtus* (the power) *et* (and) *gloria* (the glory) *in saecula* (‘into ages’ = ‘forever’), *Amen* (Amen);” in the old Latin Versions f (6th century), q (6th century, adding a “*tuum* (thy),” after “*regnum*”), g1 (8th / 9th century, omitting the “*Amen*”); and is a variant reading within the Latin Vulgate Codices. It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, the Apostolic Constitutions (3rd or 4th century) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and the early mediaeval church writer, Pseudo-Chrysostom in a Latin work (6th century).

However the doxology is omitted in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), h (5th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g2 (10th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Gregory of Nyssa (d. 394), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); and ancient church Latin writers, Tertullian (d. after 220), Cyprian (d. 258), Ambrosiaster (d. after 384), Ambrose (d. 397), Chromatius (d. 407), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430). It is also omitted other than the “Amen” elsewhere by Jerome (d. 420). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592), which follows the latter of Jerome’s citations, i.e., omitting the doxology other than the “Amen,” so that unlike the Vulgate, the “Amen” from the doxology is retained in the Clementine Vulgate.

No good textual argument may be adduced against the representative Byzantine Text, which must therefore stand as the correct reading. Its preservation by e.g., the church doctor, St. John Chrysostom, testifies to its antiquity.

The origins of this variant are conjectural. Possibly it was accidental. Beginning with “*tou ponerou* (evil),” the copyist’s page may have looked something like the following.

..... *tou ponerou*  
*oti sou estin e basileia kai e dunamis kai e doxa eis tous aionas.*  
*Amen.*

If there was a paper fade / loss making “*tous* (the) *aionas* (ages)” look something like, like

“*tou:::~::~:*”, the scribe may have seen something like the following.

..... *tou pōnērou*  
*oti sou estin ē basileia kai ē dunamis kai ē doxa eis tou:::~::~:*  
*Amen.*

Did the scribe wrote down “*tou pōnērou*,” and remembering he was up to the “*ou*” ending, was then momentarily distracted? Returning and without realizing there had been a paper fade, did he then see the “*ou*” ending of the “*tou*” and just keep writing? Thus was the original “Amen” at first have preserved (as in some manuscripts), and then later lost by a paper fade / loss? It must be said that such a combination of paper loss and ellipsis would be more likely with a continuous script, although this is not a necessary component. A great deal may also hang on the competence of the scribe. Alas, the evidence is that not all scribes were as competent as they should have been. But even if the scribe was generally competent, other factors may be relevant. Was the scribe suffering from a bad head cold at the time? Was he working late at night and suffering from fatigue? Such factors act to bring this type of error into the realm of being reasonably possible, even with a good scribe.

Was this a deliberate pruning of the text? If so, it may well have been Origen. Did a scribe either originally prune the text (cf. e.g., Matt. 4:12; 5:4,5; 5:11b), or learning of its pruning by another, help to perpetuate this? If so, if the scribe was Origen, his reasoning may have been related to his heretical views. Specifically, he believed in pre-existent souls that had rebelled against God, and were now waiting to be born into human beings. Did this lead him to conclude that so long as such pre-existent souls existed i.e., before they were all born as men, then there was a sense in which he could not say, “thine (God’s) is the kingdom,” let alone “the power” or “the glory”? Alternatively, did the pruning of the doxology at Matt. 6:13, reflect a desire to assimilate its ending to the ending found in Luke 11:4?

In the final analysis, we cannot know for sure why Matt. 6:13 was omitted. Was it accidentally lost by a combination of paper fade, ellipsis, and scribal ill-health or fatigue? Was it deliberately pruned away? We cannot be sure. We can only know for sure that it was omitted, in one line of manuscripts completely, and in another line retaining the “Amen.”

On the one hand, the doxology of Matt. 6:13 is supported by the representative Byzantine Text, some old Latin Versions, and some ancient church writers, and has no good textual argument against it. But on the other hand, it is omitted by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, some old Latin Versions, and some ancient church writers. Taking into account these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s doxology in Matt. 6:13 a “B” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading which includes the doxology at Matt. 6:13, is found in the Palestinian Syriac (c. 6th century) and Syriac Harklean h (616) Versions; together with a part of the Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) Version. It is also found in the Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries); and Slavic Version (9th century). The doxology, without the

“Amen,” is further found in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The incorrect reading which omits the doxology, is also found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); and the independent Codex Z 035 (6th century).

This erroneous reading was adopted in the NU Text *et al.* At Matt. 6:13, the ASV places the doxology in a footnote, as does the RSV. The words of the doxology are placed in square brackets in the NASB, i.e., “words” in square “brackets” are regarded by the NASB translators as being “probably not in the original writings” (NASB “Abbreviations” page); or the NIV places the doxology in a footnote, relegating it simply to “some late manuscripts.”

The *Lord’s Prayer* as traditionally said in public, is that found in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662). It differs slightly, but not on issues of text type, from that in the AV, which is also found with the *Ten Commandments* and *Apostles’ Creed* at the very end of the Presbyterian *Shorter Westminster Confession* (1648).

Anglican Book of Common Prayer (1662)	AV (1611) and (1648) Presbyterian Westminster Shorter Catechism.
Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, in earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, As we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation; But deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory, For ever and ever. Amen.	Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, As we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, But deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, For ever. Amen.

It is notable that the neo-Alexandrians have made a systematic and sustained attack on the *Lord’s Prayer*. And they have been joined in this attack by the Burgonites of the NKJV, who act with them in a pincer movement to prick and tear at the *Lord’s Prayer*. For the neo-Alexandrians, the “we forgive” (AV & TR) at Matt. 6:12 becomes, “we have forgiven.” The doxology is omitted at Matt. 6:13. And for some of the neo-Alexandrians, and for the NKJV Burgonites, “deliver us from evil (*tou pōnerou*),” becomes “the evil one” (ASV & NKJV).

The ASV puts “one” in italics to show it is added, although the same addition in their fellow neo-Alexandrian NIV, like the Burgonite NKJV, does not so put the “one” in italics,

though it surely should. On the one hand, I would accept that *one shade of meaning* of “evil” in Matt. 6:12, is “the evil one.” As St. Peter says, “Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour” (I Peter 5:8). The Greek “*tou pōnerou*” has this meaning of “the wicked [one]” in Matt. 13:38; Eph. 6:16; I John 3:12. But on the other hand, in the context of the *Lord’s Prayer*, there is no reason to so limit the meaning of “*tou pōnerou*,” and so “evil (*tou pōnerou*),” is broader than simply this one sub-element of the greater whole. E.g., in Matt. 5:37, Jesus says, “But let your communication be, Yea, yea: Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil (*tou pōnerou*).” So also, the Greek “*tou pōnerou*” has a wider meaning in John 17:15 and II Thess. 3:3, where the actions of the Lord to “keep” his children “from evil” (*tou pōnerou*), though as in the *Lord’s Prayer* including as a component of this, keeping them from “the evil one,” in fact has a much wider orbit than just this.

Thus the “evil” or “*tou pōnerou*” of Matt. 6:12, includes “the lust of the flesh” (I John 2:16), as it does at Matt. 5:37, together with any other “evil” as at John 17:15; II Thess. 3:3; of which one component, is “the evil [one]” or “the wicked [one]” of the Devil as at Matt. 13:38; Eph. 6:16; I John 3:12. In the context of Matt. 6:12, this “evil” includes, although is not exhausted by, the type of thing referred to in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) Litany, when the Minister prays, “From fornication, all other deadly sin; and from all the deceits of the world, the flesh, and the devil;” and then the people pray in response, “Good Lord, deliver us” (I Cor. 6:9; II Cor. 4:4; I John 2:15-17)

Therefore, I could accept that the RSV and ESV are within reasonable translation boundaries. The ESV follows the RSV in putting, “But deliver us from evil” (ESV) in the main text, and then adding a footnote stating that “evil” can also be translated as “the evil one” (ESV footnote). This however is *as far as one can reasonably go*. Hence to the extent that the neo-Alexandrian ASV and Burgonite NKJV make the lesser element of *the evil one*, the sum of the total, they deny the greater element of *the evil* in Matt. 6:13, and thereby badly distort the Word of God, by a most subtle and crafty device.

Whether the neo-Alexandrians removing the “we forgive” (AV) and making it “we have forgiven” (ASV) (also followed in the RSV, NRSV, ESV, & NIV); the neo-Alexandrians removing the doxology (ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, & NIV); or both some of the neo-Alexandrians (ASV, NRSV, & NIV) and Burgonites (NKJV) changing the “evil” in “but deliver us from evil” (AV) into “the evil one” (ASV), the *Lord’s Prayer* is clearly under attack. Why do these neo-Alexandrians and Burgonites so delight in trying to pull the *Lord’s Prayer* to pieces?

Prayer is an important and integral part of the Christian’s life. Through Jesus Christ, we have access to the God the Father. The *Lord’s Prayer* is featured in all the Reformation Catechisms, together with the *Apostles’ Creed* and *Ten Commandments*, and in general also the sacraments of Holy Baptism and Holy Communion. This perhaps is what has made it a special focal point for needless and cruel attack, as men take pleasure in gratuitously criticizing the piety of centuries of Protestant Christians, together with numerous saints today who use the traditional *Lord’s Prayer*. They like their minions to think things like this, “Gee, we’re smart. We know that the *Lord’s Prayer* really says, ‘the evil one,’ not ‘the evil’ like in the King James Version. That’s why we don’t use the AV, it’s not as accurate as our new version.” So why do these neo-Alexandrians and Burgonites so hate the traditional *Lord’s Prayer*? Why do they consort and conspire together against the *Lord’s Prayer*? We cannot be sure, and perhaps it is that some of

them are simply deluded into thinking that unnecessary change marks them out as “smart” and “thinking” people. But I think that at least in some instances, it is that they do not much know the sweet fellowship of prayer themselves, for it has happened to them according to the true proverb, “even his prayer shall be abomination” (Prov. 28:9).

**Matt. 6:15** “their trespasses” (TR & AV) {B}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

The scribes working on our two Sydney University Lectionaries both did some notable things here at Matt. 6:15.

With regard to Lectionary 2378. The scribe first wrote out the reading of Matt. 6:1-13 and then the reading of Matt. 6:15-21. Thereafter, before giving a combined reading from Mark 11:22-26 and Matt. 7:7,8; he gives rubric in which he first refers to the opening words of the Matt. 6:1-13 (see commentary at Matt. 6:1a & 6:1b, *supra*), and then refers to the opening words of Matt. 6:15, starting at and including only “*ta* (the) *paraptō*” from the Matt. 6:15-21 reading. Though he ends this second “*paraptōmata* (trespasses)” half way through at the end of a line with the incomplete “*paraptō*”, this rubric is nevertheless a partial second reading which clearly supports the reading of the Received Text as the representative Byzantine text reading.

With respect to Lectionary 1968. The TR here reads, “*ta* (‘the,’ neuter plural accusative, definite article from *to*) *paraptōmata* (‘trespasses,’ neuter plural accusative noun, from *paraptōma*) *autōn* (of them),” whereas Lectionary 1968 reads, “*ta* (‘the,’ neuter plural accusative, definite article from *to*) *paraptōma* (‘trespass,’ neuter singular accusative noun, from *paraptōma*) *autōn* (of them).” If the singular noun was the intended reading of Lectionary 1968, the definite article would also have to be singular i.e., “*to* (‘the,’ neuter singular accusative, definite article from *to*) *paraptōma* (trespass)” etc. . Therefore we can safely conclude that the “*ta*” suffix was accidentally lost by ellipsis, as the eye of the scribe jumped from the “*a*” before the “*ta*” of the “*ata*,” to the “*a*” after the “*ta*,” and so “*paraptōmata* (‘trespasses,’ plural)” (TR) accidentally became “*paraptōma* (‘trespass,’ singular)” (Lectionary 1968). Hence I show Lectionary 1968 broadly supporting the TR’s reading, *infra*.

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 6:15, the TR’s Greek reading, “*ta* (the) *paraptōmata* (trespasses) *autōn* (of them),” i.e., “their trespasses” (AV), in the words, “But if ye forgive not men their trespasses” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), Lectionary 2378 (11th century); and in broad terms, Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.), *supra*. It is also supported in a codex of the Latin Vulgate, and as Latin, “*peccata* (the sins) *eorum* (of them),” in old Latin Versions f (6th century) and q (6th / 7th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Basil the Great (d. 379); as well as in a commentary section disagreeing with the accompanying Greek text used by ancient church Latin writer, Chromatius (d. 407); the early mediaeval church writer, Pseudo-Chrysostom in a Latin work (6th century); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However these words are omitted in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century); together with

old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), h (5th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). They are also omitted by the ancient church Latin writer, Chromatius (d. 407) in the accompanying Greek text of his commentary that he is commenting on; ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine Text, which must therefore stand as the correct reading. Both readings were known to St. Gregory the Great (c. 540-604); and the antiquity of this reading is verified by St. Basil the Great (329-379).

The origins of the variant are speculative. Was it lost accidentally by a paper fade / loss? When such paper fades clearly interrupted the text, they would be examined more closely by a scribe. But when by chance a paper fade left a manuscript still making *pima facie* sense, they could be interpreted by the scribe as a stylistic paper break. Thus only paper fades of a certain type could give rise to such textual losses. Is this what happened here?

Alternatively, was this omission a “stylistic” pruning of the text? The first clause contains a reference to “trespasses (*ta paraptomata*),” “For if ye forgive men their *trespasses* (*ta paraptomata*),” (Clause 1, Matt. 6:14); then the second clause contains no reference to “trespasses,” “you heavenly Father will also forgive you” (Clause 2, Matt. 6:14). The third clause then contains a reference to “trespasses (*ta paraptomata*),” “But if ye forgive not men their *trespasses* (*ta paraptomata*),” (Clause 3, Matt. 6:15); and then the fourth clause contains a reference to “trespasses (*ta paraptomata*),” namely, “neither will your Father forgive you your *trespasses* (*ta paraptomata*)” (Clause 4, Matt. 6:15). In order to “stylistically balance” this, a scribe would have had to either add “trespasses (*ta paraptomata*)” on to Clause 2, i.e., so all the clauses had “trespasses(*ta paraptomata*),” or omit “trespasses(*ta paraptomata*)” from Clause 3, so that the stylistic pattern started and ended with two clauses (Clauses 1 & 4) containing “trespasses(*ta paraptomata*),” with two middle clauses (Clauses 2 & 3) that had no reference to “trespasses.” If this is what happened, then the scribe evidently chose the latter option, and so to create a “stylistic balance” omitted “their trespasses(*ta paraptomata*)” from Matt. 6:15, together with its connected “their (*auton*).” If so, was the scribe also influenced by ideas of “their trespasses” in Matt. 6:15 being “redundant,” since “trespasses” was still mentioned in clauses 1 and 4? Or notions of an assimilationist desire to make this verse more like Mark 11:26, “But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses” (AV)?

By contrast, in omitting “trespasses” in clause 2 after including it in clause 1 (Matt. 6:14), and then including “trespasses” in both clauses 3 and 4 (Matt. 6:15), Christ here put a stylistic emphasis on the fact that the Christian must “forgive” “men *their trespasses*,” and if they do not, “neither will” God “forgive” them their own “*trespasses*” (Matt. 6:15). This also echoes the words of Christ just spoken in the Lord’s Prayer, “And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors” (Matt. 6:12). Thus if this was a deliberate pruning of the text, then it seems the scribe seeking “stylistic literary balance” in this text by omitting “their trespasses” from Matt. 6:15; failed to understand the theological balance that Christ was here giving by his inclusion of these words.

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “their

trespasses” in Matt. 6:15 a high level “B” (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 6:15, “their trespasses,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (Codex B 03, 4th century); (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Palestinian (c. 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century), and some of the Coptic Bohairic Versions (3rd century) Versions; Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Version (c. 500); and Slavic Version (9th century).

The incorrect reading which omits “their trespasses,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (Codex Aleph 01, 4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). They are further omitted in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) Version; as well as the Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century), some of the Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) Version; the Anglo-Saxon Version (8th to 10th centuries); and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

With the two leading Alexandrian Text’s in disagreement, neo-Alexandrians have not been sure where to go and what to do at Matt. 6:15. Westcott & Hort (1881) included the reading in square brackets, making its acceptance or denial a matter of fairly even choice. Tischendorf, who liked to favour his “discovery” of London Sinaiticus, omitted the reading in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72), as did Nestle’s 21st edition (1952), and the NU Text in Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993). However, a footnote in the UBS 3rd corrected edition (1983), indicates “a very high degree of doubt concerning the reading selected for the text;” and a footnote in the UBS 4th revised edition (1993) indicates that the NU Text “Committee had difficulty in deciding which variant to place in the text.”

Thus the matter is somewhat unclear for those following the NU Text *et al.* Reflecting this split between the two leading Alexandrian Texts, the ASV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV follow *Rome Vaticanus* and include these words, whereas the NASB and Moffatt follow *London Sinaiticus* and omit these words. At least on this occasion, the semi neo-Alexandrian, Moffatt, appears to have resolved this division between the two leading Alexandrian texts through reference to the Western Text as “the decider.” Hence Matt. 6:15 in the Moffatt Bible simply reads, “but if you do not forgive men, your Father will not forgive your trespasses either.” Thus Moffatt exchanged the noble Byzantine Greek Text reading here, for the ignoble Alexandrian (London Sinaiticus) and Western Greek Texts’ reading.

**Matt. 6:18** “openly” (TR & AV) {C}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

The TR reads, “*krupto* (‘secret,’ word 1) *kai* (‘and,’ word 2) *o* (‘te,’ word 3) *pater* (‘Father,’ word 4) *sou* (‘of thee,’ word 5) *o* (‘the [one]’ = ‘which,’ word 6) *blepon* (‘seeing,’

word 7) *en* ('in,' word 7) *tō* ('the,' untranslated, word 9) "*kruptō* ('secret,' word 10)." In Lectionary 2378, words 2 to 10 are omitted, as the scribe's eye jumped by ellipsis from the "*kruptō* (secret)" of word 1 to "*kruptō* (secret)" of word 10. But this omission occurs before the words of special interest to us, here in this reading.

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 6:18 the TR's Greek words, "*en* (in) *tō* (the) *phanerō* (open)" i.e., "openly" (AV), is a minority Byzantine reading, found in e.g., Codex E 07 (8th century), Minuscules 27 (10th century), 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels), 655 (11th / 12th century), 21 (12th century), 1604 (13th century); together with Lectionaries 547 (11th century), 950 (12th century), and 1663 (14th century). They are also found as Latin, "*in palam* (openly)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), h (5th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), c (12th / 13th century). They are manifested in e.g., Stephanus's Greek NT (1550 & 1551) and Beza's Greek NT (1598).

However, these words are omitted in the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). They are also omitted in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century); and old Latin Versions f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), and m (Munich 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, this omission is also manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). They are further omitted by the ancient church Greek writers, Theophilus of Antioch (d. after 180) and Euthalius of Egypt (5th century); and ancient church Latin writers, Ambrose (d. 397), Chromatius (d. 407), Augustine (d. 430), and Speculum (d. c. 420).

There is a textual problem with the representative Byzantine reading. It has already been determined that the words, "in the open" or "openly" (AV), properly belong at Matt. 6:4b,6 (cf. commentary at Matt. 6:4b,6). But exactly the same contrast that one finds there i.e., between that which is "in secret" and God who "shall reward thee openly" (Matt. 6:4b,6), is found here. Therefore, the reading "thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee," found in the representative Byzantine Text, immediately stands out as incongruous with the terminology and theology of Matt. 6:4b,6. The sentence falls flat and ends abruptly with "reward thee;" and this is a literary stylistic scar pointing to an earlier textual excision. This tension in the text, can only be remedied and relieved, by following the minority Byzantine reading, which has the support of ancient old Latin Versions dating from the fourth century. Therefore, the correct reading at Matt. 6:18 must be, "thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly" (TR & AV).

The origins of this variant are conjectural. Did it come about due to a paper loss / fade? Or was this a deliberate pruning of the text as a "stylistic improvement," possibly based on the view that "openly" here was "redundant"? If the latter, then such a view struck down and rendered ineffectual, the literary beauty and theological pregnancy of the naturally expected Aramaic (or Hebraic) antithetical parallelism, i.e., "seeth in secret" and "shall reward thee openly" in Matt. 6:18. This is the same parallelism one finds earlier in Matt. 6:4. Thus if deliberate, its removal was certainly not a "stylistic improvement."

On the one hand, stylistic textual analysis of the Greek strongly favours the TR's reading,

“openly” in Matt. 6:18. But on the other hand, this reading is based primarily on the ancient witness of some old Latin Versions, whose *Latin improves the Greek*, subject to the overriding factor of Greek textual analysis, in which the *Greek improves the Latin*. To this is then added the further secondary support of some unrepresentative Byzantine Greek manuscripts. Balancing out these considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading “openly” at Matt. 6:18 a “C” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading, but has a lower level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 6:18, “openly,” is also found in (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and Minuscules 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found in a manuscript of the Syriac Palestinian Version; and a manuscript of the Armenian Version. It is further found in the Diatessaron (Armenian Version); the Georgian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries); and Slavic Version (9th century).

However, the incorrect reading which omits these words is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and the (mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also omitted in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions, together with a manuscript of the Syriac Palestinian Version; the Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Gothic Version (4th century); and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

It is omitted in the NU Text *et al.* Hence it is omitted at Matt 6:18 in the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV (which has a footnote giving the TR’s reading), ESV, NIV, and Moffatt. Moffatt’s “will reward you,” reminds us that without the distinction between ‘you’ singular and plural, the meaning of Scripture is obscured. Christ here makes this very personal, “shall reward *thee* openly” (AV); whereas to read, “will reward *you*” (Moffatt Bible) could be taken to mean some corporate and non-individualistic sense. Though (punctuation aside,) the words of translation here are the same in the NASB’s 3rd edition and the NIV, the NASB uses italics for some added words that the NIV does not.

A footnote in the Burgonite Majority Text NKJV, says at Matt. 6:18 that both the NU Text and Majority Text follow this omission. Burgon claimed, “the ‘*Textus Receptus*’ . . . , calls for . . . revision,” “upon the” basis of the “majority of authorities” (*Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, pp. 13,15); and thus Burgon’s proud boast was this, “Again and again we shall have occasion to point out . . . that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction” (*Revision Revised*, p. 21). Hence the TR’s reading is omitted in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). And so it is, that at Matt. 6:18 the Burgonites join with the neo-Alexandrians, to try and strike down the Word of God, and render it ineffectual.

But to their frustration, they cannot succeed. That is because the Received Text “needs” no such “correction” from Burgonites nor neo-Alexandrians nor anyone else. *Verbum Domini*

*Manet in Aeternum!*<sup>58</sup>

**Matt. 6:21** “your” (TR & AV) {B}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

Migne attributes a Latin quote of Gregory, “*Ubi (where) est (it is) thesaurus (treasure) tuus (thy), ibi (there) est (it is) et (also) cor (heart) tuum (thy),*” i.e., “Where thy treasure is, there thy heart is also,” to “Matth. vi, 21; Luc. xii, 34,” thus indicating uncertainty as to which of these two gospels the key words come from (Migne 79:78). Gregory makes another such citation which Migne attributes to simply “Matth. vi, 21” (Migne 79:218). My judgment is different to Migne’s. I think the first quote can be reasonably attributed to Matt. 6:21 (Migne 79:78); and while I think the second quote could be either Matt. 6:21 or Luke 12:34 (Migne 79:218), it is probably from Matt. 6:21 for the first reason, *infra*. But to be safe, I will stipulate that my attribution of this citation from Gregory is based solely on the first quote (Migne 79:78).

Concerning the first quote (Migne 79:78). In the first place I would note that the singular, “thy (*tuus* or *tuum*),” is a minority Latin reading at Luke 12:34, this exact form of “*tuus*” followed by “*tuum*” only being found in old Latin e; and a form twice using “*tuum*” further found in old Latin l. All other old Latin versions (a, b, d, ff2, f, q, r1, aur, i, & c), and the Vulgate, use the plural form at Luke 12:34. This means it is more likely than not, that Gregory is here citing Matt. 6:21 rather than Luke 12:34. (Though this logic also applies to the second quote, Migne 79:218, I am not basing my citation reference of Matt. 6:21 on this second reference.)

Gregory then prefaces these first quote (Migne 79:78) comments by saying they come from the “Gospel” (Latin, *Evangelio*), and while this singular form can refer to just one of the four gospels, it must be further said, that depending on context, it may also be used as a generic for all four gospels. Hence nothing conclusive can be made of this singular usage of “Gospel.” But of more significance, in the second place, immediately after this quote from Matt. 6:21 // Luke 12:34 ends, Gregory then says, “Therefore (*ergo*) . . . , ‘Lay up for yourselves treasure in heaven’ (Matt. 6:20)<sup>59</sup>.” The fact that Gregory immediately links this quote with “therefore (*ergo*),” and qualifies his usage of Matt. 6:21 // Luke 12:34 with a reference to Matt. 6:20, means that on the balance of probabilities he is citing Matt. 6:20,21 together as a unit, rather than Luke 12:34.

Therefore, taking into account both the improbability, though not definite uncertainty, of this quote in the singular coming from Luke 12:34; coupled with the clear contextual linking of Matt. 6:20 with this quote, means that I think we can certainly say that on the balance of probabilities it is more likely than not that Gregory is here either citing Matt. 6:21 rather than Luke 12:34; or if as is less likely he is citing Luke 12:34, then he clearly regards it to be the same reading as Matt. 6:21 since this is required to give contextual propriety to his usage of Matt. 6:20.

---

<sup>58</sup> Motto of the Lutheran Reformation first used by Frederick the Wise in 1522, from the Latin of I Peter 1:25, “The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever.”

<sup>59</sup> Migne 79:78. Though Migne writes after this second quote, “(Matth. vi, 20,33)” the quote is in fact clearly from Matt. 6:20, and not Matt. 6:33.

In either instance, I think we can therefore with a reasonable level of certainty conclude that Gregory understands this to be the reading Matt. 6:21. Hence I shall so cite him, *infra*.

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 6:21, the TR's Greek plural form of "*umōn* ('your,' genitive plural, personal pronoun, from *su*)" twice in Matt. 6:21, "For where your (*umōn*) treasure is, there will your (*umōn*) heart be also" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also found as Latin "*vester* ('your,' nominative singular<sup>60</sup>, masculine possessive adjective, from *vester-tra-trum*)" and "*vestrum* ('your,' genitive plural, personal pronoun, from *tu*)" respectively, in old Latin Version f (6th century).

However, the singular form of "*sou* ('thy,' genitive singular, personal pronoun, from *su*)" twice in Matt. 6:21, thus making the verse, "for where thy (*sou*) treasure is, there will thy (*sou*) heart be also" (ASV), is followed as Latin "*tuus* ('thy,' nominative singular, masculine possessive adjective, from *tuus-a-um*)" and "*tuum* ('thy,' nominative singular neuter possessive adjective, from *tuus-a-um*)" respectively, in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), h (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Basil the Great (d. 379) and Macarius / Symeon (4th / 5th centuries) who omits the second "thy;" the ancient church Latin writer, Tertullian (d. after 220); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

---

<sup>60</sup> The adjective must agree with the noun in number *et al.* Since "*thensaurus* (treasure)" is a nominative second declension masculine singular noun from *thensaurus-i*, the adjective "*vester*" must also be declined in the singular. However, this is still a plural form of "your." Cf. Latin, "*tuus*" ("thy," the singular form of "your," declined in the singular,) in the variant's reading.

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine Text reading, which therefore is the correct reading. The plural “your” of Matt. 6:21, flows naturally from the plural forms of immediately preceding verses, “Lay not up for yourselves (*umin*) treasures upon earth” (Matt. 6:19) etc; and “But lay up for yourselves (*umin*) treasures in heaven” (Matt. 6:20) etc. .

The origins of the variant are speculative. Was it accidental? Was the last “*umōn* (your)” lost in a paper fade / loss, and a scribe quickly copying it out then filled in “*sou* (thy)” without much thought; and then later, a second scribe copying it out, seeing a conflict between the first “*umōn* (your)” and second “*sou* (thy),” then standardized them to “*sou* (thy)”? If so, possibly with reference to Matt. 6:21,22, *infra*. Or was it deliberate? Was it a “stylistic improvement.” If so, the scribe does not appear to have considered Matt. 6:21 in the wider plural context of Matt. 6:19-21. Moreover, if so, the scribe probably looked at the singular forms of the following verse, “The light of the body is the eye; if therefore thine (singular, *sou*) eye be single, thy (singular, *sou*) whole body shall be full of light” (Matt. 6:22). Seeing Matt. 6:21 narrowly as a detached verse, he then probably assimilated the plural “your” forms of Matt. 6:21, to the singular “thy” forms of Matt. 6:22.

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s plural form of “your (*umōn*)” twice in Matt. 6:21 a “B” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct plural form at Matt. 6:21, “your (*umōn*)” is found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and the (mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also further found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); some of the Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Gothic Version (4th century).

The incorrect reading, the singular form of “thy (*sou*),” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries); and Anglo-Saxon Version (8th to 10th centuries). This reading was adopted in the NU Text.

Based on the NU Text *et al*, the singular reading at Matt. 6:21 underlies the translations of the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. E.g., the ESV reads, “For where your (*sou*) treasure is, there your (*sou*) heart will be also” (ESV). Supporting Burgon’s Majority Text, but translating from the Received Text, the NKJV reads the same, “For where your (*umōn*) treasure is, there your (*umōn*) heart will be also” (NKJV). Hence to the average English reader, there appears to be agreement on the translation of Matt. 6:21 by the ESV and NKJV. But in fact, unknown to the average English reader, the ESV is following the NU Text’s singular “*sou*” (twice), whereas the NKJV is following the TR’s plural “*umōn*” (twice). Notably, these “new” translations claim to be putting the Scriptures into a form of English more readily understandable to the reader. However, the reality at this point is that they are far less clear to the average English reader; who if reading the NASB, ESV etc., has not got a clue as to whether the *your* (twice) in Matt. 6:21 is singular or plural, and could not tell the difference between the singular *your* reading in the ESV and the plural *your* reading in the NKJV. Let us thank God for our

AV's, which not only follows the best Greek text; but also brings a greater clarity to this verse, than do these "new" translations.

**Matt. 6:25** "or what ye shall drink" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek reading, "*kai* (or) *ti* (what) *piete* ('ye shall drink,' subjunctive active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *pinō*)" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, with spelling variant "*piete*") and 1968 (1544 A.D., with spelling variant "*poiete*"). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Basil the Great (d. 379); and the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

Using the Greek "*ε*" rather than "*kai*" (*Variant 1*), with the same meaning in English, a variant reading, "*ε* (or) *ti* (what) *piete* (ye shall drink)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53).

This basic reading is also found as Latin, "*aut* (or) *quid* (what) *bibatis* (ye shall drink)," in old Latin Versions h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), m (9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is further followed in one of these two forms (TR or *Variant 1*), by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Basil the Great (d. 379), Evagrius (d. 399), Nilus (d. c. 430), and Marcus-Eremita (d. after 430); and the ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Speculum (d. 5th century).

The Greek "*kai*" is an elastic word that can e.g., mean "and," "also," "but," or "or." The Greek "*ε*," like the Latin "*aut*," means "or." The AV's translation "or" from "*kai*" in Matt. 6:26, brings harmony between the TR and this first variant, as well as recognizing the validity of the old Latin translation. Did the AV translators consider the variant Greek reading retained the correct meaning of "*kai*" here as "or," as did also the old Latin "*aut*" here as "or"? If so, was this harmonisation of Greek "*kai*" and "*ε*," a case of "back to the future" on the basis that in ancient times the Bishop of Caesarea (in Asia Minor), Basil the Great, follows both readings?

However, another variant (*Variant 2*), which omits these words, is found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, its omission is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Athanasius (d. 373), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Cyril (d. 444); and ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430).

There is no good textual reason to doubt the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand; and in which if one considers the "*kai*" means "or," has additional support from the unrepresentative Byzantine text, old Latin Versions, and some further ancient church writers.

The origins of the omission are conjectural. While one can never totally rule out the possibility of a "stylistic improvement," e.g., a scribe wanting to put an emphasis on "drink" for some quirky reason, if the scribe was a reasonable person (and more likely than not he was, but we cannot be sure of this,) then the omission seems unlikely to be a "stylistic improvement." Thus it was more probably accidental. Was it lost by a paper fade / loss? Did it come about by accident due to ellipsis with the immediately preceding words, "what (*ti*) ye shall eat (*phagete*)"?

I.e., did the scribe writing down “*ti phagete*,” remembering he was up to the word ending in “*ete*” in the line, “*ti phagete kai ti piete*,” after he wrote “*phagete*,” then look up with his eye jumping to the “*ete*” ending of “*piete*,” so that the words “or (*kai*) what (*ti*) ye shall drink (*piete*),” came to be omitted? Though dogmatism is unwise and unwarranted, I think such a loss by ellipsis seems the most likely explanation.

If so, such negligence left behind a witness to its removal, for six verses later in Matt. 6:31, we read in elucidation of the Matt. 6:25 triplet, “What ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink,” or “what ye shall put on;” a matching triplet, “Therefore take no thought, saying, What (*Ti*) shall we eat (*phagomen*)? Or (*e*), What (*Ti*) shall we drink (*piomen*)? Or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed?” (Matt. 6:31). The combination of likely ellipsis at Matt. 6:25; with the textual stylistic jarring of the doublet of Matt. 6:25 if “or (*kai*) what (*ti*) ye shall drink (*piete*),” is removed, with the triplet of Matt. 6:31; when compared and contrasted with the textual harmony of Matt. 6:25 and 6:31 when both are triplets, means that textual considerations strongly favour the TR’s reading.

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 6:25 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 6:25, “or what ye shall drink,” is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century).

The *Variant 1* reading, “or (*e*)” for “*kai*,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century).

It is further followed in one of these two forms (TR or *Variant 1*) by the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century), a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century), and some manuscripts of the Coptic Sahidic Version. Likewise it is found in some manuscripts of the Armenian Version; Gothic Version (4th century); Georgian “A” Version (5th century); Georgian “1” Version (5th century); Slavic Version (9th century); and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

*Variant 2* which omits these words, is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in some manuscripts of the Coptic Sahidic Version; some manuscripts of the Armenian Version; and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

These words were not included in the main text of Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72). Reflecting the split between the two leading Alexandrian Texts, like the earlier Westcott & Hort (1881) and Nestle 21st edition (1952), the NU Text in Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition and the UBS’s 4th revised edition, places the words of the variant, “or (*e*) what (*ti*) ye shall drink (*piete*),” in square brackets, indicating uncertainty as to whether or not they should be included in the text. Notwithstanding such uncertainties, the TR’s reading is followed at Matt. 6:25 in the ASV, RSV, NRSV (with a footnote referring to *Variant 2*), ESV, and NIV (which prunes down the Word of

God in its dynamic equivalent).

The AV's clarity of, "what ye shall drink," immediately tells the reader that this is *you* plural. But in the less precise, less clear, less understandable "new" versions, such as the NKJV, NASB, etc., which do away with the distinction between *you* singular and plural, the reader might think that this was meant as a *you* singular. Most readers do not have the time to look up a commentary every time they read "you" or "your" in one of these "new" versions, to try and find out whether it is singular or plural, and so most are labouring under a far less intelligible and far less understandable translation than the Authorized Version.

The pre-Vatican II Council (1962-5) Latin Papists who translated the *Douay-Rheims Version* (1582-1610) into English from the Latin, also followed *Variant 2*. Thus Matt. 6:25 reads in this Roman Catholic version, "... what you shall eat, nor for your body, what you shall put on ..." (Douay-Rheims). The post-Vatican II Council neo-Alexandrian Papists of both the *Jerusalem Bible* (1966) and *New Jerusalem Bible* (1985), also omit these same words, "or what ye shall drink." Their evident objection to these words, "what ye shall drink," is speculative. But perhaps they were motivated by a desire to try and "create" Bible texts in which to "eat" does not include a situation where one would also "drink." If so, this may be intended as a background device to help justify in their Roman Catholic readers' minds, their practice of giving Communion only in one kind i.e., the bread but not the wine. (This was an absolute rule of the Roman Mass in normative Roman Catholic Churches before Vatican II; and while following Vatican II there was a short-lived period of some "experimentation" on these things, over time it again became a general, though not absolute practice, of the Roman Mass in normative Roman Churches<sup>61</sup>.) This Romish practice is clearly contrary to the words of Christ, that at the Lord's Supper we are to both, "Take, eat" the bread symbolizing Christ's "body" (Matt.26:26), and also "Drink" the wine symbolizing Christ's "blood" (Matt. 26:27,28)<sup>62</sup>. Thus we must defend this true Biblical teaching about the sacrament of Holy Communion which is clearly taught in Scripture (I Cor. 11:23-26), against the false teachings of Popery. As Article 30 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*, entitled, "Of both kinds," rightly says, "The Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay-people: for both parts of the Lord's sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and

---

<sup>61</sup> See Flannery, A. (Ed.), *Vatican Council II, The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, Costello, New York, USA, 1977, p. 121 (s. 32 of *Second Instruction on the proper implementation of the constitution on the sacred liturgy*).

<sup>62</sup> Christ sometimes used figurative language such as, "I am the light" (John 8:12), "I am the door" (John 10:9), "I am the bread" (John 6:35), or "I am the vine" (John 15:5). Christ's usage of both "bread" (John 6:35) and the fruit of "the vine" (John 15:5) at the Last Supper was clearly in harmony with this type of wider symbolic imagery. Who would be so silly as to suggest e.g., Christ is a literal "door" (John 10:9)? Yet through transubstantiation, the Church of Rome denies the natural symbolism of the Lord's Supper. Now "the sacramental bread and wine remain in their very substances, and therefore may not be adored; (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural body and blood of our Saviour are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one" (Final rubric, *The Communion Service, Anglican Book of Common Prayer*, 1662). Since concerning his humanity, our Lord's body can only be in one place at one time, and it is in heaven, the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation is a denial "that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh" (I John 4:3).

commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.”

**Matt. 6:33** “of God, and his righteousness” (TR & AV) {A}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

*The First Matter.* In the textual apparatus of Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72), old Latin k is regarded as supporting the reading that omits “of God” (Greek, *tou Theou*) after “*ten* (the) *basileian* (kingdom).” The textual apparatus of the UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993) is slightly more circumspect, claiming that old Latin k, has “minor differences” with the reading, “the kingdom and his righteousness,” but “in general” old Latin k “supports” this reading.

In fact, old Latin Version k, (*Variant 2, infra*) reads, “regnum (the kingdom) *et* (and) *justitiam* (righteousness) *Dei* (of God).” It would be possible to read the “*et* (and)” disjunctively i.e., “the kingdom,” then quite separately to this, “and the righteousness of God.” This is evidently the view of Tischendorf and the NU Text Committee. But it is also possible to read the “*et* (and)” conjunctively, and in my opinion it is far more natural and probable to do so i.e., “the kingdom and the righteousness” are both “of God.” If so, the Latin scribe of old Latin k was probably following the Greek Received Text when he made this translation (unless of course he was copying a line from a later Latin manuscript with such an earlier origin).

On the one hand, I think old Latin k is therefore more likely than not, to be a Latin scribe’s dynamic equivalent supporting the TR’s reading “the kingdom of God, and his righteousness.” But on the other hand, Tischendorf and the NU Text Committee think old Latin k is more likely to support the reading which omits “of God” after “the kingdom.” Under God, the reader must decide this matter for himself.

(According to Tischendorf’s textual apparatus, old Latin g1 follows the same reading as old Latin k. But according to Julicher and the UBS textual apparatus, old Latin g1 follows the same reading as old Latin a, b, *et al, infra*. Given such uncertainties as to what the reading of g1 is, I shall not make any reference to it here at Matt. 6:33.)

*The Second Matter.* The reading here reminds us that as with modern writers, Scripture citations from ancient and mediaeval church writers are sometimes incomplete selections. E.g., one of the Western Church’s four ancient and early mediaeval doctors, the Latin writer, Bishop Gregory (d. 604), held the Bishopric of Rome before the later mediaeval invention of the Roman Papacy under Boniface III (Bishop of Rome, 607; First Pope, 607); and indeed St. Gregory the Great denounced any notion of a “universal bishop,” saying this was the teaching, goal, and identifier of the “Antichrist.” Thus Bishop Gregory’s teaching in fact requires the conclusion that from 607 onwards, those later Bishops of Rome holding the Office of Pope of Rome, in fact hold the Office of Antichrist. At the reading presently in question, Matt. 6:33, in one citation, Bishop Gregory cites only the “*regnum* (the kingdom) *Dei* (of God)” part of Matt. 6:33 (Migne 79:1153). Were this the end of the matter, then he could not be cited, *infra*. But in another quote, Bishop Gregory cites the TR’s reading (Migne, 76:141). Thus on this occasion, he can in fact be cited, *infra*.

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 6:33, the Greek words, “*ten* (the) *basileian* (kingdom) *tou* (of the) *Theou* (of God) *kai* (and) *ten* (the) *dikaiosunen* (righteousness) *autou* (his / of him),” i.e., “the kingdom of God, and his righteousness” (AV), are supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Codices W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); the purple parchment, Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century); the purple parchment, N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, 6th century); Minuscule 180 (12th century, Byzantine other than in the independent Acts); and (in both instances abbreviating “*Theou*” / “*θεου*” as “*θυ*” with a line on top,) Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*, abbreviating “*ten*” as “*τ*”, on top of which is something like a question mark without its dot and a line, both slanting at the same angle, something like “?*\*”) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). They are further supported as Latin, “*regnum* (the kingdom) *Dei* (of God) *et* (and) *justitiam* (righteousness) *eius* (his / of him)” i.e., “the kingdom of God and his righteousness,” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century); and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Serapion (d. after 362), Basil the Great (d. 379), Evagrius (d. 399), Chrysostom (d. 407), Marcus-Eremita (d. after 420), Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444), and Theodoret of Cyrus (d. 460); the ancient church Latin writers, Chromatius (d. 407) and Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

In *Variant 1*, the words “of God,” are omitted, making the reading, “the kingdom and his righteousness.” This variant is found in old Latin Version 1 (7th / 8th century), as well as Latin Codices, O (7th century Oxford & 7th / 8th century, Oxford), A (7th / 8th century, Florentius), and Z (7th / 8th century, London). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer Macarius / Symeon (4th / 5th centuries); and the ancient church Latin writer, Speculum (d. 5th century).

In *Variant 2*, found in old Latin Version k (4th / 5th centuries), the word “*Dei*” (God) is first omitted after “*regnum*,” but then reintroduced after “*justitiam*” (righteousness) instead of “*eius*” (his), reading, “*regnum* (the kingdom) *et* (and) *justitiam* (righteousness) *Dei* (of God).”

*Variant 3* “of God” is replaced by the words “*ton ouranon* (plural, ‘of heavens,’ but translated in the singular, ‘of heaven’),” i.e., “the kingdom of heaven, and his righteousness.” Variant 3 is followed by Byzantine Minuscule 858 (14th century), and with minor differences of sentence segmentation by the ancient church Greek writer, Clement (d. before 215).

*Variant 4* omits “and his righteousness,” and reads “*ten* (the) *basileian* (kingdom) *tou* (of the) *Theou* (of God)” i.e., “the kingdom of God,” and is followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407), and ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420); as well as Byzantine Minuscules 119 (12th century) and 482 (13th century). It is also followed in the Byzantine Minuscules 119 (12th century), 245 (12th century), and 482 (13th century).

*Variant 5* reads, “*ten* (the) *basileian* (kingdom) *ton ouranon* (of heaven),” i.e., “the kingdom of heaven,” and is followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Justin Martyr (d. c. 165) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

There is no good textual reason to doubt the representative Byzantine reading, which must

therefore stand as correct. The words “his” before “righteousness” survive in Variants 1 and 3, which includes, notably, the Vulgate. There is a contextual contrast, between that which “the Gentiles seek” (Matt. 6:32), meaning what “*the heathens* seek” (see my comments at Matt. 6:32, Appendix 3, Volume 1), and that which we who are saved are to “seek” (Matt. 6:33). The “Gentiles,” meaning “*heathens*,” seek material “things” (Matt. 6:31,32), which in their lust, they set up as false gods (Col. 3:5; Philp. 3:19); whereas God’s children are told, “But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness” (Matt. 6:33). The context of this contrast, requires that “his righteousness” refers to God i.e., as opposed to the gods of lust “the Gentiles seek,” and so the survival of “his” in Variants 1 and 3, is a testimony to the fact that “of God” was omitted. Scarcely would one say, “his” of the inanimate “heaven,” i.e., “heaven’s righteousness,” and so the “heaven” of Variant 5 is not plausible. Variant 2 may have been a “stylistic improvement,” although it is also possible that it was accidentally omitted, and the scribe realizing his mistake, then added it back in at a later point. Thus stylistic textual factors strongly favour the reading of the TR. Since believers are to “seek” “God, and his righteousness” (Matt. 6:33) it follows that God’s “righteousness” must “deliver” i.e., save (Ps. 31:1), and so justify men (Pss. 31:1,2; 32:1,2; Matt. 20:28), not simply condemn them, as indeed recognized by that great Christian Reformer, Martin Luther (1483-1546).

In St. Matthew’s Gospel, “kingdom” sometimes stands by itself (Matt. 4:23; 6:10,13; 8:12; 9:35; 13:19,38,41; 16:28; 20:21; 24:14; 25:34). But more commonly, reference is made to “the kingdom of heaven” (Matt. 3:2; 4:17; 5:3,10,19,20; 7:21; 8:11; 10:7; 11:11,12; 13:11,24,31,33,44,47,52; 16:19; 18:1,3,4,23; 19:12,14,23; 20:1; 22:2; 23:13; 25:1,14), or less commonly, to “the kingdom” of the “Father” (Matt. 13:43; 26:29), or “the kingdom of God” (Matt. 12:28; 19:24; 21:31,43).

Was Variant 1 a deliberate assimilation to the usage of “kingdom” in the nearby *Lord’s Prayer*, where we twice read, “Thy kingdom come,” and “thine is the kingdom” (Matt. 6:10,13)?

Or was it omitted due to a paper fade / loss? Was Variant 2 a “stylistic improvement,” or a “correction” once a scribe realized he had accidentally omitted it? Variant 3 looks like an assimilation to the far more common Matthean terminology, “kingdom of heaven.” Was this a deliberate “stylistic improvement;” or was there a paper fade / loss, and a scribe “reconstructed” this as “*ton ounon*” (an abbreviation found in some Byzantine manuscripts<sup>63</sup>), with a later scribe expanding this abbreviation out to the fuller “*ton ouranon* (heaven)”?

Was Variant 4 lost to a paper fade? Or did Variant 4 arise from ellipsis, when the copyist’s eye jumped from the “*ou*” ending of “*Theou* (God),” in “*ten* (the) *basileian* (kingdom) *tou* (of the) *Theou* (of God),” to the “*ou*” ending of “*autou* (of him / his),” in the following clause, “*kai* (and) *ten* (the) *dikaiousunen* (righteousness) *autou* (of him),” thus omitting the words “and the righteousness of him” i.e., “and his righteousness”? Variant 5, was probably as assimilation of Variant 4, to the more common Matthean terminology, “kingdom of heaven” (cf. Variant 3), but made in time after Variant 4 arose. Was it an accidental or deliberate assimilation, per the thinking of Variant 3, *supra*?

The TR’s reading has representative Byzantine support, and strong support among both

---

<sup>63</sup> See e.g., *ounois* (for *ouranois*) in Matt. 7:11 of M 021, or in Matt. 12:50 of M 021, S 028, & U 030; or *ounon* (for *ouranon*) in Matt. 12:11 of M 021, S 028, & U 030.

the old Latin Versions and a number of church writers, including the church doctors, St. Basil the Great, St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, and St. Gregory the Great. Textual analysis strongly favours the TR's reading; and the five textual variants are understandable errors. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 6:33 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 6:33, "the kingdom of God, and his righteousness," is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); as well as various non-Byzantine Minuscules e.g., (the mixed text type) 33 (9th century), and (independent) 157 (12th century). It is further found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian "I" and "A" Versions (5th century); Slavic Version (9th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

*Variant 1*, "the kingdom and his righteousness," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). An altered form of *Variant 1*, which in order to overcome the incongruity of "his" while denying the omission of "God," rearranges the word order of Variant 1 from "the kingdom and his righteousness," to the strained sounding, "the righteousness and his kingdom," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century).

Reflecting textual contradiction within the Alexandrian Text, strong support for the TR's reading outside the Byzantine Text, and recognition of diverse interpretations of the data, the NU text places "of God (*tou Theou*)" in square brackets, thus making it optional in Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and the UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). This shows the confusion that exists among NU Text advocates, although it is an improvement on Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott & Hort (1881), or Nestle's 21st edition (1952), all of which followed Variant 1 and omitted "of God" from the main text altogether.

The omission is found at Matt. 6:33 in the neo-Alexandrian translations of the ASV, NASB, RSV, and NIV, all of which have the same basic reading. They all understand the "his" to refer to "kingdom and righteousness" conjunctively, rather than to "righteousness" disjunctively from "kingdom," i.e., "his righteousness and kingdom." But this is so strained and unlikely a possibility, that they find it necessary to replicate and supply an additional "his" in order to smooth over the roughness of their altered text. Thus e.g., the ASV reads "But seek ye first his kingdom, and his righteousness." Despite the fact that the ASV is meant to be a literal translation that uses formal equivalence, it misleadingly lacks italics for the first "his" (ASV). This same lack of italics also characterizes the NASB, which claims to be different to e.g., the RSV and NIV because of its usage of italics.

The tortured textual quality of the Alexandrian text was, on this occasion, too much for the NRSV and ESV to bear, both of which here break with the RSV and follow the correct reading. Possibly they were influenced in this decision by Moffatt, who also followed the correct reading at Matt. 6:33, in his instance, probably being influenced on this occasion by its strong support in the Syriac.

**Matt. 6:34** “the things of itself” (TR & AV) {B}*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

In the Byzantine Text’s jewel, *Codex Freerianus* (5th century, Matt. 1-24; Luke 8:13-24:53), which is one jewel among many thousands of Byzantine Greek Text and Latin Text crown jewels, one finds at the page showing Matt. 23:34-24:3, the section containing Matt. 24:2.

In the words, “There shall not be left here one stone upon another” (AV), the scribe first wrote “*ou mē* (not) *aphethe* (shall be left),” then omitting, “*ode* (here),” wrote “*lithos* (a stone)” etc. Realizing he had made a mistake, he then wrote “*ode* ( here)” in between the lines, starting the “*o*” of “*ode*” in between the “*ē*” of “*aphethe*” and “*l*” of “*lithos*,” thus indicating that this is where “*ode*” should be inserted.

Certainly ellipsis was not the reason for this omission. The only viable explanation appears to be that “*ode*” is a very short word, just three letters. As the scribe copied out a text, he may have kept his place on the original manuscript with a line-pointing device, or simply his finger. If his finger, then if momentarily distracted, his finger might slip a small space forward. In the case of a very short word, such as “*ode*,” this might prove fatal, as the scribe looking down and seeing the beginning of a new word, may just keep writing. Not all scribes were as adroit as this one was here, who returned to correct his error.

*This is significant for showing a tendency for short words or letters to fall out of manuscripts by scribal inadvertence. This matter will be referred to, infra.*

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 6:34, the Byzantine Text is fairly evenly divided between two readings, although the TR’s reading is still that of the majority Byzantine Text. The TR’s Greek reading, “*ta* (the [things]) *eautes* (of itself)” in the words, “for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself” (AV), is the representative Byzantine Text’s reading, found e.g., in Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), E 07 (8th century), K 017 (9th century), M 021 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), and Pi 41 (9th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Basil the Great (d. 379).

The alternative, well attested to minority Byzantine reading, lacking “*ta* (the things),” and so simply reading, “for the morrow shall take thought of itself (*eautes*)” (*Variant 1*), is found e.g., in Codices G 011 (9th century), V 031 (9th century), Omega 045 (9th century), and S 028 (10th century). According to the Nestle-Aland 27th edition, Codex W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), also supports this reading. (For the purposes of my determination of the text and associated rating of the TR’s reading, I shall act as though Nestle-Aland correctly characterizes this as the reading of Manuscript Washington or W 032; although after having first made my determination of the text and associated rating of the TR’s reading, *infra*, I shall then consider this issue further.) It is also followed by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and some old Latin Versions. It is further followed by the ancient church Latin writers, Cyprian (d. 258), Hilary (d. 367), and Augustine (d. 430). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

There is no good textual reason to doubt the representative Byzantine reading which must therefore stand as correct. It is certainly within Matthean Greek to use “*ta*” like this in St. Matthew’s Gospel. In Matt. 15:20, St. Matthew refers to “the [things] (*ta*) defiling a man” i.e., “the things which defile a man” (AV). In Matt. 16:23, to “the things (*ta*) of God (*tou Theou*)” i.e., “the things that be of God” (AV). And in Matt. 22:21, he refers to “the things (*ta*) of Caesar (*Kaisaros*)” i.e., “the things which are Caesar’s” (AV); and also “the things (*ta*) of God (*tou Theou*)” i.e., “the things that are God” (AV)<sup>64</sup>. In the immediate context of Matt. 6:32-34, reference is made to the fact that “your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things (*touton*)” (Matt. 6:32); and “all these things (*tauta*) shall be added unto you” by “God” (Matt. 6:33). Hence it is contextually natural, and indeed expected, that in Matt. 6:34, for the term “of itself” (genitive) to presuppose a subject of “the things” (which is nominative plural); and hence one would more naturally expect this verse to read, “the morrow shall take thought for the things (*ta*) of itself.” The longer reading thus flows more naturally here than the shorter reading; and thus the majority Byzantine Text’s longer reading is the preferred reading.

The origins of the Variant 1 are speculative, but it may have arisen in one of at least four ways by accident. Firstly, a paper loss in a manuscript that separated the Greek words may have occurred at the *ta*, and if the words were still written fairly close to one another, a copyist may have wrongly concluded that no part of the text was lost in the paper loss, and thus “*meriumnēsei* (shall take thought for) *ta* (the things) *eautēs* (of itself),” may have accidentally become “*meriumnēsei* (shall take thought for) *eautēs* (itself).” Secondly, especially if the manuscript had no spacing between the words, then reading “... *meriumnēseitaeautēs*...,” it would have been easy for a copyist’s eye to jump in ellipsis, from the “a” in “*ta*” to the next “a” and write “...*meriumnēseitautēs*...” A later copyist looking at this, realizing that a mistake had been made, if the manuscript were in lower case letters, may have thought that the “t” (Greek tau) was an error from a poorly formed “e” (Greek epsilon), and depending on handwriting, these Greek letters may look sufficiently similar to each other for this to be plausible. If so, the later copyist may have reconstructed *eautēs* from context; once again making the reading, “*meriumnēsei* (shall take thought for) *eautēs* (itself).” (For a variation on this same idea with capital letters, see commentary at *Variant 2*, outside closed class, *infra*.)

The English and modern Greek script capital “T” and “E” used in Greek New Testaments are the same, although some ancient capital “E’s” I have seen were more curved, and so looked like a back-the-front “3” i.e., “Ɔ,” (although others again that I have seen look like a “C” with a bar on the right in the middle). However, in handwriting, some “Ɔ” letters look straighter, and so more like a modern “E” than others. This is relevant to the third possibility. If the manuscript on which the second possibility occurred was in capital letters, then if the “T” (Greek Tau) was slightly lopsided with the bar at the top longer to the right than to the left; the top of it may have seemed to a copyist to be more like the top part of an “E” (Greek Epsilon). The copyist may have concluded that the other parts of the “E” i.e., the bars in the middle and the bottom to the right of the letter, had faded on his manuscript, and so he may then have

---

<sup>64</sup> These passages also highlight some of the difficulties of using italics for added words. “*Ta*” literally means “the,” and “ones” or “things” is then a connected inference. On the one hand, the AV uses no italics at Matt. 6:34; 16:23; 22:21 (twice); but on the other hand, the AV places both “the” and “things” of “the things” in italics at Matt. 15:20.

“resupplied” them on the basis of “context.”

A fourth possibility, is that the scribe had his finger (or a pointing device) on the words he was copying out; but as he was momentarily distracted, due to inadvertence this slipped forward.

Since only two letters were involved, he did not realize what had happened. Seeing the next word, he simply wrote on. (See Preliminary Textual Discussion, *supra*).

Another possibility is that the alteration was deliberate. A scribe may have considered that “*ta* (the things)” was “redundant,” and a “more concise” and “succinct” reading that pruned away “*ta* (the things)” as “unnecessary wordage” was to be preferred as a “stylistic improvement.”

On the one hand, there is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine Text reading of the TR, which is therefore the correct reading. Indeed, there is a good positive textual argument in its favour; so that even if, *as is not the case*, the two readings had the same support in the Byzantine Text, stylistic factors of textual analysis would favour the TR’s longer reading as the more likely reading. It further has the support of the ancient church father and doctor, St. Basil the Great. Moreover, one can understand how the minority Byzantine Text variant (*Variant 1*) arose. But on the other hand, the shorter reading still makes contextual sense, and though a minority Byzantine reading, the Byzantine Text is fairly evenly divided on the longer and shorter readings. Taking into account these competing factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading which includes “the things” (*ta*) at Matt. 6:34 a “B” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

A question arises as to the reading of Manuscript Washington (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), commonly designated by, “W” or “W 032” I have for the purposes of my determination of the text and associated rating of “C” for the TR’s reading, *supra*, assumed that I am wrong, and Nestle-Aland is right in reading W 032 as *Variant 1*. This means I have thereby safeguarded my above conclusions against any claim that they require support from W 032, or require a specific rejection of the claim that W 032 supports *Variant 1*. The inbuilt Divine safety mechanism of following the representative Byzantine Text unless there is a good textual reason with support inside the closed classes of three sources; means that the broad brush facts are not obscured by disputes of this nature as to the exact reading of this or that manuscript. God has designed his method of textual preservation in such a way, that it can easily cope with this type of disputation, which by the grace of God, may be fairly side-lined as a side-issue.

The Nestle-Aland 27th edition claims that W 032 supports the minority Byzantine reading (*Variant 1*), “for the morrow shall take thought of itself (*eautes*).” By contrast, Swanson claims that W 032 supports the reading, “for the morrow will take thought of its own (*autes* literally, ‘of it’)<sup>65</sup>” (*Variant 2, infra*). Fortunately, I have been able to inspect Manuscript Washington due to the circulation of a facsimile edition (1912)<sup>66</sup>.

---

<sup>65</sup> Swanson, R. (Editor), *New Testament Greek Manuscripts, Variant readings ... against Codex Vaticanus*, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield, England, UK, 1995, Vol. 1, p. 53.

<sup>66</sup> *Facsimile of the Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels in the Freer Collection*,

Written in capital letters without spacing between the words, in which “C” is used for the capital “s” (sigma), the manuscript reads on the last line of page nineteen, “*MEPIMNHCEI AAEAYTHC*.” I.e., coming off the top of the last letter of “*MEPIMNHCEI* (shall take thought for)” there is a small smudge from the top right of the “T” that makes it look like “I”. This strikes me as accidental by the copyist. But it is then followed by “AA”. However, there is a small mark at the bottom left hand corner of the first “A”, that is generally absent on other instances of the letter “A” in the vicinity. It looks like the scribe started to write the wrong letter, possibly a “C” (capital Sigma / S), and stopped as he started to draw the curve at the bottom; changing it to an “A”. Though it is possible that this first letter is a badly smudged “E,” the concomitant claim of Nestle-Aland (27th edition) that this is an “EA” is inconsistent with the general shape and length of the protrusion of the bottom part of the “E” elsewhere in the vicinity, and strikes me as a possible reading, though not the most probable reading. The claim of Swanson that one can simply ignore this “A,” presumably reading it as an “ink blotch” (?) or other error to be ignored, and so read the text as “*MEPIMNHCEI* (shall take thought) *AYTHC* (of its own),” strikes me as outside the bounds of any reasonable possibility.

It seems to me that the most likely construction of what occurred is this. The copyist wrote down that last “T” of “*MEPIMNHCEI* (shall take thought for)” and slightly smudged the top right of it so it looks like “I”. *Scenario 1*: He was evidently fatigued, and or rushing to finish off the last line of the page, and end the line with the “C” of “*EAYTHC* (of itself),” so he was probably thinking in his head, “C” and started to write down “C”. He then stopped before he had completed the “C”, realizing he had made a mistake. *Scenario 2*: He was evidently fatigued, and or rushing to finish off the last line of the page, and thinking ahead in his mind started to write down the “E” of “*EAYTHC* (of itself).” He then stopped before he had completed the “E”, realizing he had made a mistake.

Looking back quickly to see where he was up to, he saw the smudged “I”, and in his fatigued rush, took this to be the “T” of “*TA* (the things) *EAYTHC* (of itself).” He thus then wrote down the “A” of “*TA*.” Thinking in his tired and befuddled head, “I’m up to the “A” i.e., the “A” of “*TA*,” he then looked on his manuscript for the “A,” and seeing the “A” of “*EAYTHC*,” thought, “I’m up to the “A,” and so wrote down “*AYTHC*.” Thus he came to write down, “*MEPIMNHCEI AAEAYTHC*”. There were a few spaces left at the end of this line, but he then left off copying in order to allow the ink to dry; and returning some time later, simply turned the page to start writing at the top of page twenty.

Thus we have at page nineteen of Manuscript Washington, a “snapshot” of a copyist making an error. In my opinion, this error not only gives further testimony for the reading of the TR (not that such testimony is required for this majority Byzantine reading), but also provides an

example of how *Variants 1* and *2* may have arisen in at least some instances, since Nestle-Aland reads this as *Variant 1*, and Swanson erroneously reads this as *Variant 2*.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 6:34, “for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself,” is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further supported by Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type in the Gospels), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 1241 (12th century, independent in the Gospels). It is also found in the Syriac Harelean h Version (616).

The incorrect reading, *Variant 1*, “for the morrow shall take thought of itself,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century), Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) and 700 (11th century, independent); and by a second “corrector” of one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century).

Another reading, *Variant 2*, Greek “*autēs* (“of itself” or “of herself”) i.e., “for the morrow will take thought of itself,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century). On the second possibility for the origins of *Variant 1*, i.e., especially if the manuscript (possibly in capitals, using the “C” for capital “s” / sigma) had no spacing between the words “*MEPIMNHCEI* (shall take thought for) *TA* (the things) *EAYTHC* (of itself),” then reading “... *MEPIMNHCEITAEAYTHC...*,” it would have been easy for a copyist’s eye to jump in ellipsis, from the “A” in “*TA*” to the next “A” and write “*..MEPIMNHCEITAYTHC... .*” One later copyist looking at this, who originated *Variant 1*, realizing that a mistake had been made, may have thought that the “T” was an error for an “E,” or the cross strokes in the middle and bottom had faded on a faded “E.” If so, the later *Variant 1* copyist may have reconstructed “*EAYTHC* (*eautes*)” from context; once again making the reading, “*MEPIMNHCEI / meriumnēsei* (shall take thought for) *EAYTHC / eautes* (itself).” However, another copyist looking at this same error, who originated *Variant 2*, may have concluded that the “T” was the accidental slip of a copyist’s pen (depending on how tidy the handwriting was, depending on how plausible this would be), or simply a copyist’s error. It is also possible that the “T” had sufficiently faded for it to be written off as a copyist’s blotch; or completely faded and was not longer visible, with the spacing lost sufficiently small for it not be regarded as absent. Thus he may have reconstructed this by dropping the “T” i.e., reading “*MEPIMNHCEI / meriumnēsei* (shall take thought) *AYTHC / autēs* (of itself).” If so, possibly the scribe also justified this through reference to the *autēs* at the end of this same verse, i.e., “Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof (*autēs*, literally ‘of it;’ or ‘of her’ as *autēs* is in feminine gender).”

This may also explain the origins of *Variant 3*, literally, “for the morrow shall take thought for the thing (*to*) of itself (*eautes*),” i.e., “the morrow shall take thought for that (*to*) of itself.” This reading is found in the (mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century) and

Minuscule 565 (9th century, independent). I.e., in this third instance, the scribe may have added an “OE” after the “T,” and so reconstructed “..MEPIMNHCEITAYTHC...” as “MEPIMNHCEI (shall take thought for) *TO* (that, literally ‘the [thing]’) *EAYTHC* (of itself).” If so, possibly the scribe also justified this through some reference to Matt. 1:20; 15:11; 27:9<sup>67</sup>. It is also notable that one of these two texts, namely, Codex Theta (9th century), also adds the Greek “*to*” at Matt. 20:10 (as there also do London Sinaiticus, Codices L, Z, and 085).

Thus it is possible to explain all the variants from the Received Text on this same basis. But it should be also borne in mind, that with both this one explanation for the origins of the three variants, and also the other possibilities, that the same error may have been made multiple times. I.e., a number of copyists may first, by ellipsis, have made “MEPIMNHCEITAEAYTHC” into “MEPIMNHCEITAYTHC,” and so Variants 1,2, and 3 may have arisen autonomously from this same error replicated on a number of occasions.

So too, it should be remembered that the five possibilities mentioned above, for how “the things” (*ta*) dropped out of the text, are not of necessity mutually exclusive. I.e., multiple errors can occur over time, so that e.g., “*ta*” may have dropped out from paper loss in a manuscript using capital letters and spacing that was close together, in a manuscript used by Cyprian (d. 258). Then Augustine (d. 430) may have used a manuscript that was a reconstruction, occurring after ellipsis from “*A*” to “*A*”. Both of these possibilities would be unrelated to the suggested way the error arose in Manuscript Washington, which is so peculiar that one needs the evidence of the script in front of oneself, such as the smudge coming down the letter “*T*” as “*T*”, and the poorly formed letter following first “*A*”, in order to make the suggested reconstruction as to how the error may have arisen. Without the evidence of Manuscript Washington before one’s eyes, the conjectured reconstruction may not seem sufficiently plausible; but with the evidence of Manuscript Washington, it emerges that truth is sometimes stranger than fiction. Thus the fact that both Cyprian and Austin quote the shorter ending, does not necessarily mean that the erroneous manuscripts they are citing were both generated from the same error; as they may well have been generated from independent errors. We simply do not have enough data to know for sure how all these errors arose. We only know for sure that these are errors.

---

<sup>67</sup> Matt. 1:20 “for that which (*to*) is conceived in her” (AV), or literally, “for” (*gar*) “the thing” (*to*) “in (*en*) her (*aute*);” Matt. 15:11, “not that which (*to*) goeth into the mouth” (AV), or literally, “not the [thing](*to*) going into the mouth;” and Matt. 27:9, “Then was fulfilled that which (*to*),” or literally, “Then was fulfilled the [thing] (*to*).”

Reflecting the split in the two main Alexandrian texts at Matt. 6:34, the erroneous *Variant 2* was adopted by Westcott-Hort (1881); whereas the erroneous *Variant 1* was adopted by Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the NU Text. Thus *Variant 1* was followed by the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV and NIV. *Variant 1* appears in the NRSV as, "for tomorrow will bring worries of its own" (NRSV). Both variants may be rendered the same, as seen in comparison between the NU Text based ESV which reads, "for tomorrow will be anxious for itself" (ESV) (*Variant 1*); and the Westcott-Hort based ASV which reads, "for the morrow will be anxious for itself" (ASV) (*Variant 2*).

**Matt. 7:2** "it shall be measured to you again" (TR & AV) {C}

The TR's Greek reading, "*antimetretthesetai* ('it shall / will be measured again,' future indicative passive 3rd person singular verb, from *antimetreo*) *umin* (to you)" i.e., "it shall be measured to you again" (AV), is a minority Byzantine reading found in the magnificently illuminated purple parchment, Sigma 042, *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century), the purple parchment, *Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus* (N 022, 6th century); Minuscules 262 (Paris, France, 10th century), 660 (Berlin, Germany, 11th / 12th century), 1187 (St. Catherine's Monastery, Sinai, Arabia, 11th century), and 477 (Trinity College, Cambridge University, England, UK, 13th century), 482 (British Library, *Londinium*, UK, 13th century); *Sidneiensis Universitatis* Lectionary 2378 (11th century); and appearing in e.g., Stephanus's (1550 & 1551) and Beza's (1598) 16th century Greek NTs. It is supported as Latin, "*remetietur* ('it shall / will be measured again,' future indicative active, 3rd person singular, deponent verb from *remetior*<sup>68</sup>)," by *Codex Veronensis* (old Latin Version b, 5th century), *Codex Claromontanus* (old Latin Version h, 5th century), *Codex Brixianus* (old Latin Version f, 6th century), *Codex Aureus* (old Latin Version aur, 7th century), *Codex Sangermanensis* (old Latin Version g1, 8th / 9th century), *Codex Corbeiensis* (old Latin Version ff1, 10th / 11th century), and *Codex Colbertinus* (old Latin Version c, 12th / 13th century); and some Latin Vulgate Codices. From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Clement of Alexandria (d. before 215), Athanasius of Alexandria (d. 373), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

However, a variant reading, Greek, "*metetretthesetai* ('it shall / will be measured,' future indicative passive 3rd person singular verb, from *metreo*) *umin* (to you)" i.e., "it shall be measured to you" (ASV), is the majority Byzantine reading, found e.g., in Codices W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), E 07 (8th century), G 011 (9th century), K 017 (9th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further followed as Latin, "*metietur* ('it shall / will be measured,' future indicative active, 3rd person singular, deponent verb from *metior*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), and l (7th / 8th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Clement of Rome (d. c. 160), Origen (d. 254); the ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

---

<sup>68</sup> Latin deponent verbs ("*remetior*" following the Received Text, and "*metior*" following the variant, 4th conjunction) have passive endings, but active meanings (Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, pp. 234-8,455-7).

The TR's Greek "*antimetetret̄hēsetai*" is from *anti* meaning "in place of," or "because of," or "in return of," and here carrying the connotation of "again" (AV), and *metreō* meaning "to measure," so that the root word of , *antimetreō* means to "measure out in return," or "measure out again." It is thus qualitatively different to the variant's "*metetret̄hēsetai*" by itself, which being from just *metreō* meaning "to measure," simply means "it shall be measured."

Of interest here are what some call the "parallel" readings of Mark 4:24 and Luke 6:38. In fact, such readings are simply *other instances*, when over his three and a half year public ministry, Christ said the same or similar words; for he often repeated core elements of his teachings, though he tailored his message to the context, with the result that these wrongly designated "parallel" readings sometimes exhibit slight differences of emphasis and wording. In Mark 4:24, on another occasion in another context; Christ said, "With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured (*metetret̄hēsetai*) to you (*umin*)."<sup>1</sup> In Luke 6:38, on yet another occasion and another context, Christ said, "For with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured again to you (*antimetetret̄hēsetai umin*)."<sup>2</sup>

In Luke 6:37,38 there is a crescendo build up to the climax, "it shall be measured *again* to you." I.e., (1) "Judge not, and ye shall not be judged;" (2) "condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned;" (3) "forgive, and ye shall be forgiven;" (4) "Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, and running over, shall men give into your bosom." (5) "For with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured again to you." The ending thus highlights this *tit for tat* paradigm, in which "again," is an important and integral component.

By contrast, in Mark 4:24, there is no such crescendo build up to these words. Rather we simply read, "And he said unto them, Take heed what ye hear: with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you." Thus the absence here of "again" flows naturally from the context.

However, when we consider the representative Byzantine Text's reading of Matt. 7:1,2; a textual problem emerges. There is clearly a crescendo build up to the climax, "it shall be measured to you." I.e., (1) "Judge not, that ye be not judged;" (2) "For with what judgement ye judge, ye shall be judged;" (3) "and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you." As seen in comparative analysis with Mark 4:24; Luke 6:37,38; the natural and expected ending to this crescendo is the climax, "it shall be measured again to you (*antimetetret̄hēsetai umin*)" as in Luke 6:38; and not the ending of the representative Byzantine text, "it shall be measured (*metetret̄hēsetai*) to you (*umin*)" as in Mark 4:24.

In the stylistic context of Matt. 7:1,2 the representative Byzantine Text reading clangs on the ears, is unexpectedly curt, and is stylistically incongruous with what we would expect on the basis of comparative analysis with similar sayings in Mark 4:24 & Luke 6:38. This stylistic textual defect can only be remedied by adopting the majority old Latin Versions' reading, also found in ancient times in the Greek of Clement. Therefore the correct reading is that found as a slim minority Byzantine reading, i.e., "it shall be measured again (*antimetetret̄hēsetai*) to you (*umin*)."<sup>3</sup>

The origins of the variant are speculative. Did it come about accidentally due to a paper fade in which the "*anti*" was lost from "*antimetetret̄hēsetai*," and taken by a subsequent scribe as a "stylistic" paper space? Or was the shorter reading of the majority Byzantine text a fairly early

deliberate scribal assimilation of Matt. 7:2 to Mark 4:24?

Our principal recourse to the majority old Latin Versions' reading, means that we here have a manifestation of the lesser maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*. However, the fact that we justify this Latin reading after textual analysis of the Greek, *not the Latin*, in Matt. 7:1,2; Mark 4:24; Luke 6:37,38; means that we make this lesser maxim subordinate to the overriding greater maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. This was one of the refinement's to the *Textus Receptus* that came from the great work of the textual scholars of the 16th and early 17th centuries. Though found in Tyndale (1526)<sup>69</sup>, it was then omitted by Tyndale (1534) and Cranmer (1539), and it is found in e.g., Stephanus's NT Greek Text (1550), and appears in the Geneva Bible (1557).

On the one hand, textual factors strongly favour the longer reading of the *Textus Receptus* in Matt. 7:2. It also has strong and long support in the majority old Latin Versions' reading; and it is found in the sixth century purple parchment, *Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, as well as four ancient church writers. Reminding us that at ancient Alexandria there was both a good school of scribes, as well as a bad school of scribes who produced the Alexandrian text, on this occasion some of the good clearly triumphed over the bad. For we find that the *Textus Receptus* at Matt. 7:2 was preserved for us by e.g., two holy church fathers who were both Bishops of Alexandria, to wit, St. Cyril of Alexandria (c. 375-444), "an old and holy doctor" (Book 2, Homily 2, Part 2, Article 35, Anglican 39 Articles), and St. Athanasius of Alexandria (c. 293-373), "a very ancient, holy, and learned bishop and doctor" (*Ibid.*), who before gaining his bishopric was present at the *Council of Nicea* in 325 (at that time attending Bishop Alexander of Alexandria as a deacon).

But on the other hand, the representative Byzantine Text, the Vulgate, and some ancient church writers, all follow the shorter reading. Taking these competing factors into account, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading "again" at Matt. 7:2 a "C" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading, but has a lower level of certainty.

The composers of the Roman Catholic Clementine Vulgate (1592) (and Sixtinam Vulgate, 1590), departed from Jerome's Vulgate at this point, and restored the "again" in "it shall be measured again" (Latin "*remetiatur*") to the text of Matt. 7:2; where the Vulgate simply reads, "it shall be measured" (Latin "*metietur*"). But to this it must be added that these Roman Catholic scholars arrived at the correct conclusion, in the wrong way. Specifically, they elevated the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, so as to deny its subservience to the master

---

<sup>69</sup> Tyndale did not get this from the Latin of Erasmus's Greek-Latin NT, which in both 1516 & 1522 reads, "*metietur* (it shall be measured)," (abbreviated Latin form in 1522).

maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. I.e., they arrived at their conclusions from a textual analysis of the Latin, *not the Greek*. In this instance, they were correct to recognize the strong support for the correct reading of Matt. 7:2 in the old Latin Versions.

However, also of relevance to them, would be the fact that Latin “*remetiatur*” is found not only in the Latin of Luke 6:38, but also in the Latin of Mark 4:24 (and so it appears in Jerome’s Vulgate, the Sixtinam Vulgate, and Clementine Vulgate). Hence it follows that their inclusion of *remetiatur* at Matt. 7:2, was *to some extent*, a simple assimilation of what they considered to be *the* definitive stylistic reading whenever Christ used this terminology. Therefore, these Latin textual scholars did not understand or accept the relevant Greek textual argument, since if they had, they could not have left the Latin *remetiatur* at Mark 4:24, but would have had to make it *metiatur*. While these Latin scholars of the Latin Church achieved the correct result at Matt. 7:2 *on this occasion* (in the same way that NU Text Greek scholars sometimes achieve the correct result *on a given occasion*); it must also be plainly stated, that whenever the Roman Catholic Latin scholars of the Clementine Vulgate (or earlier Sixtinam Vulgate) achieved the correct result (as in those instances where the NU Text Greek scholars achieve the correct result); it is done so in spite of their faulty theories of textual analysis, textual sources, and textual transmission, and not because of them. Yet notwithstanding such needful qualifications, it is notable that the Roman Catholic scholars of the Clementine Vulgate (and Sixtinam Vulgate) detected the absence of “again” in the Vulgate, and corrected its omission at Matt. 7:2. Their reading is a manifestation of an earlier Latin reading clearly inside the closed class of sources, and on this occasion constituted an improvement on Jerome’s Latin Vulgate.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the longer correct reading at Matt. 7:2, “it shall be measured to you again,” is also found in the independent Greek Codex 0233 (8th century); the (mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.*

However, the incorrect reading is found in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). The incorrect shorter reading, “it shall be measured to you,” is also found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); the (mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and the (independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It was adopted into the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 7:2, and thus is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. They thus continue the type of omission found in the earlier Westcott-Hort based American Standard Version, which reads, “it shall be measured unto you” (ASV).

**Matt. 7:4** “out” (TR & AV) {B}

The TR’s Greek reading, “*ek* (out),” in the words, “Let me pull out the mote out (*ek*) of thine eye” (AV), is a minority Byzantine reading supported by the magnificently illuminated purple parchment, Sigma 042, *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century), the purple parchment, *Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus* (N 022, 6th century); as well as Minuscules 28 (Paris, France, 11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), 945 (Edinburgh University, Scotland,

UK, 11th century), 21 (Paris, France, 12th century), 924 (Athos, Greece, 12th century), and 235 (Copenhagen, Denmark, 14th century). It is also supported as Latin, “*de* (out of),” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

By contrast, a variant reading, Greek, “*apo* (from),” making the reading, “Let me pull the mote from (*apo*) thy eye,” is adopted by Scrivener’s Text (see Appendix 1, Vol. 1), and is the majority Byzantine reading, found e.g., in Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), M 021 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), S 028 (10th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.).

However, the representative Byzantine reading poses a textual problem. Having first said in Matt. 7:4, “Let me pull out the mote from (*apo*) thine eye;” creates a stylistic tension with the reference to this in Matt. 7:5, “Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out (*ek*) of thine own eye; and then thou shalt see clearly to cast out the mote out (*ek*) of thy brother’s eye.” The *response* usage of “out (*ek*)” in Matt. 7:5, seems to presume and require that the prior *stimulus* verse of Matt. 7:4 also uses “out (*ek*).” This stylistic textual tension can only be remedied by adopting the majority Latin and minority Byzantine reading, and so the TR is surely correct to do so and read in Matt. 7:4, “Let me pull out the mote out (*ek*) of thine eye” (AV). Thus once again, we see that the lesser maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek* (with Latin *de* very well attested to), is subject to the greater maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin* (for we base our final textual decision on analysis of the Greek reading, not the Latin reading, of Matt. 7:4,5).

The origins of the variant are conjectural. Was there a paper fade / loss of “*ek* (out),” and a scribe “reconstructed” this as “*apo* (from)”? Or was this a deliberate “stylistic improvement”? Either way, the reading was quite possibly influenced by the usage of “*apo*” at Matt. 7:15 *et al.*

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s “out (*ek*)” at Matt. 7:4 a “B,” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 7:4 “out (*ek*)” is also found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type in Gospels), 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels), 13 (13th century, independent), and 209 (14th / 15th century, independent in Gospels).

The incorrect reading, “from” (*apo*), is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent) and 700 (11th century, independent).

Its support in the Alexandrian text meant that for the wrong reasons, the correct reading entered the NU Text *et al.* Hence the correct reading at Matt. 7:4 is found in the ASV as, “Let me cast out the mote out of thine eye” (ASV). The correct reading is also found in the NASB,

RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

The Burgonite NKJV is meant to follow the *Textus Receptus*, placing what it regards as “the better” readings in a footnote as the Majority Text; and also referring in its textual apparatus to the NU Text (although in practice its textual apparatus is not sufficiently comprehensive to meet its theoretical goals). Yet here at Matt. 7:4 they have been so anxious to fulfil their master’s claim, “the ‘*Textus Receptus*’ ..., calls for ... revision,” “upon the” basis of the “majority of authorities” (Burgon’s *Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, pp. 13,15); and their master’s dictum, “Again and again we shall have occasion to point out ... that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction” (Burgon’s *Revision Revised*, p. 21); that the Burgonites have fallen over themselves to make such a “correction” without advising their readers that they are departing from the Received Text. Thus the incorrect reading appears in this Burgonite version as, “Let me remove the speck from (*apo*) your eye” (NKJV). Hence the NKJV is less accurate here than the neo-Alexandrian versions! With what gall they claim to be preferable to the old King James Version! “Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. But they said, We will not walk therein” (Jer. 6:16).

**Matt. 7:9** “if ask” (TR & AV) {B}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

We live in an age when we can pick up any number of NT Greek Dictionaries, such as the one found at the back of *Strong’s Concordance* of the Authorized Version, or Mounce’s *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT* (1993). We can thus generally find an agreed spelling of various words. But the only one of our two Sydney University Lectionaries to cover this reading here at Matt. 7:9, to wit, Lectionary 2378, reminds us that such generally agreed standards did not always exist. Here in the same passage, the Lectionary first reads at Matt. 7:9, “*o* (whom) *ean* (if) *etesei* (he will ask)” i.e., changing the “*ai*” (alpha-iota) prefix of “*aitesei*” to an “*e*” (epsilon).

But in the very next verse, the Lectionary reads, “*aiteisei*” i.e., changing the “*e*” (eta) of “*aitesei*” to an “*ei*” (epsilon-iota). This type of variation in spelling, by the same scribe, 3 to 4 lines apart (the second “*aiteisei*” is written over two lines), is thus significant for reminding us that standard spelling has not always existed in the formal way that it now does.

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 7:9, the TR’s Greek reading, “*ean / an* (if) *aite<sub>e</sub>se* (‘he ask,’ aorist subjunctive active, 3rd person singular verb, from *aiteo*)” in the words, “whom if his son ask bread” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century, with variant spelling, *supra*). It is further supported as Latin, “*si* (if),” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g2 (10th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Latin writers, Cyprian (d. 258) and Augustine (d. 430). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However, an alternative reading that omits “*ean / an* (if),” and reads Greek, “*aite<sub>e</sub>sei* (future indicative active, 3rd person singular verb, from *aiteo*),” i.e., therefore making the reading

on this reconstruction, “whom when his son asks (*aitesei*) for bread,” finds support in the absence of Latin, “*si* (if),” in old Latin Version a (4th century), b (5th century), h (5th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). This alternative reading is also followed by the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

There is no good textual reason to doubt the reading of the representative Byzantine Text, which is therefore established as the correct reading. The origins of the variant are conjectural. It appears to be an assimilation with the “*aitesei*” reading of Luke 11:11. Was this an accidental “reconstruction” following a paper fade, in which “*an aitese*” looked something like “*:::aite:::*”, and the scribe “worked out the reconstruction” from Luke 11:11 to be “*aitesei*”? Or was this a deliberate assimilation from Luke 11:11 as a “stylistic improvement” to “standardize gospel readings”? We cannot be sure. We only know for sure that the reading of the *Textus Receptus* (TR) was changed to that of the variant.

Notwithstanding the fact that Austin (Augustine) uses both readings, the correct reading has support from three church fathers i.e., St. Austin, St. Jerome, and St. Cyprian. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 7:9 a “B,” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty. (See also comments at Matt. 7:10, *infra*).

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 7:9, “if,” in “whom if his son ask bread,” is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (Paris, 8th century); the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Harelean h Version (616).

The incorrect reading, “whom when his son asks for bread,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in the (mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); together with the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Pesitto Versions.

The incorrect reading is found in the main text of the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 7:9. The ASV’s translation is, “Or what man is there of you, who, if his son shall ask him for a loaf.” A similar reading is found in the RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV. Though at first glance it may appear that the ASV translation using “if” (ASV), also found in the similar readings of these other versions is correct, the fact that this is based on the neo-Alexandrian text means that “if” (ASV) here is used in a temporal sense i.e., “when” in the future, rather than a conditional sense, and so is incorrect (see further comments on Matt. 7:9 at Matt. 7:10, *infra*). The Moffatt Bible translation lacks this ambiguity, using “when” (Moffatt) not “if” (ASV), and so reading, “which of you, when asked by his son for a loaf” (Moffatt Bible). A similar reading is found in the NASB.

**Matt. 7:10** “Or if he ask a fish” (TR & AV) {A}

The Greek of the *Textus Receptus* (TR), “*Kai* (Or) *ean* (if) *ichthun* (a fish) [the son] *aitese* (‘he should ask,’ aorist active subjunctive, 3rd person singular verb, from *aiteo*)” i.e., “Or (*kai*) if (*ean*) he asks (*aitese*) a fish (*ichthun*)” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., E 07 (*Codex Basilensis*, 8th century), G 011 (*Codex Seidelianus*, 9th century), U 030 (*Codex Nanius*, 9th century), V 031 (*Codex Mosquensis*, 9th century), and X 033 (*Codex Monacensis*, 10th century).

The pivotal words, “Or (*kai*) if (*ean*),” are further supported in the Greek, in *Variant 1*. This reading places the correct key words, “Or (*kai*) if (*ean*),” not with the subjunctive (indicating possibility,) *supra*, but in the future tense, with the ending, “*aitesei* (‘he asks,’ future indicative active, 3rd person singular verb, from *aiteo*),” i.e., still reading in English, “Or if he asks a fish.” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century, with regard to *aitese* being put into the future tense, see Matt. 7:9, *supra*). (Concerning *aitese* and *aitesi*, see Appendix 3, Vol. 1.)

These key words are also supported as Latin, “*aut* (Or) *si* (if) *piscem* (a fish) *petet* (‘he will ask,’ future indicative active, 3rd person singular verb, from *peto*),” i.e., “or if he will ask a fish,” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century); old Latin Versions s (7th / 8th century, Milan), ff1 (10th / 11th century, St. Petersburg); and Latin Codices Z (6th / 7th century London & 7th / 8th century, London), A (7th / 8th century, Florentinus), M (8th century, Munich), T (8th century Madrid), B (8th / 9th century Paris & 9th century Bamberg), and C (9th century La Cava). It is further supported as Latin, “*aut* (Or) *si* (if) *piscem* (a fish) *petit* (‘he asks,’ present indicative active, 3rd person singular verb, from *peto*),” i.e., “Or if he ask a fish,” in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), and g1 (8th / 9th century); and Latin Codices F (6th century Fulda), O (7th / 8th century), L (7th / 8th century), D (8th / early 9th century), and H (9th / 10th century London). As, “*aut* (Or) *si* (if) *piscem* (a fish) *postulaverit* (= *postulaverit*, ‘if he will / shall ask,’ future perfect indicative active, 3rd person singular verb, from *postulo*), in old Latin Version k (4th / 5th centuries). And as, “*aut* (Or) *si* (if) *piscem* (a fish) *petierit* (‘if he will / shall ask,’ future perfect indicative active, 3rd person singular verb, from *peto*)<sup>70</sup>, in old Latin Version c (12th / 13th century); and from the Latin support for this syncopated perfect reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

The key words, “*e* (Or) *kai* (also),” (with *aitese* not *aitesei*) (*Variant 2*), are found as a minority Byzantine reading in Codices M 021 (9th century), Pi 041 (9th century), and S 028 (10th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, “Or (*kai*) if (*ean*),” which is thus correct. The origins of the variants are speculative. Were they “reconstructions” following paper fades / losses, or were they deliberate “stylistic improvements”? If deliberate changes, then in fact they constituted an unwarranted tampering

---

<sup>70</sup> The future perfect indicative active, 3rd person singular verb from *peto* is *petiverit*. However, the syncopated perfect may drop the “v,” thus becoming, *petierit*.

with God's holy Word. Whether these changes were deliberate or accidental, that original Word of God was protected under His Divine Majesty's gracious Providence for us, in both the Greek and Latin. *Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum*<sup>71</sup>.

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading, "Or (*kai*) if (*ean*)," at Matt. 7:10 an "A," i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the TR's reading at Matt. 7:10, "Or (*kai*) if (*ean*) he asks (*aitesē*) a fish (*ichthun*)" (AV), is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and the (mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); together with the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Syriac Harclean h (616) Versions.

*Variant 1* i.e., the correct initial words, "Or (*kai*) if (*ean*)," also found in the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries), are placed with the incorrect ending, "he asks (*aitesei*)" in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century).

*Variant 3*, "Or (*ē*) also (*kai*) a fish (*ichthun*) he asks (*aitesei*)" i.e., "Or also when he asks for a fish," are found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), and Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type in the Gospels). From an Alexandrian base, it unsurprisingly entered the NU Text.

A complexity of translation into English at Matt. 7:9,10; Luke 11:11,12 has already been touched upon briefly at Matt. 7:9 with respect to the ASV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV, *supra*. These are not so called "parallel readings," but are similar teachings of our Lord, said on different occasions in different contexts; in which Christ has put a slightly different wording and emphasis in his teaching on these different instances. The Ministry of Christ extended some three and half years; and he evidently repeated similar teachings on many occasions, slightly modifying or adapting it to the context in which he spoke it. This is important for overcoming the error of "parallel gospel readings."

It is possible for "if" to convey a *temporal sense* in which it is synonymous with "when" i.e., as opposed to "if" being used in a *conditional sense*. Consider e.g., the well known

---

<sup>71</sup> Latin Motto of the Lutheran Reformation, "The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever" (I Peter 1:25).

Christian hymn of Joachim Neander (1650-1680). Neander was a German Protestant who was a Latin school teacher at Dusseldorf, and who then became a Minister of the German Reformed (or Calvinist) Church at Bremen in 1679. Before dying of tuberculosis at the age of 30, Neander wrote the hymn, "Praise to the Lord, the Almighty, the King of creation." Among rival English versions, the last part of the final verse is translated as either, "Ponder anew, What the Almighty can do, If with his love he befriend thee;" or "Ponder anew, What the Almighty can do, If to the end he befriend thee." But either way, the meaning here of "if" is "when."

Thus the reader should remember that depending on context, "if" may be used to convey a *temporal sense* in which it is synonymous with "when" (possibly in reference to the future); as opposed to "if" being used in a *conditional sense*. E.g., Person 1 says to a boy, "At lunch-time today your father will give you both fish and bread." Person 2 then says to the boy, "Well, if you're given fish and bread at lunch-time today, which are you going to eat first?" The statement of Person 2 might also have used "when" rather than "if," i.e., "Well, when you're given fish and bread, which are you going to eat first?" A further difficulty arises in that the temporal usage of "if" in this sentence to some extent is conveyed by vocalized nuance of the voice i.e., in the above sentence, if "if" was conditional, it would tend to be said in a slightly louder voice followed by a very brief pause. Thus especially in written English, when simply looking at the sentence, "Well, if you're given fish and bread at lunch-time today, which are you going to eat first?;" it would be possible for someone to still read the "if" as conditional, even though it was intended to be temporal. This type of temporal usage of "if" is used by the AV translators in Luke 11:11, which has the temporal sense, rather than the condition sense of "if," i.e., "If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father," might also have been translated as, "When a son shall ask bread" etc. . Thus it is quite different to Matt. 7:9, where "if" (Greek *ean* and Latin *si*) is conditional i.e., "or what man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread," etc. .

It is possible to have a temporal usage of "if," followed by a conditional usage of "if." E.g., Person 1 says to a boy, "At lunch-time today your father will give you both fish and bread." Person 2 then says to the boy, "Well, if (temporal use) you're given fish and bread, which are you going to eat first; if (conditional use) that is, you don't eat them together?" Such a combination usage is found in the AV's Luke 11:11,12. "If (temporal use) a son ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? Or if (conditional use, Greek *ei*) he ask a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent? Or if (conditional use, Greek *ean*) he shall ask an egg, will he offer him a scorpion?" Nevertheless, the difficulties in English, especially written English, of detecting when "if" is temporal and when it is conditional, means that I think one would need to consult the underpinning Greek to really understand what is being said here by the temporal "if" in the AV's Luke 11:11,12. Understandably, "when" is more commonly used than the temporal "if." (Cf. "if" in the AV's I Cor. 7:13; II Peter 1:8).

Thus on the type of precedent found in Luke 11:11 (AV), it is possible to translate the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 7:9,10, with "if" in the temporal sense; as opposed to "if" with the conditional sense as it is translated in the AV from the TR. Following in the footsteps of such a translation in the ASV, "or if (temporal use, Greek *kai*) he shall ask for a fish;" seemingly this is what has been done at Matt. 7:10 by the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. Moffatt who first used "when" at Matt. 7:9, *supra*, is particularly confusing to the English reader, because he then inconsistently used the temporal "if" here at Matt. 7:10. Hence there appears to be contrast between "when" and "if," in these two verses i.e., "when asked by his son" (Matt. 7:9), and "if he asks a fish" (Matt. 7:10) (Moffatt Bible).

Without consulting the underpinning Greek, the average reader would probably not detect the difference between, “Or if (conditional use, Greek *ean*) he ask a fish” (AV & TR), and “Or if (temporal use, Greek *kai*) he shall ask for a fish” (ASV, Westcott & Hort *et al*). But if the reader undertook further study in the Greek, possibly in a commentary; then the commentary following the neo-Alexandrian Text e.g., the NU Text, would certainly mislead him; and if he was unaware of the difference in the Greek between the neo-Alexandrian Text and the Received Text, he might erroneously think the AV was saying the same thing as his the neo-Alexandrian Text translation e.g., the ASV, NASB, or NIV. By the grace of God, let us be careful and diligent, not to take the glories of Christendom’s Received Text, being drawn from the glories of Eastern Christendom’s Byzantine Text, here supported in Matt. 7:9,10 by the glories of Western Christendom’s Latin Text; and exchange these glories for a couple of old, long lost, and only recently rediscovered, inglorious third rate manuscripts from the Land of Ham.

**Matt. 7:13,14b** “the gate” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek reading, “*ε* (the) *pule* (gate)” (twice), in the words, “for wide is the gate” (Matt. 7:13) and “strait is the gate” (Matt. 7:14), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported in Matt. 7:13,14 as Latin, “*porta* (the gate)” (twice), by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate; and old Latin Versions f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Basil the Great (d. 379), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604, in four separate quotes<sup>72</sup>).

However, “the gate,” Latin, “*porta*,” is omitted at Matt. 7:13 in old Latin Versions a (4th century), and k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), h (5th century), and c (12th / 13th century); and at Matt. 7:14 by old Latin Versions a (4th century) and k (4th / 5th centuries). Furthermore, “the gate” is omitted in both verses by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Clement of Alexandria (d. before 215), Naassenes (2nd / 3rd century) according to Hippolytus (d. 235), and Eusebius (d. 339); and the ancient church Latin writers, Cyprian (d. 258), Augustine (d. 430), Speculum (d. 5th century); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604, in four separate quotes<sup>73</sup>).

There is no good textual reason to doubt the representative Byzantine reading which is therefore surely correct. The origins of the variant are speculative. Was it lost due to a paper fade / loss? The fact that some manuscripts omit one reference to “the gate,” but not the other, heightens the possibility of two independent such paper fades. Moreover, the fact that Gregory

---

<sup>72</sup> Matt. 7:13 (“*portam*” at Migne 79:877) and Matt. 7:14b (“*porta*” at Migne 79:731, 698, 1410).

<sup>73</sup> Matt. 7:13 (Migne 75:1118; 77:40; 79:698) and Matt. 7:14b (Migne 75:1287).

cites both readings means that the omission of “gate” (twice) may simply have been a shorter form used for convenience. If so, did a scribe, seeing this shorter form in an ancient church writer’s works, e.g., that of Cyprian, wrongly take it to be “the correct full reading,” and then “correct” his manuscript accordingly?

Alternatively, these may have been deliberate simultaneous omissions, and the existence of subsequent rival texts may have given rise to one being omitted but not the other, in some manuscripts lines, as scribes critically selected readings from the rival texts. If the original omissions were deliberate, then the omissions of “the gate,” i.e., replacing “for wide is the gate, and broad is the way” with “for wide and broad is the way” (Matt. 7:13), and replacing, “Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way” with “Because strait and narrow is the way;” may have been a “stylistic improvement” by a scribe, who wrongly saw a tension between first saying “the gate (*e pule*)” and then “the way (*e odos*),” because he did not conceptualize a road “way” leading to a “gate.” Thus by omitting “gate,” he may have thought he was “improving” the text by removing “a fundamental absurdity,” i.e., that a “gate” is not a “way;” when in fact the fundamental absurdity really lay in his failure to properly grasp the complementary, not the contradictory, image of a “gate” and a road “way” leading to it.

Indeed, omitting “the gate” creates a textual problem, because Christ first says, “Enter ye in at the strait gate,” and then talks about “the” alternative “way” rather than the alternative “gate” at the end of the wrong road “way” in Matt. 7:13; and in Matt. 7:14 likewise continues this as a discourse on the road “way.” The tension thus created can only be remedied by following the representative Byzantine Text, which we cannot doubt is the correct reading. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s readings of “the gate” (twice) at Matt. 7:13,14 an “A,” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 7:13,14, “the gate,” is found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) Version; Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries). However, while one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) follows the correct reading in both instances; the other leading Alexandrian text, London Sinaiticus (4th century), follows the correct reading at Matt. 7:14, but the incorrect reading at Matt. 7:13.

Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72) places “the gate” in square brackets i.e., making its acceptance or rejection optional, at both Matt. 7:13 and Matt. 7:14. Westcott & Hort (1881) make the first “the gate (*n pule*)” optional by placing it in a footnote at Matt. 7:13, but includes “the gate” at Matt. 7:14. This reflects the division in the two leading Alexandrian Texts. Reflecting this stronger view among the neo-Alexandrians that only Matt. 7:13 should be optional since the two leading Alexandrian Texts are split on this verse, the ASV (1901) includes “the gate” at Matt. 7:13, but it qualifies this with a footnote reading saying, “Some ancient authorities omit ‘is the gate’” (more accurately, some manuscripts omit “the gate,” since “is” is not in the Greek text, and hence it is in italics in the AV). This slightly better position, which at least leaves “the gate” in at Matt. 7:14, was also followed by Nestle’s 21st edition (1952), which placed “the gate” only at Matt. 7:13 in square brackets i.e., making its acceptance or rejection optional.

The contemporary NU Text i.e., Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993), has done better again, and restored both readings of "the gate" to the main text without any square brackets. Such slipperiness and instability in the neo-Alexandrian critical text, varying and fluctuating as it does over time, means that we cannot be sure as to how long their present recognition of "the gate" at Matt. 7:13,14 will last. But to the extent that this is the present NU Text view, we find that on this occasion, the present NU Text jettisoned the variant of London Sinaiticus, and followed the correct reading; albeit for partly the wrong reasons. In this instance, the correct reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV at Matt. 7:13,14.

Reversing the emphasis of Westcott & Hort (1881) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952) which considered the first "the gate" was optional (Matt. 7:13), but the second "the gate" (Matt. 7:14) was not; Moffatt by contrast, considered the first "the gate" was correct (Matt. 7:13), but not the second "the gate" (Matt. 7:14). Hence the semi neo-Alexandrian, Moffatt, reads, "for the gate (*n pulē*) is broad" (Matt. 7:13); and then omitting the second "*n pulē*," "But the road that leads to life is both narrow and close" (Matt. 7:14a) (Moffatt Bible).

Now at Matt. 7:13,14, whose so called "great brain," are the neo-Alexandrians going to follow on this one? Tischendorf? If so, they must regard both occurrences of "the gate" as optional. Westcott, Hort, and Nestle? If so, they must regard the first occurrence of "the gate" as optional, but the second occurrence of "the gate" as correct. Moffatt? If so, they must regard the first occurrence of "the gate" as correct, but the second occurrence of "the gate" as incorrect. The NU Text Committee? If so, they must regard both occurrences of "the gate" as correct. So many "great brains" among the neo-Alexandrians, resulting in so much dispute. "Ah!" you may say good reader, "But didn't one of them get it right on this occasion, to wit, the NU Text Committee?" "Yes," I reply, "But when *so many* neo-Alexandrians, make *so many* guesses, one of them is bound 'to get it right,' not because they know what they're doing, but just as a fluke."

**Matt. 7:14a** "Because" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek reading, "*Oti* (Because)," in the words, "Because (*oti*) strait is the gate," is a minority Byzantine reading supported by Codex X 033 (*Codex Monacensis*, 10th century, Munich, Germany); Minuscules 1010 (Athos, Greece, 12th century), 924 (Athos, Greece, 12th century), 477 (Trinity College, Cambridge, England, UK, 13th century); and Lectionaries 1552 (St. Petersburg, Russia, 985 A.D.), 751 (Athos, Greece, 11th century), 859 (St. Catherine's Monastery, Sinai, Arabia, 11th century), 673 (Athos, Greece, 12th century), 547 (Vatican City State, Rome, 13th century), and 184 (British Library, London, England, UK, 1319 A.D.). It is also supported by an independent individual Latin Vulgate edition, and the old Latin Version m (Munich, 8th/9th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Naassenes (2nd / 3rd century) according to Hippolytus (d. 235), Origen (d. 254), and Pseudo-Justin (d. 4th / 5th century); and ancient church Latin writers, Ambrose (d. 397), Gregory-Elvira (d. after 392), Gaudentius (d. after 406), and Speculum (d. 5th century); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604)<sup>74</sup>. It is manifested in e.g., Erasmus's 1516 and

---

<sup>74</sup> Gregory reads Latin, "*Quia* (Because)," in Migne 77:388; and Latin, "*quoniam* (because)," in Migne 79:1410 (which unlike Migne I take to be contextually part of the citation). Though I would classify them as further variants that I do not here discuss, on other occasions

1522 Greek NT editions, as well as Stephanus's Greek NT of 1550.

However, *Variant 1*, "How (*ti*)<sup>75</sup> strait is the gate," is the majority Byzantine reading e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also followed as Latin, "*Quam* (How)," by Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Didymus (d. 398) and Macarius / Symeon (d. 4th / 5th century); and the ancient church Latin writers, Cyprian (d. 258), Gaudentius (d. after 406), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430). *Variant 2*, "But (*kai*) strait is the gate," is followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

The representative Byzantine reading (*Variant 1*) here, presents a textual problem. In Matt. 7:13 Jesus says, "Enter ye in at the strait gate, for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat." The words of Matt. 7:13, if left unqualified, seem to require an explanation. But instead, we read in the Byzantine text, "How (*ti*) strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." This exclamation fails to provide the required explanation, and is stylistically inconclusive. Then, the whole thing falls flat, since we are left up in the air, when suddenly there is a complete change to, "Beware of false prophets" (Matt. 7:15). This incongruity can only be relieved by adopting the minority Byzantine reading of Matt. 7:14, attested to in antiquity by numerous ancient church writers. This reading explains and finalises the starter words, "Enter ye in at the strait gate" (Matt. 7:13), and provides a suitable explanation, i.e., "Because (*oti*) strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." Having brought the idea back to a gentle landing, so we are no longer up in the air, the sub-section then constitutes a natural terminus at Matt. 7:14. Thus the following subsection, "Beware of false prophets" (Matt. 7:15), is not then stylistically jarring and unexpected. Therefore the minority Byzantine reading, attested to in antiquity by e.g., the ancient church doctor and Bishop of Milan, St. Ambrose, is to be preferred as the correct reading.

I think it likely that the change from *oti* ("because") to *ti* ("how") was accidental. I.e., in some way the omicron or "o" of "*oti*" was lost, and thus "*ti*" was accidentally formed as *Variant 1*. Probably this was due to a paper fade. It is also possible, that a scribe looking at a manuscript in capital letters, and reading "thereat" (*autēs / AYTHC*) "because" (*OTI*) in a line without spacing, i.e., "...AYTHCOTI...", if the "O" from "*OTI*" had slightly faded on the right-hand side; may have seen something like "... AYTHCCTI...", and wrongly concluded that a scribal error had repeated the sigma ("C"), and thus omitted it as a "corrective."

The error having thus entered the text as *Variant 1*, it may have seemed to a scribe, on a

---

Gregory reads Latin, "*Et* ('And' / 'Moreover')," in Migne 79:698; and Latin "*Sed* (But)," in Migne 79:731.

<sup>75</sup> On the usage of Greek *ti* to mean "how" (AV) see e.g., Mark 2:16; Luke 1:62; 2:49.

superficial analysis, to have been a plausible reading on the basis that the usage of “How” as an exclamation is a well known Hebraic poetical idiom. E.g., “How beautiful are thy feet with shoes;” “Thy neck is as a tower of ivory; thine eyes like the fishpools in Heshbon, by the gate of Bathrabbim,” “How fair and how pleasant art thou, O love, for delights!” (S. of Sol. 7:1,4,6). Or, “How doth the city sit solitary, that was full of people! How is she become as a widow! She that was great among the nations, and princes among the provinces, how is she become tributary!” “The ways of Zion do mourn, because none come to the solemn feasts: all her gates are desolate” (Lam. 1:1,4). Certainly such a conclusion could not withstand strict scrutiny, due to the textual difficulties posed in Matt. 7:14,15 by the reading “how,” *supra*. But allowing for an inferior quality of scribe, such superficiality may have wrongly seemed like a “crushing argument” in favour of “how” (*ti*), with the consequence that e.g., a scribe reading a manuscript with a slightly faded sigma that looked something like “... AYTHCCTI...,” *supra*, may have thought he had arrived at the correct reading due to “the presence of the Hebrew or Aramaic idiom, ‘How’.”

So too, I think a paper fade / loss, or covering with a foreign agent, of the “OT” of “OTF” in a manuscript where it was clear that two letters had been lost, probably bests account for the “reconstruction” of “KA” in the place of the missing letters, to form “KAP” (and), as *Variant 2*. In all likelihood, the existence of *Variant 2* thus acts as a confirmation highlighting the fact that such paper loss could, and seemingly did, occur. It also confirms that two letter spaces had to be filled i.e., the original must have been “OTF” not “TI.”

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 7:14a a “B,” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct at Matt. 7:14a, “Because,” in “Because strait is the gate,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); and a similar reading, “*Oti* (Because) *de* (to the contrary),” i.e., Because to the contrary, strait is the gate,” is found in the other leading Alexandrian text, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is further found in Minuscules 1243 (independent text in the Gospels, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 828 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is also found in the Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; as well as the Georgian Version (5th century).

The incorrect reading, *Variant 1*, “How (*ti*),” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It further appears in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Gothic Version (4th century), Slavic Version (9th century), Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries), and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The incorrect reading, *Variant 2*, “But,” is further found in (the independent text in the Gospels) Minuscule 205 (15th century).

Because of its strong support in the Alexandrian text, Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-

72), Westcott-Hort (1881), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952) followed the correct reading for the wrong reason. However, the later NU Text advocate, Bruce Metzger, claims, "There is no reason why the familiar *oti*, if original, should have been altered to *ti*" (*Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 19; 1994, p. 16). Of course, Metzger's claim, fails to consider the issue of accidental alteration, due to omission of "o" from "oti" to form "ti," *supra*. Thus we find in Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993), that the reading in the main text is the incorrect "*ti*" (*Variant 1*). This vacillation in the unstable neo-Alexandrian critical texts is a "never-ending story," and so we cannot be sure whether or not it will change back in the future to "*oti*;" although if it does, then as with Tischendorf's 8th edition, Westcott & Hort, and Nestle's 21st edition, this will then be the right reading but at least in part, for the wrong reasons.

Amidst this diversity of neo-Alexandrian critical text readings, the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV, followed the correct reading, *oti*, found in e.g., Nestle's 21st edition, and found earlier in the ASV's "For (*oti*) narrow is the gate." By contrast, the NIV and Moffatt both followed the highly improbable *Variant 2*, i.e., "But (*kai*)" (Moffatt Bible). *Variant 1* is also found as an ASV footnote reading, "How (*ti*) narrow is the gate." The incorrect reading is also found in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). The Burgonite Majority Text's NKJV supports *Variant 1*, saying in a footnote that it has both Majority Text and NU Text support.

Thus Burgon here exhibits his claim, "the '*Textus Receptus*' ..., calls for ... revision," "upon the" basis of the "majority of authorities" (*Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, pp. 13,15); with his associated proud boast, "Again and again we shall have occasion to point out ... that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction" (*Revision Revised*, p. 21). And the neo-Alexandrians here exhibit their claim that one should follow the religiously liberal "Lachmann" and "apply to the New Testament the criteria" "used in editing texts of the classics" (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 2nd ed., 1994, p 10\*). *Thus the Burgonites' wind blows hard against the TR here at Matt. 7:14a, and the NU Text wind also comes to try and blow down the TR. But all to no avail, for the Textus Receptus is "founded upon a rock" (Matt. 7:25). That Rock is Christ who said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away" (Matt. 24:35).*

**Matt. 7:15** "Beware" (TR & AV) {C}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

Does the TR include "*de*" here or not? Scrivener takes the view that it does, and was simply left untranslated by the AV translators, whereas I take a different view. Certainly the matter is not one that necessarily affects English translation, and we cannot doubt that the AV translators sometimes regarded such conjunctives as redundant in English translation. I have nevertheless included discussion of it here. See Appendix 3, Volume 1, "The conjunctions, for instance, 'de' (and) and 'oti' (that)."

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 7:15, the Greek reading without "*de*," i.e., "*Prosechete* ('Beware,' literally, 'Ye beware,' present active imperative, 2nd person plural verb, from *prosecho*)" in the words, "Beware of false prophets" (AV), is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex Omega 045 Athos, Greece, 9th century); together with Minuscules 945 (Athos, Greece, 11th century) and 660

(Berlin, Germany, 11th / 12th century). It is also supported as Latin “*Attendite* (‘Beware,’ literally, ‘Ye beware,’ present active imperative, 2nd person plural verb, from *attendo*),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), h (5th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Eusebius (d. 339), Athanasius (d. 373) and Chrysostom (d. 407); the ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367) and Lucifer of Cagliari (d. c. 370); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

By contrast, an alternative reading which adds “But” (*de*), potentially makes the reading, “But (*de*) beware of false prophets,” although since “*de*” may be left untranslated in English on the basis of redundancy, it might still be rendered, “Beware of false prophets” (AV). This is the majority Byzantine Text reading e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). (It is also manifested in Scrivener’s Text, see Appendix 1, Vol. 1.) It is also followed in some old Latin Versions (Latin, *autem*), for instance, old Latin Versions f (6th century) and q (6th / 7th century).

However, a textual problem arises with the representative Byzantine reading. Matt. 7:15-20 forms a sub-section represented in English by a paragraph, distinct from other sub-sections such as Matt. 7:1-5; 7:6; 7:7-12; 7:13-15; 7:21-23. The connector “but” (*de*) stands out as stylistically incongruous, since it does not immediately connect from Matt. 7:14, “Because strait is the gate,” “and few there be that find it.” While this is not intrinsically fatal since the conjunction “*de*” can sometimes connect what, in English grammar, would be two separate paragraphs; nevertheless, it is notable that in the immediate context, the other surrounding sub-sections in Matt. 7 do not have this connector, “but” (*de*). This clearly makes its presence here at Matt.7:14 draw attention to itself as conspicuous and stylistically incongruous.

Wider stylistic analysis of Jesus’ words also supports this conclusion. The terminology, “But (*de*) beware (*prosechete*) of men” (Matt. 10:17), stylistically occurs in the context of a warning, “Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves” etc. (Matt. 10:16). This supports the proposition that the terminology, “But (*de*) beware (*prosechete*),” in Christ’s language style, should have a connecting context such as occurs in Matt. 10:16,17, but not in Matt. 7:14,15. Likewise in Matt. 16:6 there is no “but” (*de*) before the starter statement, “Take heed and beware (*prosechete*) of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.” So too, if one considers Christ’s terminology outside of St. Matthew’s Gospel, one finds that in St. Luke’s Gospel, there is the simple usage of “Beware” (*prosechete*) to start an idea in Luke 12:1, “Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees” etc., and Luke 20:46, “Beware of the scribes” etc. .

Thus both immediate stylistic textual analysis in Matt. 7, and wider stylistic textual analysis, demonstrates that the presence of “but” (*de*) at Matt. 7:15 raises a problem. The jarring literary effect of “but” (*de*) at Matt. 7:15, can only be remedied by omitting this word, and following the more natural and expected reading found in the Vulgate, which simply and elegantly reads in the Latin, “*Attendite* (Beware) *a* (of) *falsis* (false) *prophetis* (prophets).” Therefore, the simple elegance of Matt. 7:15 in St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, here supported by such ancient church writers as e.g., the godly and learned Greek writing bishops and doctors, St.

Athanasius (Bishop of Alexandria, 328-373) and St. Chrysostom (Bishop of Constantinople, 398-407); as well as the early mediaeval pious Latin writing bishop and doctor, St. Gregory (Bishop of Rome, 590-604), must surely stand as the correct reading. Thus while there is some slim minority support for this reading in the Greek Byzantine textual tradition, its main textual support is the Latin textual tradition. But because the conclusion to omit the “*de*” is based on stylistic analysis of the Greek, not the Latin, it follows that once again, the lesser maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, is made subject to the greater maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*.

The origins of “*de*” are necessarily in the realm of conjecture. Did a scribe find and then assimilate Matt. 7:15 to the terminology of Matt. 10:17? Or was there a stylistic paper space marking out the beginning of verse 15 at Matt. 7:15 which a scribe mistook for “a paper fade,” so that he then went about to “reconstruct” the “missing word” of “*de*”?

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 7:15 a “C” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading, but has a lower level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 7:15, “Beware,” is found in e.g., the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as (the independent text) Codex 0250 (*Codex Climaci*, 8th century), and (the independent text) Minuscule 565 (9th century). It is further found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and celebrated Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions; the Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century), and some Coptic Sahidic Versions; Armenian Version (5th century), Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect reading which adds “but” (*de*), is followed in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and the (mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It also appears in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further followed by the Syriac Harklean h (616) Version; the Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) and some Coptic Sahidic Versions; as well as the Gothic Version (4th century).

With strong support from the Alexandrian Text, for the wrong reasons, the correct reading entered the NU Text *et al*, and so is found in both the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV, as it was in the earlier Westcott-Hort based ASV.

**Matt. 7:22** “cast out devils” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek reading, “*daimonia* (devils) *exebalomen* (we cast out)” i.e., “cast out devils” in the clause, “and in thy name have cast out devils?” is supported by the representative Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and

Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is also supported as Latin, “*daemonia* (devils) *ejecimus* (we cast out)” i.e., “cast out devils” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and most of the old Latin Versions. It is further supported by the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However, a variant adds “many” (*polla*), i.e., “and in thy name have cast out many (*polla*) devils?” This reading is found in the early mediaeval church Greek writer, John of Damascus (d. before 754).

There is no good textual argument against this reading. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

While the Alexandrian Text usually prunes away, e.g., in Matt. 7:27 London Sinaiticus omits “blew” (*epneusan*) in the words, “and the winds blew,” it is instructive to note that this is not always the case (e.g., Matt. 7:29; Acts 16:7). I have included this reading in the commentary, to remind the reader that the Alexandrian School scribes sometimes, albeit less commonly, also added to the text. E.g., here in Matt. 7:22, one of the two leading Alexandrian Texts, London Sinaiticus, adds “many” (*polla*) thus making the clause read, “and in thy name have cast out many (*polla*) devils?” This error is followed by (the mixed text type) Codex L019 (8th century). On this occasion the error was not adopted by the NU Text *et al.* The correct reading is found in the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

**Matt. 7:29** “the scribes” (TR & AV) {B}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

My positive form microfilm photocopy (black printing on white background), and my negative form microfilm photocopy (white printing on black background) of Lectionary 2378 here show a blank with some uncertain markings. Therefore I inspected the original at Sydney University and found that on the vellum page 27b there was a very faded *auton* i.e., *Variant 1, infra*. This thus shows how readings can be lost in paper fades.

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt 7:29 the TR’s Greek reading, “*oi* (the) *grammateis* (scribes),” in the words, “and not as the scribes,” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Codices M 021 (*Codex Campianus*, 9th century) and U 030 (*Codex Nanius*, 9th century); Minuscule 2 (Basel, Switzerland, 12th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*, with variant spelling changing “*ei*” to “*ε*” in “*grammatεs*”). It is also supported by the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430) (who elsewhere also follows *Variant 2, infra*)<sup>76</sup>.

---

<sup>76</sup> St. Augustine in: Migne (Latin Writers Series) (1841 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 34, p. 1094 (Harmony of the Gospels, 2:17:35) (Latin). In his “Harmony of the Gospels” (*Works of Augustine*, 2:17:35; in Schaff’s *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, first series, *op. cit.*,

However, another reading, *Variant 1*, adds, “*auton* (‘of them’ or ‘their’) after “*oi* (the) *grammateis* (scribes),” i.e., “their scribes.” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), E 07 (8th century), K 017 (9th century), and Lectionary 2378 (11th century). It is also followed by old Latin Version f (6th century); as well as the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339); and the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

Another reading, *Variant 2* adds, “and Pharisees.” This is found as Latin, “*scribae* (the scribes) *et* (and) *Pharisaei* (Pharisees),” i.e., “the scribes and Pharisees” in old Latin Versions a (4th century), h (5th century), and l (7th / 8th century). It is further found in the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Sixtinam Vulgate (1590).

Another reading, *Variant 3*, adds “their” after “the scribes” and then “the Pharisees.” This is a minority Byzantine reading, “*kai* (and) *ouch* (not) *os* (as) *oi* (the) *grammateis* (scribes) *auton* (of them) *kai* (and) *oi* (the) *Pharisaioi* (Pharisees),” i.e., “their scribes and Pharisees,” found in Codex W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53). It is also found as Latin, “*non* (not) *sicut* (as) *scribae* (the scribes) *eorum* (‘of them’ = ‘their’) *et* (and) *Pharisaei* (Pharisees),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as correct. The origins of the variants are speculative.

*Variant 1* is found in Lectionary 2378 (11th century), where due to a paper fade, the *prima facie* reading of the microfilm copy looks like the reading of the TR i.e., “the scribes.” But there is a notable paper space after “the scribes,” and upon inspecting the original, the faint

---

Vol. 6, p. 121), Austin says, “Mark (Latin, *Marcus*)” “has stated what Matthew (Latin, *Matthaeus*) also states,” “namely, that ‘He taught them as one that had authority, and (Latin, *et*) not (Latin, *non*) as (Latin, *sicut*) the scribes (Latin, *scribae*)” (Matt. 7:29; Mark 1:22). Austin here considers that the reading in Matt. 7:29 and Mark 1:22 is the same, which it is in the TR here quoted by Augustine.

presence of “*auton* (‘of them’ or ‘their’)” is clearly visible. Did such a paper space, intended as a stylistic marker to the next verse and chapter, result in a scribe adding in “*auton* (‘of them’ or ‘their’)”? If so was this an accidental alteration in which the scribe wrongly thought “there must have been a paper fade,” and so “reconstructed” this? Or (for the types of reasons discussed at *Variant 3, infra,*) was this a deliberate addition by an opportunistic scribe designed as “a stylistic improvement”?

*Variants 2 & 3* appear to be assimilations to terminology elsewhere in the Gospels. The usage of simply “the scribes” in Matt. 7:29, is harmonious with the terminology of Christ in Matt. 9:3 where we read of, “the (*ton*) scribes (*grammateon*);” or Matt. 17:10; Mark 1:22, where we also find the identical terminology, “the (*oi*) scribes (*grammateis*);” and elsewhere (Mark 3:22; 9:11,14,16; 12:28,35; Luke 20:46). The terminology of “scribes and Pharisees” (e.g., Matt. 5:20; 15:1; 23:2,13,14,15,23,25,27,29) appears to have exercised a pervasive influence on those making the “stylistic improvement” of *Variant 2*. So too, the “stylistic improvement” of “their” (literally, “of them,”) in *Variants 3*, though possibly influenced by Matt. 2:4, “scribes (*grammateis*) of the (*tou*) people (*laou*),” and Acts 4:5, “their (*auton*) rulers (*tous archontas*), and (*kai*) elders (*presbuterous*), and (*kai*) scribes (*grammateis*);” appears in the final analysis to be an assimilation with the terminology of Luke 5:30, “the (*oi*) scribes (*grammateis*) of them (*auton*) and (*kai*) the (*oi*) Pharisees (*Pharisaioi*),” i.e., “their scribes and Pharisees.”

Were *Variants 2 & 3* accidental changes? Was there a paper space stylistic marker between the end of chapter 7 and beginning of chapter 8? If so, was this wrongly taken by a scribe as “a paper fade” and accidentally “reconstructed” as *Variants 2 and / or 3*? Was this deliberately so “reconstructed”?

Were *Variants 2 & 3* deliberate changes? Did *Variant 2* arise from a concern that the reader might think that while the scribes did not teach with authority, the Pharisees did? Did elements of *Variants 2 & 3* arise to link “the people” (Matt. 7:28) more closely to the *Jewish* people i.e., to more thoroughly distance “the scribes and Pharisees” from Gentile people?

We cannot be sure as to how any of the variants arose, we only know that these changes were made. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 7:29 a “B,” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 7:29, “the scribes,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (independent text, 9th century) and 700 (independent text, 11th century). It is further found in the Gothic Version (4th century).

*Variant 1*, “their scribes,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts* (Swanson), which contain (in agreement with the *Family 1 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee*), Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere) and 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude); and the *Family 13 Manuscripts* (Swanson), which contain (in

agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee*) Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic and Coptic Bohairic Versions; Armenian Version, and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

*Variant 2*, “the scribes and the Pharisees,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century).

*Variant 3*, “their scribes and Pharisees,” is found at the hand of a “corrector” of (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); together with Minuscules 33 (mixed text type in Gospels, 9th century) and 1241 (independent in Gospels, 12th century). It is also found in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), with Ciasca’s Latin here reading the same as the Vulgate, *supra*.

*Variant 1*, “their scribes,” entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 7:29. Although *Variant 3* was included as a footnote alternative in Westcott-Hort (1881), the ASV ignores it and simply follows *Variant 1*, “and not as their scribes” (ASV). *Variant 1*, is also followed in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV. It is also found in the NIV’s unwarranted amplified reading, “their teachers of the law” (NIV).

**Matt. 8:2** “there came” (TR & AV) {A}

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

The TR reads, “*elthon* (there came) *prosekunei* ([and] worshipped) *auto* (him);” whereas Lectionary 2378 reads, “*proselthon* (there came unto) *auto* (him) ([and] worshipped) *auto* (him).”

Is the “*auto* (him)” after the variant “*proselthon* (there came unto)” a new minority Byzantine reading *per se*? Or did the scribe first get confused with the “*prose*” of “*prosekunei*” and “*proselthon*,” and write the “*auto*” that is after “*proselthon*,” instead after “*prosekunei*”; and then realizing his error, write out “*proselthon auto*” but forget to “cross out” the earlier “*auto*”? Either way, Lectionary 2378 clearly follows the variant reading.

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 8:2 the TR’s Greek reading, “*elthon* (‘there came,’ more literally, ‘having come,’ aorist active participle, nominative singular, from *erchomai*),” in the words, “And, behold, there came (*elthon*) a leper and worshipped him (*auto*),” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is likewise supported in the Latin reading, “*leprosus* (a leper) *veniens* (‘there came,’ present active participle, nominative singular, from *venio*),” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century) and old Latin Versions 1 (7th / 8th century) and ff1 (10th / 11th century); and with minor variations in the verse not relevant to this issue, also by the old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However an alternative reading, Greek, “*proselthōn* (‘there came unto,’ i.e., adding *pros* meaning “to” or “unto” before *elthōn*, aorist active participle, nominative singular, from *proserchomai*),” i.e., “there came unto [him],” is a minority Byzantine reading, followed by Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), E 07 (8th century), M 021 (9th century), Minuscule 108 (11th century); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century). What is arguably a similar type of reading is found as Latin, “*introivit* (‘he went in,’ perfect indicative active, 3rd person singular verb, from *introeo*),” in old Latin Version k (4th / 5th centuries). It is further followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore correct. When this terminology appears elsewhere in St. Matthew’s Gospel, such as in Matt. 4:3, “came to” or “came unto” is usually followed immediately by “to him” (thus making the second “to” of “to him” redundant in English translation) i.e., “and when the tempter came to (*proselthōn*) him (*auto*)” (cf. Matt. 5:1; 8:5; 9:14,28; 13:36; 14:15; 15:30; 17:14; 19:3; 20:20; 21:14,23; 22:23; 26:7,69), or as part of the immediate clause (Matt. 8:25; 24:1). While this is absent in Matt. 26:73 (where “him” is added in italics in the AV), the more normative expectation in St. Matthew’s Gospel if *proselthōn* were original, would be to find “*auto* (to him)” following *proselthōn* i.e., “there came to (*proselthōn*) him (*auto*) a leper and worshipped him (*auto*).” It is notable that in the ASV’s translation of this variant, “him” is added, *but not in italics* (the ASV reading is based on the Westcott-Hort Text, which is based on other manuscripts following this variant that are outside the closed class of three witnesses). Given that this is a minority Byzantine reading, a good textual argument therefore exists against it on the grounds that in St. Matthew’s Gospel, it is an improbable, though not impossible, reading.

The origins of this variant are speculative. However, it appears to be a superficial assimilation to other Matthean usage of *proselthōn*, especially the nearby Matt. 8:5. Was this inadvertent? Did “*elthōn*” have a stylistic paper space before it e.g., due to the fact that it came at the beginning of a line, and there was a gap left at the end of the previous line? If so, due to a paper fade, did the original “ ” at the end of one line and “*elthōn*” of the beginning of the next line, come to look something like, “ ” and “*:.thōn*” respectively? Was this then “reconstructed” by a scribe over two lines as “*proselthōn*” with some reference to Matt. 8:5? Or was this a deliberate “stylistic improvement” by a superficial and incompetent scribe who considered that on the basis of Matt. 8:5 *et al*, *proselthōn* “sounded more Matthean”? Deliberate or accidental assimilation to Matt. 8:5? We cannot be sure. We can only be sure that it is not original.

As a representative Byzantine reading, with support from St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, a number of old Latin Versions, the church father, St. Hilary of Poitiers in France, and a good textual argument against the variant reading, the reading of the TR is sure. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading in Matt. 8:2 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 8:2, “there came,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (mixed text type in Gospels, 9th century) and 1241 (independent in Gospels, 12th century). It is also followed by the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); and a Coptic Version.

The incorrect reading, “there came unto [him],” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in Minuscules 1 (independent in Gospels, 12th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 13 (independent, 13th century), and 209 (independent in Gospels, 14th century). It is also followed in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); Gothic Version (4th century), Armenian Version (5th century), Syriac Harclean h (616) Version, and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect reading entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 8:2, although a footnote in Nestle-Aland refers to the correct reading. Amidst the dynamic equivalents is difficult to know for sure which reading the NIV followed, though they appear to have followed the correct reading, (though removing the “behold” i.e., Greek “*idou*”), in their translation, “A man with leprosy came and knelt before him” (NIV). The incorrect reading is found in the ASV, which fails to put “him” in italics, reading, “And behold (*idou*), there came to (*proselthon*) him a leper” (ASV). The errors of the ASV were also followed in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV.

**Matt. 8:3** “Jesus” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek, “*o (-) Iesous* (Jesus),” in the words, “And Jesus put forth his hand,” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Codices W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), the purple parchment, Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), the purple parchment, N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, 6th century); and the two Sydney University Lectionaries written in brown ink with colourful bright red illumination of key letters and section markers, to wit, Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*, abbreviating to “*oiσ*” with a bar on top of the “*ισ*”) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*, abbreviating “*ι̅σ̅*” to “*oic*” with a bar on top of “*ic*”). It is further supported as Latin, “*Iesus* (Jesus),” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), g2 (10th century), and c (12th / 13th century), (although old Latin Versions a, c, f, g1, and g2, place “*Iesus*” earlier in the verse than does the Vulgate and other old Latin versions). It is further supported by the ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592) (following g1, which places it earlier in this clause than the other old Latin Versions).

However, a variant which omits “*o (-) Iesous* (Jesus),” is found in the ancient church Greek writer, Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444). The omission also occurs in old Latin Version k (4th / 5th centuries).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must therefore stand as correct. The origins of this variant are conjectural. Possibly the loss of “*O* (‘the’) *IC* (‘Jesus,’ abbreviated from *IECOYC*)” i.e., “*OIC*” came about from a paper fade of “*OIC*.” If so, its omission may have gone unnoticed by a scribe who thought the three letter’s blank space were a stylistic gap, such as one finds in Manuscript Washington.

On the one hand, the TR has the support of the representative Byzantine Text e.g., W 032, S 042, and N 022; and also has support from Saint Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, and an ancient church

father, St. Hilary. But on the other hand, there is some movement within the old Latin Versions as to exactly where “Jesus” is placed in the text, with old Latin Version k omitting it, and one ancient writer also omitting it. Balancing out these considerations, and bearing in mind the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “Jesus,” in Matt. 8:3 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 8:3, “Jesus,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and the (mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further followed in all extant Syriac Versions the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; together with an independent manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; the Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century); and the Armenian Version (5th century).

The incorrect reading which omits “Jesus,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), the (mixed text in the Gospels) Minuscule 33 (ninth century) and (mixed text type) Minuscule 892 (9th century). It is further followed in some independent manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; as well as the Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); Gothic Version (4th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect reading entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 8:3, although a footnote in Nestle-Aland refers to the correct reading “Jesus.” Following the Westcott-Hort Text’s ASV, which reads, “And he stretched forth his hand,” the name of “Jesus” is omitted in the RSV, NRSV, and ESV (which puts the correct reading in the main text, but then with a footnote claims that the Greek supports only the variant,) together with the NASB’s 1st edition and 2nd edition. However, showing an uncharacteristic, albeit very welcome, critical usage of the NU Text textual apparatus, this position has been altered, and the correct reading has been adopted in the NASB’s 3rd edition; as indeed it always was in the NIV’s reading.

**Matt. 8:5** “when Jesus was entered” (TR & AV) {C}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

Outside the closed class of sources Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron reads in Ciasca’s Latin translation, “*Et (And) cum (when) introisset (entered) Iesus (Jesus) Capernaum (Capernaum)*,” i.e., “And when Jesus entered Capernaum.” Since the “parallel” reading of Luke 7:1 lacks the name “Jesus,” this means the Arabic Diatessaron is necessarily drawing this element from Matt. 8:5. Therefore I show the Arabic Diatessaron following the TR’s reading, *infra*.

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 8:5 the Greek of the *Textus Receptus* (TR), “*Eiselthonti* (‘when was entered,’ or more literally, ‘having entered,’ aorist active participle, masculine singular dative [in agreement with the *to*], from *eiserchomai*) ... *to* (-) *Iēsou* (Jesus)” i.e., “when Jesus was entered,” in the verse, “And when Jesus was entered into Capernaum, there came unto him a centurion” (AV)

etc., is a minority Byzantine reading supported by Minuscules 2 (Basle, Switzerland, 12th century) and 1354 (Jerusalem, Israel, 14th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*, abbreviating the “*Iesou*” to “*ι̅*” with a bar on top of the upsilon). It is further supported in the similar reading, “*Elthonti* (‘when was entered,’ or more literally, ‘having entered,’ aorist active participle, masculine singular dative from *erchomai*) *τ̅* (-) *Iu* (‘Jesus,’ abbreviating the “*Iesou*” to “*ι̅*” with a bar on top of the iota and upsilon)” i.e., “when Jesus was entered,” in Lectionary 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). (Both Lectionaries omit the “*de*” / “And” before “*τ̅ Iesou*” as part of Lectionary formatting.) The name of “Jesus” here, is also supported as Latin, “*introisset* (‘when he had entered into,’ active subjunctive pluperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *introeo*<sup>77</sup>) *Iesus* (Jesus),” i.e., “when Jesus had entered,” by the old Latin Versions *aur* (7th century) and *c* (12th / 13th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430)<sup>78</sup>. It is manifested in e.g., Stephanus’s Greek NT (1550 & 1551) and Beza’s Greek NT (1598).

However, an alternative reading, *Variant 1*, Greek, “*Eiselthonti* (‘when was entered,’ per TR, *supra*) ... *αυτ̅* (to him),” making the verse, “And when he was entered into Capernaum, there came unto him a centurion,” is the majority Byzantine reading e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). It is further followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

Another reading, *Variant 2*, Latin, “*Cum* (‘when,’ word 1) *autem* (‘and,’ word 2) *introisset* (‘when he had entered into,’ word 3) *Capharnaum* (‘Capernaum,’ word 4),” i.e., “And when he had entered into Capernaum,” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions 1 (7th / 8th century) and ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found with the same meaning in Latin word order 2,1,3,4, in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), h (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), and g1 (8th / 9th century); and in Latin word order 1,2,3,4, inserting the additional and redundant “*in* (into)” between words 3 and 4, in old Latin Version f (6th century). With reference to the Greek of the TR and *Variant 3*, *Variant 2* might be reconstructed as Greek, “*Eiselthontos* (‘entering,’ aorist active participle, masculine singular genitive, from *eiserchomai*) ... *αυτου* (of him).”

---

<sup>77</sup> The active subjunctive pluperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *introeo*, is *introivisset*. However, the syncopated perfect may drop the “*v*,” and as here, quite often additionally contract the vowels, thus here becoming, *introisset*. The syncopated perfect is here best rendered, “when he had entered into,” since as a pluperfect subjunctive, it here indicates an action that occurred *before* the main verb.

<sup>78</sup> St. Augustine in: Migne (Latin Writers Series) (1841 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 40, p. 413 (Of Holy Virginity, 32) (Latin). Augustine says, “The ‘centurion’ ... said ... ‘I am not worthy that thou shouldest enter under my roof’ [Luke 7:6]. Whence also Matthew [Matt. 8:5,8], for no other reason says that he ‘came (Latin, *accessisse*) unto (Latin, *ad*)’ ‘Jesus (Latin, *Iesum*)’ [Matt. 8:5]; whereas Luke most plainly signifies that he came not unto him himself, but ‘sent’ his friend [Luke 7:3].” (*Of Holy Virginity* 32, in Austin’s *Works*. Though Schaff’s translation fails to comprehensively use quotations marks, see his *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, first series, *op. cit.*, Vol. 3, p. 428).

Yet another reading, *Variant 3*, Greek “*iselthontos* (‘entering,’ per *Variant 2, supra*) ... *tou* (of the) *Kuriou* (Lord),” making the relevant reading, “And when the Lord was entered into Capernaum,” is followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

A textual problem exists with the representative Byzantine Text reading, “And when he was entered into Capernaum” (*Variant 1*). Subject to only one qualified exception, *infra*, in the passages surrounding Matt. 8:5-13, each new sub-section, which in our AV’s is a new paragraph, uses the name of “Jesus” to start it, where there is discussion of another person in the preceding verse, so as to avoid initial confusion by the reader.

Let us consider the wider immediate stylistic context of Matt. 7:28-9:8. In the nearby sub-sections, Matt. 7:28,29 ends with Christ teaching “as one having authority, and not as the scribes,” so there is no confusion when Matt. 8:1 commences, “When he was come” etc., or Matt. 8:2 “there came a leper and worshipped him.” But lest the reader be thinking of the leper who said, “Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean” (Matt. 8:2), and initially think the leper’s “hand” be meant, Matt. 8:3 commences, “And Jesus put forth his hand” (Matt. 8:3).

So too, with the Matt. 8:5-13 section ending, “And his servant was healed in the selfsame hour;” lest one think it was this servant who then “was come into Peter’s house,” Matt. 8:14,15 commences with, “And when Jesus was come into Peter’s house.” The subsection of Matt. 8:18-22 ends with “Jesus” speaking” a short sentence, “Follow me; and let the dead bury their dead;” so that when the subsection Matt. 8:23-27 commences, “And when he was entered into a ship, his disciples followed him,” is clearly referring to Christ, as immediately clarified by “the (*oi*) disciples (*mathetai*) of him (*autou*)” i.e., “his disciples” (AV). The subsection Matt. 8:23-27 ends with a clear focus on Christ, with “the men” “saying, What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him!;” so there is no confusion when the subsection Matt. 8:28-34 starts with, “And when he was come to the other side.” So too, it ends with “the whole city came out to meet Jesus: and when they saw him, they besought him that he would depart out of their coasts” (Matt. 8:34); so again there is no confusion when “Matt. 9:1-8 commences with, “And he entered into a ship.”

Now to this, is the exception of Matt. 8:16,17, where after discussing Peter’s mother-in-law, ending with, “and she arose, and ministered unto them” (Matt. 8:15), the next sub-section starts, “When the even was come, they brought unto him” (Matt. 8:16). But since there is a change in linguistic gender from the feminine (Matt. 8:15), i.e., “her (*autēs*, literally ‘of her’) hand,” “the fever left her (*autēn*),” and then “she arose (*egerthē*);” it follows that when one reads in Matt. 8:16 the Greek masculine linguistic gender, “When the even was come, though brought unto him (*autō*),” that one knows the focus is back on Christ. There is a further good stylistic reason for not using “Jesus” in Matt. 8:16, namely, to help strengthen the parallel reading of “himself” in the prophetic fulfilment in Matt. 8:17, i.e., that “which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself (*Autos*) took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses.”

On this basis, when we read in Matt. 8:4, “And Jesus saith unto him, See thou tell no man; but go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them,” the focus is on the healed leper. Hence when we read in the next verse (Matt. 8:5) of the representative Byzantine Text, “And when he was entered into Capernaum, there came unto him a centurion” etc., we are uncharacteristically left in confusion i.e., who is

the “he” (*auto* literally, ‘to him’), to whom this centurion is coming? Is it the healed leper? Or is it Christ? The stylistic incongruity of this ambiguity in Matt. 8:5, being at variance with the stylistic clarity and rules clearly followed in the immediately surrounding wider section of Matt. 7:28-9:8; means that the “he” in the representative Byzantine reading of Matt 8:5, “And when he was entered into Capernaum,” sticks out like the proverbial “sore thumb.” This swelling stylistic “sore” can only be healed by adopting the ancient reading of the learned church doctor, St. Augustine, which is further supported by some old Latin Versions. Thus like Stephanus and Beza, we recognize that the lesser maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, stands in perpetual subservience to the greater maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*; for we avail ourselves of the Latin reading, only when compelled to do so from textual analysis of the Greek reading.

Furthermore, we are also able to clearly find this reading in the Greek of our two Sydney University Lectionaries. In Greek, “*eis*” means “into” and so our English translation does not vary between the shorter, “*Elthonti* (when was entered)” in Lectionary 2378 over the longer “*Eiselthonti* (when was entered)” of the Received Text. Was this an accidental change? Was the “*eis*” prefix lost in an undetected paper fade? Was this a deliberate change? Did a scribe, perhaps looking to “save space” on his parchment, remove what he regarded as “the redundant” “*eis*” prefix?

As to the origin of *Variant 1*, in which “*o Iesou* (Jesus)” became “*auto* (to him),” it is possible that this was a deliberate “stylistic improvement” by an inferior quality scribe, who himself knowing the context, thought “Jesus” was redundant, and superficially justified this on the basis of e.g., Matt. 8:1,16,23,28,9:1. Alternatively, this may have been an accidental alteration, from a paper loss. I.e., in a handwritten manuscript, probably in columns on a page, that originally looked something like:

*MOCHC EIS MAPTYPION*  
*AYTOIC EICELTHONTI DE TQ*  
*IHCOY EIS KAPEPPNAOYM*  
*PROCHLTHEN AYTQ*

If due to a paper loss, “*TQ IHCOY*” (or *to Iesou*) dropped out, i.e.,

*MOCHC EIS MAPTYPION*  
*AYTOIC EICELTHONTI DE :::*  
*::::: EIS KAPEPPNAOYM*  
*PROCHLTHEN AYTQ*

*Variant 1* may have simply been reconstructed by a well meaning, but inferior quality scribe, as “*AYTQ*” (or *auto*), superficially justifying this on the basis of e.g., Matt. 8:1,16,23,28,9:1.

Alternatively, if “*IHCOY* (Jesus)” had been abbreviated to “*IY*” (see “*IN*” in preliminary textual discussion at Matt. 1:25); the paper loss of “*TQIY*” would have been about the same, so the paper loss, or ink-blotch covering, may have been on the same line i.e., “...*DETQIYEIS*...” may have become “...*DE:::EIS*...”. Furthermore, if the letters “*T*” and “*Y*” remained loose on the page following a fraying of the paper and associated paper loss, rearranging them to form the second and third letters of “*AYTQ*,” may have seemed to the scribe to be a viable reconstruction of the text. Were the origins of this variant deliberate or accidental? We cannot be sure. We

only know for sure that a change occurred in the text.

*Variant 3*, “And when the Lord was entered into Capernaum,” was possibly Origen’s deliberate “stylistic improvement,” in which he substituted his preferred nomenclature, “the Lord,” for the Greek text’s “Jesus,” and made an associated change from “when was entered (*eiselthonti*)” to “entering (*eiselthontos*).” Alternatively, this may have been an accidental alteration, from a paper loss. I.e., in a handwritten manuscript, probably in columns on a page, that originally looked something like *supra*, if due to a paper loss, the “*T*” of “*EICELTHONTI*” had dropped out, as had the “*DE*” (or *de*, meaning “And”), and also the “*TQ IHC*” (or *to Ies*), leaving the last two letters of “*IHCOY* (Jesus)”, *OY* (or *ou*) i.e.,

*MOCHC EIS MAPTYPION*  
*AYTOIC EICELTHONT:::.....*  
 :::*OY* ...

*Variant 3* may have simply been reconstructed by Origen, as “*EICELTHONTOC*” (or *eiselthontos*); and the last two letters of “*IHCOY* (Jesus)” *OY* (or *ou*), may have been thought by Origen to have been the last two letters of “*TOY KYPIOY*” (or *tou Kuriou*),” on the superficial basis of “Lord” (*Kurie*) in e.g., Matt. 7:22; 8:2,6,8,21,25. Where the origins of this variant deliberate or accidental? We cannot be sure. We only know for sure that a change occurred in the text.

It is possible that *Variant 2*, “*Eiselthontos* (entering) ... *autou* (of him),” was a deliberate “stylistic improvement” by an inferior quality scribe, who himself knowing the context, thought “Jesus” was redundant, and superficially justified this on the basis of e.g., Matt. 8:1,16,23,28,9:1. Alternatively, this may have been an accidental alteration from a paper loss. I.e., in a handwritten manuscript, probably in columns on a page, that originally looked something like *supra*, if due to a paper loss, the “*T*” of “*EICELTHONTI*” had dropped out and also “*TQ IHC*” (or *to Ies*) dropped out, leaving the last two letters of “Jesus” *OY* (or *ou*) i.e.,

*MOCHC EIS MAPTYPION*  
*AYTOIC EICELTHONT:: DE :::*  
 :::*OY EIS KAPEPPNAOYM*  
*PROCHLTHEN AYTQ*

The first part of *Variant 2* may have simply been reconstructed by a well meaning, but inferior quality scribe, as “*EICELTHONTOC*” (or *eiselthontos*), possibly influenced by the “*EICELTHONTOC*” (or *eiselthontos*) of Origen’s reading “*iselthontos* (entering) ... *tou* (of the) *Kuriou* (Lord).” The second part of *Variant 2* may have simply been reconstructed by a well meaning, but inferior quality scribe, as “*AYTOY*” (or *autou*), superficially justifying this on the basis of e.g., Matt. 8:1,16,23,28,9:1. Where the origins of this variant deliberate or accidental? We cannot be sure. We only know for sure that a change occurred in the text.

On the one hand, textual factors strongly favour the reading of the *Textus Receptus*, which has the support of the ancient church doctor, St. Austin of Hippo, as well as some old Latin Versions. But on the other hand, this preferred reading is not as well attested to as *Variants 1* and *2*. Taking into account these factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “when Jesus was entered,” at Matt. 8:5 a “C” i.e., the text of the TR is the

correct reading, but has a lower level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 8:5, “when Jesus was entered,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (Paris, 8th century). It is further followed in some Syriac Versions, the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version. It is also found in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The incorrect *Variant 1*, “when he was entered,” is also found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (Greek *Codex Sangallensis*, 9th century) and the (mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (*Codex Coridethianus*, 9th century); as well as (the independent text) Minuscule 157 (12th century). In the precise form used by Origen, *Variant 3* lacks a further textual history outside the closed classes of sources.

The incorrect *Variant 2*, (translating into English the same as *Variant 1*), “when he was entered,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), and (the independent) Codex Z 035 (6th century). It is also found in e.g., Minuscules 21 (independent in Gospels, 9th century), 33 (9th century, mixed in the Gospels, Alexandrian text Acts-Jude), 700 (independent, 11th century), 788 (independent, 11th century), 1 (independent in Gospels, 12th century), 13 (independent, 13th century), and 209 (independent in Gospels & Revelation, 14th / 15th century).

*Variant 2* entered the NU Text *et al.* It is found in the American Standard Version at Matt. 8:5 as, “And when he was entered into Capernaum” (ASV). It is likewise followed in the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NASB’s 1st edition and 2nd edition. However, the NASB has corrected this error, and adopted the correct reading in the NASB’s 3rd edition. The correct reading is also found in the NIV.

Burgon & Miller (1899) here specifically reject *Variant 2*, but then adopt *Variant 1* over the TR’s reading. The Burgon & Miller majority text preference for *Variant 1* is followed by both the majority texts of Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005).

*Thus the Burgonites and Neo-Alexandrians here form a pact to “choke at each other’s throat,” with the winner to then turn and “choke the throat” of the TR. But all to no avail. As the Burgonites and Neo-Alexandrians grip at each other’s throats, one hand of the TR extends to choke the Burgonites and the other hand of the TR extends to choke the Neo-Alexandrians. They simultaneously fall dead to the ground. Once again, it is a victory for the Received Text!*

**Matt. 8:7** “Jesus” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek reading, “ο (-) *Iēsous* (Jesus),” in the words, “And Jesus said unto him,” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). It is also supported as Latin, “*Iesus* (Jesus),” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur

(7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is also supported as Latin, “*Ihesus* (Jesus),” in the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century), although this Diatessaron’s common Latin spelling of “*Ihesus*” rather than the Vulgate’s spelling of “*Iesus*,” both here and throughout the Sangallensis Diatessaron, acts to show some small and inconsequential difference inside this Vulgate Codex. From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, an alternative reading which omits “Jesus,” is found in old Latin Version k (Africa, 4th / 5th centuries).

There is no good textual reason to doubt the representative Byzantine Text, which is therefore the correct reading. The origins of the variant are conjectural. Did the loss of “O (‘the’) IC (abbreviated from *IECOYC*, ‘Jesus’)” i.e., “*OIC*” came about from a paper fade or paper loss at the end of a line, of “*OIC*”? If so, its omission may have gone unnoticed by a scribe who thought e.g., the paper fade of three letter’s blank space was a stylistic gap, such as one finds in Manuscript Washington.

With such strong support from both the Greek and Latin, including the support of the church doctor, St. Gregory the Great, for a reading that raises no textual problems, and such correspondingly poor support for the variant; on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 8:7 an “A,” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 8:7, “Jesus,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0250 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (mixed text in Gospels, 9th century), 157 (independent text, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is further found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions, and some Syriac Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions; some manuscripts of the Coptic Bohairic Version; and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The incorrect reading which omits “Jesus,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Minuscule 892 (9th century); as well as the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century); and Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century).

The incorrect reading which omits “Jesus,” entered the NU Text *et al.* Hence the name of “Jesus” is omitted at Matt. 8:7 in the ASV which reads, “And he saith unto him.” It is further omitted in the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NASB 1st and 2nd editions. However, this NASB position has been altered, and the correct reading has been adopted in the NASB’s 3rd edition. The correct reading is also found in the NIV.

**Matt. 8:8a** “speak the word” (TR & AV) {C}

The TR’s Greek, “*eipe* (‘thou speak,’ aorist active imperative, 2nd person singular verb, from *lego*) *logon* (‘the word,’ masculine singular accusative, second declension noun, from *logos*)” (AV), in the words, “but speak the word only,” is a minority Byzantine reading, found in Codex Gamma 036 (*Codex Oxoniensis Bodleianus*, 10th century, Bodleian Library, Oxford University, UK); Minuscule 270 (Paris, France, 12th century); and the two Sydney University Lectionaries written in brown ink with colourful bright red illumination of key letters and section markers, to wit, Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). It is also supported as Latin, “*dic* (‘thou speak,’ present active imperative, 2nd person singular verb, from *dico*) *verbum* (‘the word,’ neuter singular accusative, second declension noun, from *verbum-i*),” i.e., “speak the word,” by old Latin Versions 1 (7th / 8th century) and ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Basil the Great (d. 379). It is manifested in e.g., Stephanus’s Greek NT (1550 & 1551) and Beza’s Greek NT (1598).

However, an alternative reading, Greek, “*eipe* (‘thou say’) *logo* (‘in a word’ or ‘with a word,’ masculine singular dative, second declension noun, from *logos*),” i.e., “say in a word” or “say with a word,” is the majority Byzantine reading e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). It is further followed as Latin, “*dic* (thou say) *verbo* (‘in a word’ or ‘with a word,’ neuter singular dative, second declension noun, from *verbum-i*),” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions b (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254), and ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430)<sup>79</sup>.

According to e.g., the religiously liberal neo-Alexandrian text’s UBS 3rd edition (1975), UBS 3rd corrected edition (1983), and 4th revised edition (1993) *Greek New Testament*, Matt. 8:5-13; Luke 7:1-10; and John 4:43-54 are parallel Gospel accounts. But I consider we must be very careful about so called “parallel” stories in the Gospels. I certainly do not think that Matt. 8:5-13 and Luke 7:1-10 recount the same story as John 4:46-54.

For instance, John 4:46,47,50,53 speaks of a “son (*uios*),” which is therefore also the meaning of “son (*pais*)” in John 4:51; which contrasts with the “servant (*pais*)” of Matt. 8:6,8,13. The nobleman of Capernaum wanted Christ to “come down” to where his “child” was, but Christ refused, saying, “Go thy way; thy son liveth” (John 4:49,50). This is the complete opposite of the centurion of Capernaum, who did not want Christ to “come under my roof,” and who by his faith thus halted Christ’s physical movement to his house (Matt. 8:8,10,13).

---

<sup>79</sup> St. Augustine in: Migne (Latin Writers Series) (1841 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 35, p. 1749 (Gospel of St. John, 49:5) (Latin). Like the Vulgate, Austin’s Latin reads, “*sed* (but) *tantum* (only) *dic* (say) *verbo* (the word).” The claim of Schaff, that it reads, “*sed* (but) *tantum* (only) *dic* (speak) *verbum* (the word),” i.e., “but speak the word only” (Schaff), is not correct. Schaff, P., (Editor), *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, [first series,] *op. cit.*, Vol. 7, p. 272 (English translation).

The healing of John 4:46-54 was “the second miracle that Jesus did” in “Galilee” (John 4:54), his first being the time he changed water into wine, which was at “Cana of Galilee” (John 2:1-11). Capernaum is on the east of the Sea of Galilee, and so St. John evidently includes the region around the Sea of Galilee in his terminology of “Galilee.”<sup>80</sup> But in addition to this first miracle, by the time of Matt. 8:5-13, we are told in the immediately preceding verses of Matt. 8:2-4 that Christ also performed the miracle of healing a leper (Matt. 8:2-4), after the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5-7; 8:1) i.e., also in “Galilee” (Matt. 4:23), so that Matt. 8:5-13 could not possibly be only Christ’s “second miracle in “Galilee” (John 4:54) i.e., it was at least his third miracle in Galilee.

Furthermore, before Luke 7:1-10, St. Luke records: that Christ had “done” some miraculous work at “Capernaum,” which on the basis of the “proverb, Physician, heal thyself,” probably alludes to the healing of John 4:46-54, and possibly other work Christ wrought there (Luke 4:23) i.e., in “Galilee” (Luke 4:14). St. Luke also records the exorcism of the devil-possessed man “in the synagogue” at “Capernaum, a city of Galilee” (Luke 4:31-37); the healing of the leper (Luke 5:12-16), which may or may not have been in Galilee (John 4:54); the healing of the man sick of palsy (Luke 5:17-26), which may or may not have been in “Galilee” (Luke 5:17); and the sabbath day healing of the man with the withered hand (Luke 6:6-11), which may or may not have been in Galilee. Since St. Luke records at least two prior miracles in Galilee (Luke 4:23; 4:31-37), this also clearly acts to rule out any possibility that the healing of the sick’n’dying centurion’s servant in Luke 7:1-10 was only “the second miracle that Jesus did” in “Galilee” (John 4:54) i.e., it was at least his third miracle in Galilee. Indeed, when we combine St. Matthew’s and St. Luke’s account, we know that there were at least three prior miracles performed by Christ in Galilee (Luke 4:23; 31-37; Matt. 8:2-4), so that the miracle of Matt. 8:5-13; Luke 7:1-10 was at least Christ’s fourth miracle at Galilee. Thus the miracle of Matt. 8:5-13; Luke 7:1-10 could certainly not have been “the second miracle that Jesus did” in “Galilee” (John

---

<sup>80</sup> This is different to the designation of the region by Imperial Roman provinces, since in the time of Christ there was a Province of Galilee to the east of the Sea of Galilee (under the Tetrarchy of Herod Antipas), a Province including Gaulanitis to the north-east of the Sea of Galilee that included the City of Capernaum (under the Tetrarchy of Philip), and a Province of Decapolis to the south-east of the Sea of Galilee (which was a province of Syria).

4:54).

Thus in time, Matt. 8:5-13; Luke 7:1-10 must have come after John 4:46-54. This is in itself significant. As one who has visited Capernaum on the Sea of Galilee (in February 2002), I can testify that by modern standards it was a small city. It therefore seems likely to me that this centurion would have heard of Christ's earlier miracle in which he healed the nobleman's sick'n'dying son (Luke 4:23; John 4:47). Moreover, at Capernaum I inspected *The White Synagogue* (built with white stones), dating from the 4th century A.D., which is built on the still visible foundation stones of *The Black Synagogue* (built with black stones); and which it is thought may well be the synagogue dating back to New Testament times. These foundation stones act to remind us that it was this Gentile Japhethite centurion who "built" the "synagogue" at "Capernaum" (Luke 7:1,5); and so it is also surely likely that he had heard of Christ's earlier exorcism of the devil-possessed man in the Capernaum Synagogue (Luke 4:31-37). If God used these (and possibly other) events to illicit faith in Christ from the centurion for the healing of his sick'n'dying servant (Luke 7:2), then this helps to explain the evident pre-existing faith in Christ as "Lord" (Matt. 8:8; 7:6; I Cor. 12:3), given by God to the centurion of Capernaum, and manifested in the story of Matt. 8:5-13; Luke 7:1-10.

In contrast with John 4:46-54; it seems to me that Matt. 8:5-13 and Luke 7:1-10 are indeed telling the same story, albeit generally recounting different elements of it (cf. commentary at Matt. 8:28). The words of Matt. 8:10b; Luke 7:9; namely, that "Jesus" "marvelled," "and said," "I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel;" are in my opinion so extraordinary and unqualified, that they must constitute parallel Gospel readings, said at the same time. This conclusion is also supported by the fact, that both gospels record that this story was about a "centurion" (Matt. 8:5; Luke 7:2) of "Capernaum" (Matt. 8:5; Luke 7:1), who had a "sick" "servant" (Matt. 8:6; Luke 7:2). The character of this man, which exhibits both a typical white supremacist military character (Gen. 9:27), coupled with a godly humility (reminiscent of so many former saints in the godly Protestant white supremacist British Empire), together with the general similarity of this army officer's terminology found in Matt. 8:8,9 and Luke 7:6-8; all surely indicate that this is the same man, in the same circumstances, in both St. Matthew's and St. Luke's Gospels.

Therefore, I think the sequence of events in the two gospels was as follows:

- 1) The centurion sent "the elders of the Jews" to Jesus (Luke 7:1-6b).
- 2) The "centurion" then "sent friends" to Jesus, thinking, "I am not worthy that" the "Lord" "shouldest enter under my roof" (Luke 7:6b-8).
- 3) Possibly influenced in his thinking by the fact that the nobleman of Capernaum had spoken to Christ in person (John 4:49,50); upon matured reflection, the centurion of Capernaum changed his mind, and decided he would also petition Christ in person. While the delegation of "friends" he had sent were still there, the centurion then arrived in person, either as they were finishing, or had just finished, speaking. Here fit the events of Matt. 8:5-9.
- 4) Matt. 8:10 parallels Luke 7:9, i.e., "Jesus" "marvelled," "and said," "I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel."
- 5) Christ then said the words of Matt. 8:11-13b.
- 6) The centurion's friends who "were sent," then returned "to the house" (Luke 7:10a).
- 7) Both Gospels then tell of the servant's miraculous healing (Matt. 8:13b; Luke 7:10b).

This means that St. Matthew's and St. Luke's Gospels have complimentary perspectives, focusing on different characters in the same story. This is sometimes a feature of the four Gospels, also evident elsewhere (e.g., the diverse character development connected with the resurrection accounts of different Gospels).

However, the words of Christ at Matt. 8:8a in the representative Byzantine Text, namely, "say (*eipe*) in a word (*logō*)," or "say (*eipe*) with a word (*logō*)," present a textual difficulty. The word "say (*eipe*)" is a conditional imperative i.e., it states a condition (or "protasis"), upon which the fulfilment (or "apodosis") of another verb depends. Put simply, *If condition A is met; then consequence B will happen*. But in the representative Byzantine Text, the consequence, "and my servant shall be healed," is premised on the condition that Christ "say (*eipe*) in a word (*logō*) only," or "say (*eipe*) with a word (*logō*) only." The Greek word, *logos* ("word"), is here declined as "*logō*" i.e., a (singular masculine) dative, used for the indirect object ("to," "for," "in," or "with"). The dative is used to designate that which is of more remote concern, such as with *personal interest*, referring to someone "to" or "for" or "with" something is done.

The dative's usage in Luke 7:7, "but (*alla*) say (*eipe*) in a word (*logō*)," is entirely appropriate, since Christ has made no commitment to say any word of healing, and the centurion asks via his delegation that Christ might "say (*eipe*) in a word (*logō*), and my servant shall be healed" (Luke 7:7). But it is quite another matter here in Matt. 8:8a. For here, at a later point in time, the centurion himself has come to Christ, and Christ has specifically given an undertaking to say such a word of healing, stating plainly, "I will come and heal him" (Matt. 8:7). Under these circumstances, for the centurion to now say in the remote dative sense, "say (*eipe*) in a word (*logō*) only, and my servant shall be healed," would indicate doubt and uncertainty on his part as to the word of Christ, "I will come and heal him" (Matt. 8:7). Such a usage of the dative here, is not consistent with the clear teaching of the passage that this is a man of faith, indeed, one of whom Christ says, "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel" (Matt. 8:10).

This textual difficulty can be overcome by following the Matt. 8:8a reading of St. Basil the Great (*Epistle 42*) i.e., "speak (*eipe*) the word (*logon*) only, and my servant shall be healed."<sup>81</sup> The Greek word, *logos* ("word"), is here declined as *logon* i.e., a (singular masculine) accusative, used for the direct object. The accusative has the function of limiting the action of a verb, i.e., as to the verb's goal, or extent, or scope, or direction. Its usage here in Matt. 8:8a is appropriate, and relieves the textual concerns of the representative Byzantine Text reading. Christ has already undertaken to say a word of healing, saying, "I will come and heal him" (Matt. 8:7). Now, the centurion seeks to limit this action, petitioning Christ that he "speak (*eipe*) the word (*logon*) only, and my servant shall be healed." Such a usage of the accusative indicates certainty on his part that Christ was going to heal his servant, and is consistent with the clear teaching of the passage that this is a man of "great faith" (Matt. 8:10).

Therefore the reading of St. Basil *et al* is the preferred reading. The origins of the variant are conjectural. Origen was possibly the originator of the incorrect reading at Matt. 8:8a, and he was also possibly responsible for the change of this text at Matt. 8:8b, *infra*. The incorrect

---

<sup>81</sup> St. Basil the Great in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1886 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 32, p. 352 (Epistle 42) (Greek); Schaff, P. & Wace, H. (Editors), *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, second series, 1891, Vol. 8 (Basil), p. 114 (English translation).

reading appears to have arisen as a scribal assimilation of Matt. 8:8a with Luke 7:7, by one seeking to harmonize so called “parallel” gospel readings, which in fact are not parallel at all. (This assimilation was also possibly influenced by some superficial reference to the nearby non-specific, unstated, and appropriately dative, usage of “word” in Matt. 8:16. Cf. the dative “words” in Acts 2:40.) Whether this assimilation was a deliberate “stylistic improvement,” or an erroneous “reconstruction” of “*logō*” following a paper loss of the “*on*” ending from “*logon*,” is speculative and so uncertain

On the one hand, textual considerations favour the Received Text’s reading at Matt. 8:8a “speak (*eipe*) the word (*logon*); which is a minority Byzantine Greek reading and minority old Latin reading, supported by the ancient church doctor and father, St. Basil the Great (Bishop of Caesarea c. 329-379). But on the other hand, the alternative reading, “say (*eipe*) in a word (*logō*),” is the representative Byzantine Greek reading and representative Latin reading, followed by an ancient church writer, (possibly its originator,) Origen. Weighing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 8:8a a “C,” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading, but has a lower level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 8:8a, “speak the word,” is found in (the independent text) Minuscule 157 (12th century) and (independent text) Minuscule 1071 (12th century). It is further found in the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the incorrect reading, “say in a word” or “say with a word,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Gothic Version (4th century).

The incorrect reading entered the NU Text *et al*, e.g., it had entered earlier neo-Alexandrian critical texts such as e.g., Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72). It is found in the earlier Westcott-Hort Text’s ASV in translating Matt. 8:8a as “say the word” (ASV), with a clarifying footnote reading, which states that on the text it is following, the “Greek” literally reads, “say with a word” (ASV fn). This reading is followed without the ASV’s clarifying footnote in the NASB, RSV, ESV, and NIV. The NKJV also shows confusion and lack of understanding in the *contextual* sense of the Greek, with its translation of Matt. 8:8a as “speak a word” (NKJV) (rather than “speak the word,” AV), and Luke 7:7 as “say the word” (NKJV) (rather than, “say in a word,” AV or “say with a word,” ASV Luke 7:7 footnote). Notably, the correct reading is found in the NRSV.

Let us thank God for our *Saint James Bibles*, which amidst such confusion, accurately and succinctly convey to us the sense of the underpinning Greek! As is so often the case, the more thoughtful, detailed, and saintly, *King James Version* translators, had a better sense of what the Holy Spirit of God is saying, than do the more superficial, less detailed, less spiritually mature, translators of the “new” and “modern” versions. (See also my comments on Matt. 8:8a at Matt. 8:8b, *infra*)

**Matt. 8:8b** “my servant” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek words, “*o* (the) *pais* (servant) *mou* (‘my,’ literally ‘of me’)” i.e., “my servant,” in the words, “and my servant shall be healed,” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, “*puer* (the servant) *meus* (‘my’ or ‘of me’),” i.e., “my servant,” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592), which follows the Vulgate’s “*peur* (servant) *meus* (my)” i.e., “my servant.”

However, a variant which omits “my servant,” is found in old Latin Version k (Africa, 4th / 5th centuries), and also by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

There is no good textual argument against the Byzantine reading which is therefore correct. How the scribe, quite possibly Origen, could make such an error, is speculative. Was it a deliberate “stylistic improvement”? Or was it a fumbling mistake? If the latter, then e.g., in looking at, “...*KAI IATHHCETAI O PAIC MOU KAI GAR EGO* ...,” having written down, “*KAI* (and) *IATHHCETAI* (shall be healed),” the scribe may have been momentarily distracted e.g., by a night-time mosquito flying around him that he sought to swat, as he remembered in his head “I’m up to the *KAI AI*” i.e., the “*KAI*” followed by the word ending in “*AI*.” Perhaps still not entirely focused on his scribal work e.g., still looking out “for that blasted buzzing mosquito,” and still thinking in his head, “*KAI AI*,” he befuddled this to “*AI KAI*,” and looking back at his page quickly and seeing the last two letters, “*AI*,” he spotted the “*KAI*” of “*AI KAI*” i.e., “*KAI* (-) *GAR* (For) *EGO* (I),” and wrote down “*KAI GAR EGO* ...,” thus accidentally omitting the words, “*O* (-) *PAIC* (servant) *MOU* (my).” Of course, we cannot open the pages of unrecorded history and know for sure exactly how this bumbling scribe made the mistake. We can only know that he most assuredly did make a mistake, possibly along the lines conjectured, even if some of the precise details (such as the literary licence used to speculate about a “mosquito,”) were in fact different.

I have included this Variant for two reasons, firstly, because it helps to better contextualize the likelihood that Origen was the originator of both the Matt. 8:8a and Matt. 8:8b variants. (See the second reason, *infra*.) With such strong support from both the Greek and Latin for a reading that raises no textual problems, and such correspondingly poor support for the variant; on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 8:8b an “A,” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources at Matt. 8:8b the correct reading, my servant,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) Version; Gothic Version (4th

century); Armenian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500); and the Georgian “1” Version (5th century). For partly the wrong reasons, and partly the right reasons, the correct reading entered the NU Text *et al*, and so is found in the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV and NIV.

However, the incorrect reading which omits “my servant,” is found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; as well as Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere) and 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere). It is also omitted in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions; and also some independent manuscripts of the Coptic Bohairic Version.

I have included discussion of this Variant for two reasons. (See the first reason, *supra*.) My second reason is that both the UBS 3rd edition (1975) and UBS 3rd corrected edition (1983), took the view that “there is a considerable degree of doubt whether the text” i.e., *o (-) pais* (servant) *mou* (my), “or the apparatus” i.e., the omission of these words by “Origen” *et al*, “contains the superior reading.” While I think there is no such doubt at all, in view of the unstable nature of the NU Text, which can, and has, varied over time, I thought these unwarranted claims were a good reason to include some reference to this clearly erroneous, and safely dismissed, variant of Origen *et al*.

These UBS editions say in their textual apparatus at Matt. 8:8, “*o pais mou* (see Lk 7:7),” from which it must be assumed that their uncertainty about this reading stems from a belief that it was assimilated from these same words at Luke 7:7. In opposition to this NU Text Committee’s “considerable degree of doubt” about “the text,” one of the Committee members, Metzger, was confident that the reading at Matt. 8:8b was correct (Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 20). The omission of this textual information in the UBS 4th revised edition (1993), may indicate a Committee swing in Metzger’s direction i.e., now thinking that the reading of Matt. 8:8b is correct. If so, we cannot be sure as to if and when, another NU Text Committee changes this once again, as part of that ongoing drama of fluctuation based in the shifting sands of the NU Text.

Here at Matt. 8:8a (see comments at Matt 8:8a, *supra*) and Matt. 8:8b, we clearly see the divide that exists between neo-Byzantine Received Text supporters and neo-Alexandrian NU Text supporters. This is evident in three issues. Firstly, the unwarranted claim in the UBS Greek NT that John 4:43-54 is a parallel Gospel account with Matt. 8:5-13; Luke 7:1-10 (discussed at Matt. 8:8a, *supra*). If the reader were to accept this false claim, it would necessarily lead him into religious liberalism denying the infallibility and associated authority of the Bible, since John 4:54 says this was “the second miracle that Jesus did” in “Galilee,” whereas it is clear that the healing of the centurion’s servant in Matt. 8:5-13; Luke 7:1-10 was preceded by more than just one former miracle in Galilee.

Secondly, at Matt. 8:8a where there is a good textual argument for assimilation of the words from Luke 7:7, the Committee raises no question about their diverse NU Text reading, not so much as providing the alternative readings of the TR and its support in the textual apparatus of UBS (nor does this textual information appear in Nestle-Aland). Thirdly, in contrast with Matt.

8:8a, at Matt. 8:8b where there is no good textual argument for assimilation of the words from Luke 7:7, the NU Text Committee comprehensively shows the support for the different readings in the 3rd and 3rd corrected editions of UBS. While I welcome all textual information on a reading, the reality is that UBS give textual information on relatively few variants, and they do so here as part of their view that there is “a considerable degree of doubt” as to “the text” (and some textual information also appears against *o pais mou* in Nestle-Aland).

What saith the Infallible Book about such divides as these three found in just one verse, Matt. 8:8, between the good old Authorized Version and its Received Text, as opposed to the “new” versions with their NU Text? “Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the way, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. But they have said, We will not walk therein” (Jer. 6:16). Let us humbly walk in “the old paths,” thanking God for the Received Text and our Authorized Versions<sup>82</sup>.

**Matt. 8:9** “under authority” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek reading, “*upo* (under) *exousian* (authority),” in the words, “For I am a man under authority,” is supported by the majority Byzantine text in e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as Latin, “*sub* (under) *potestate* (authority),” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Version f (6th century), as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century); and as Latin “*sub* (under) *potestatem* (authority),” in the old Latin Versions 1 (7th / 8th century) and ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is further supported by the ancient Greek church writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, a variant which adds “*tassomenos* (‘being set,’ present nominative singular,

---

<sup>82</sup> Some “neo-Evangelicals” say they believe in an “infallible” Bible but not an “inerrant” Bible. I.e., they make an artificial distinction between an “infallible” Bible (which they say is “infallible” for the purposes written, but which may and does contain various historical and scientific errors), and an “inerrant” Bible (meaning not only their definition of “infallible,” but also without any historical or scientific errors). Others claim the autographs of Scripture were “inerrant,” but the Received Text apographs are unreliable. I make and recognize no such distinctions. When I say the Bible is “infallible,” I include in that definition the traditional Protestant recognition that it is thereby inerrant in both its autographs and Received Text apographs. I maintain “infallible” and “inerrant” are synonyms.

passive participle, from *tassō*” i.e., “*upo* (under) *exousian* (authority) *tassomenos* (set),” making the reading, “For I am a man set under authority,” is followed as Latin, “*sub* (under) *potestatem* (authority) *constitutus* (‘being set,’ nominative singular masculine, perfect passive participle, from *constituo*),” by old Latin Version a (4th century); and as Latin, “under (*sub*) authority (*potestate*) set (*constitutus*),” by old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), h (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); and the ancient church Latin writers Hilary (d. 367) and Augustine (d. 430).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Greek Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as correct. The origins of the variant are conjectural. But the variant, found mainly as a Latin reading, appears to be an assimilation from these same words, “*upo* (under) *exousian* (authority) *tassomenos* (set),” at Luke 7:8. What was quite possibly conceptualized by a scribe as a “stylistic improvement,” also appears to reflect an erroneous scribal notion of “parallel” Gospel readings in Matt. 8:9 and Luke 7:8 (for a better harmonization of these two verses, see my comments at Matt. 8:8a, *supra*).

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 8:9 an “A,” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

The composers of the Roman Catholic Clementine Vulgate (1592), departed from Saint Jerome’s Vulgate at this point. Following the strong support in some significant old Latin Versions, at Matt. 8:9 the Clementine Vulgate adds “set (Latin, *constitutus*),” and so reads, “under (*sub*) authority (*potestate*) set (*constitutus*),” i.e., “set under authority.” These erroneous conclusions, manifest the old Romish error of the Latin Church, which in translating the NT refused to subordinate the maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, to its natural master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. By elevating the subordinate maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, so as to make it usurp the proper place of its master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, the Clementine Latin Vulgate here incorporated manifest error.

Since the Byzantine Greek Text is the basic NT text God has preserved over the ages, the representative Byzantine Text must always be our starting point, and we may only properly depart from it to another reading inside the closed class of three sources also preserved with reasonable accessibility of the ages, where there is a clearly warranted reason for doing so evident in a textual problem raised by this Greek text, and resolved in this Greek text by adopting that alternative reading. No such textual problem here exists at Matt. 8:9. We of the true and holy Protestant Christian faith, could never accept this kind of dominant position, here given by the Clementine Vulgate to the Latin over the Greek. For the purposes of establishing the *Textus Receptus*, by the grace of God, we stand unflinching in our conviction that the master maxim is, *The Greek improves the Latin*, and not the converse. From this position, we cannot, we will not, we dare not, we must not, ever depart!

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 8:9, “under authority,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in the

Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616 Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Georgian Version (5th century).

Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century) reads in the 19th century Latin translation of the 12th-14th centuries Arabic, "*sub obedientia potestatis* ('of authority,' genitive)," i.e., rendering it from the original Arabic, "in obedience to authority" (Hogg), and so the Arabic Diatessaron essentially supports the correct reading.

However, the incorrect reading, "set under authority," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in the Syriac Palestinian Version (c. 6th century).

Based on the same thinking as the Clementine Vulgate, the incorrect reading is found in the Roman Catholic *Douay-Rheims Version*. Thus the Clementine Vulgate's "set under authority," *supra*, is in the words of the Roman Catholic *Douay-Rheims Version* (1582 & 1609/10), which was translated from the Latin, rather than the original Hebrew (OT) and Greek (NT), rendered as, "subject to authority."

Partly for the wrong reasons, and partly for the right reasons, the incorrect reading which is poorly attested to, and clearly stands as an interpolation brought over from Luke 7:8, was rightly rejected by the Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). However, Westcott & Hort (1881) included it in square brackets as optional. The correct reading was placed in the main text of the ASV, "under authority;" although an ASV footnote says, "Some ancient authorities insert 'set'." The correct reading was followed at Matt. 8:9 without such a footnote in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

**Matt. 8:10** "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek words, "*oude* (no, not even) *en* (in) *to* (the) *Israel* (Israel) *tasauten* (so great) *pistin* (faith) *euron* (I found)," i.e., "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel" (AV), are supported by the majority Byzantine Text. It enjoys the support of at least 90% of the relevant manuscripts in von Soden's K (Koine) group of about 1,000 manuscripts, and this K group is clearly large enough to be a representative sample of the still larger number of several thousand Byzantine manuscripts. E.g., Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, 6th century) (though not affecting English translation, both S 042 and N 022 read *euron* rather than *euron*, a minority Byzantine tradition also found in G 011, 9th century, and V 031, 9th century); E 07 (*Codex Basilensis*, 8th century), K 017 (*Codex Cyprius*, 9th century), X 033 (*Codex Monacensis*, 10th century), Pi 041 (*Codex Petropolitanus*, 9th century); Minuscules 1006 (11th century, Byzantine Matthew to Jude), 1505 (1084 A.D., Byzantine Gospels), 180 (12th century, Byzantine other than in the independent Acts), 1100 (12th century), 1292 (13th century, Byzantine other than general epistles); and (in both instances abbreviating "*Israel*" to "*Iel*" with a line over the last two letters,) Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). They are also supported as Latin, "*non* (not) *inveni* (I have found) *tantam* (so great) *fidem* (faith) *in* (in) *Israhel* (Israel)," "I have not found so great faith in Israel," by Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions b (5th century), h (5th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th

century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). They are further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation, and Chrysostom (d. 407); and the ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430).

However, a variant Greek reading, “*par*’ (with) *ouden*i (no man) *tasauten* (so great) *pistin* (faith) *en* (in) *to* (the) *Israel* (Israel) *euron* (I found),” i.e., “with no man in Israel have I found so great faith” (ASV ftn), is a minority Byzantine reading, found in Codex W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53). It is also found in old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), and q (6th / 7th century); e.g., in old Latin Version a, as Latin, “*quia* (for) *in* (among) *nullo* (none) *tantam* (so great) *fidem* (faith) *inveni* (I have found) *in* (in) *Israhel* (Israel),” i.e., “among none in Israel have I found so great faith.” It is further found in the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

There is no good clear textual problem raised by the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore correct. We cannot be certain as to how this variant arose. But quite possibly, because these words of Matt. 8:10 are exactly the same as those of Luke 7:9, a scribe, recognizing that they were too unqualified to be said twice on two occasions, and unable to reconcile the fact that they came *both* after the comments of the centurion’s delegation in Luke 7:9, *and also* after the comments of the centurion himself in Matt. 8:10; sought to make a “stylistic improvement” to Matt. 8:10, that allowed these to be said at different points in time. Such a “stylistic improvement,” perhaps “well intentioned,” was nevertheless an unwarranted tampering with God’s holy Word. Having told St. Matthew in his vocabulary what to write in St. Matthew’s Gospel; and having told St. Luke what to write in his vocabulary in St. Luke’s Gospel, the Holy Spirit of God has here provided us with precise words in both St. Matthew’s and St. Luke’s Gospels that are a quote of what Jesus said. Having done so, the Holy Ghost has given us a point of identical reference in time and place between the two accounts. As discussed at Matt. 8:8a, *supra*, evidently the “centurion” “sent friends” to Jesus, thinking, “I am not worthy that” the “Lord” “shouldest enter under my roof” (Luke 7:6b-8); then possibly influenced in his thinking by the fact that the nobleman of Capernaum had spoken to Christ in person (John 4:49,50); upon matured reflection, the centurion of Capernaum changed his mind, and decided he would also petition Christ in person. While the delegation of “friends” he had sent were still there, the centurion then arrived in person, either as they were finishing, or had just finished, speaking (Matt. 8:5-9). Matt. 8:10 then parallels Luke 7:9, i.e., “Jesus” “ marvelled,” “and said,” “I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.”

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 8:10 a “B,” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 8:10, “I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex 0233 (8th century), (the independent) Codex 0250 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in the (mixed text in Gospels) Minuscule 33

(9th century), (the independent text) Minuscule 157 (12th century), and (independent text) Minuscule 1071 (12th century). It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Syriac Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as the Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Version; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Slavic Version (9th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However the incorrect reading, "with no man in Israel have I found so great faith," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century), and (the mixed text type) Minuscule 892 (9th century). It is also found in the Palestinian Syriac (c. 6th century) and Syriac Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; as well as the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The correct reading at Matt. 8:10 is found in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72). However, the incorrect reading of Westcott-Hort (1881) is also found in Nestle's 21st edition (1952), the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and the contemporary NU text i.e., Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). Even though Westcott and Hort had the wrong Greek reading, the ASV (1901) retained the AV's reading in its main text, "no, not in Israel" (ASV), while giving the alternative reading from Westcott-Hort in a footnote reading, as "Many ancient authorities read, 'With no man in Israel have I found so great faith'" (ASV ftn).

So likewise, the ASV's elder son, the RSV retained the correct reading in the main text, but contained a footnote giving the erroneous alternative. This order was then reversed by the RSV's sons, the NRSV and ESV, both of which put the incorrect reading in the main text, and the correct reading in a footnote. The ASV's younger son, the NASB, also adopted the incorrect reading, and while the NASB's 1st edition had a footnote referring to the TR's reading, this footnote was removed in the NASB's 2nd and 3rd editions. The incorrect reading also appears in the NIV. Moffatt reads, "I have not met faith like this anywhere in Israel" (Moffatt Bible), in what appears to be a loose dynamic equivalent for the correct reading.

*With such vacillations and choppings'n'changings, one can never be sure where one is with the neo-Alexandrian Texts and Versions.* And even if one thinks one has worked it out, the problem is, it can then change again in the "next edition" or "next revision" or "next version" of the neo-Alexandrian School! But we neo-Byzantines can rest assured that our *Textus Receptus* and our Authorized Versions of the Bible, are not subject to such fluctuations. "For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all the churches of the saints" (I Cor. 14:33).

**Matt. 8:12** "shall be cast out" (TR & AV) {B}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

In Lectionary 2378, in this reading of Matt. 8:5-13, after "*ekblethesontai* (shall be cast out)," and before the next word, "*eis* (into)," there is a small hole in page 28b (column 2), c. 4-5 mm high and c. 2-3 mm wide, or c. ¼ inch high and c. 1/8 inch wide. On the opposite side of the page at page 29a (column 1), in the reading of Matt. 9:9-13, to the left of the hole is the verse 10, "*τῷ*" (written as elsewhere, "ω" with the "τ" on top), followed by "w" with a line on top, i.e.,

the “Jesus” of “as Jesus sat at meat” etc. (Matt. 9:10). The unusually large amount of paper space between these words on both sides of the page, coupled with the fact that both pages perfectly preserve the correct reading without any obvious later “corrector” scribe, indicates that the hole was in the page when the scribe wrote these words.

In the first place, Lectionary 2378 reminds us that in an era of expensive parchments, what was deemed “a good page” could not be discarded because of “a small hole.” And in the second place, Lectionary 2378 here reminds us that because a small hole can more easily rip into a larger hole, that suchlike increased the probability of subsequent paper loss in the area of the hole. However, since Lectionary 2378 is now about a millennia old, and no such further damage has occurred, it also reminds us that this was not always a necessary consequence of using such paper with a hole in it.

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 8:12, the TR’s Greek reading, “*ekblethesontai* (‘they shall be cast out,’ passive indicative future, 3rd person plural verb, from *ekballo*),” in the words, “But the [Jewish racial] children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, “*eicientur* (‘they shall be cast out,’ indicative passive future, 3rd person plural verb, from *eiicio*),” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions *aur* (7th century), *l* (7th / 8th century), *ff1* (10th / 11th century), and the *Sangallensis* Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported as Latin, “*expellentur* (‘they shall be expelled,’ indicative passive future, 3rd person plural verb, from *expello*),” in old Latin Version *f* (6th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); the ancient church Latin writer, Cyprian (d. 258); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604)<sup>83</sup>.

However, an alternative reading, “they shall come forth (Greek, *exeleusontai*, indicative middle future, 3rd person plural verb, from *exerchomai*),” is (given that the Greek middle here is a deponent, i.e., a middle voice with an active voice meaning,) followed as Latin, “*ibunt* (indicative active future, 3rd person plural verb, from *eo*),” in old Latin Versions *a* (4th century), *b* (5th century), *h* (5th century), *q* (6th / 7th century), *g1* (8th / 9th century), and *c* (12th / 13th century); and as Latin, “*exient* (indicative active future, 3rd person plural verb, from *exeo*),” in old Latin Version *k* (4th / 5th centuries). It is also followed by the ancient Greek writers, Heracleon (2nd century) according to Origen (d. 254), Irenaeus (2nd century) in Greek and Latin texts, and Eusebius (d. 339); and the ancient church Latin writers, Cyprian (d. 258) and Augustine (d. 430).

There is no good textual reason to question the representative Byzantine reading, which must thus stand as correct. This scribal change to “shall come forth (*exeleusontai*)” was possibly

---

<sup>83</sup> With alternative spelling, “*ejicientur* (from *ejicio*)” at Migne 75:839; and as “*projicientur* (‘they shall be cast forth,’ indicative passive future, 3rd person plural verb, from *projicio*)” at Migne 79:71.

influenced by the presence of “shall come forth” in the Matthean Greek of Matt. 13:49, which like Matt. 8:12 also refers to judgment i.e., “at the end of the world: the angels shall come forth (*exeleusontai*), and sever the wicked from among the just.” Though far less probable, the scribe was also possibly influenced by “shall they come forth” in Acts 7:7, which like Matt. 8:12 also refers to an exit of Jews and judgement, albeit unlike Matt. 8:12, in Acts 7:7 this is in a favourable context towards the Jews, i.e., “And the nation” of Egypt “to whom” the Israelites “shall be in bondage will I judge, said God: and after that shall they come forth (*exeleusontai*), and serve me in this place.”

The fact that Christ here isolates the racial progenitors of the Jewish race, “Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob,” means that he is making a distinction between those of the Jewish race i.e., “the” racial “children of the kingdom,” contextually the ones who lack faith; as opposed to “many” Gentiles who “shall come from the east and west,” i.e., the Gentile “faith” children of the kingdom<sup>84</sup>. The scribal selection of “shall come forth (*exeleusontai*)” at Matt. 8:12, possibly also reflects a desire of finding a “stylistic balance” to “shall come (*exousi*)” in Matt. 8:11, i.e., “Many [Gentiles] *shall come (exousi)* from the east and west, and shall sit down with [the Jewish racial fathers] Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, but the [Jewish racial] children of the kingdom *shall come forth (exeleusontai)* into outer darkness” etc. .

While this may have been a deliberate “stylistic improvement,” it may also have been an accidental change, stemming from an attempted reconstruction of *ekblethesontai* if due to paper loss, a scribe saw something like *e::l::sontai*, and taking into account both Matt. 13:49 and the immediate context of “shall come” (*exousi*) in Matt. 8:11, wrongly concluded that Matt. 8:12 must have originally read “*exeleusontai*.” Whether this was a deliberate or accidental alteration is unclear; we only know for sure that it was an alteration.

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 8:12 a “B,” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 8:12, “shall be cast out,” is

---

<sup>84</sup> The Semitic race of West Asia are Mediterranean Caucasoids, they are light brown, with wavy black hair, brown eyes, slight prognathism, and medium width noses, usually hooked. One ethnic race family within the Semitic race is the Biblical Jewish race, here (like Rom. 9-11) referred to. The Jewish race has been preserved among many (though not all) of the Sephardic Jews from Spain and Portugal (Obadiah 20). They should not be confused with other racial groups which have converted to modern Judaism, e.g., Ashkenazi Jews (called “white Jews,” from the Caucasian Caucasoid progenitor, Japheth, via Ashkenaz, Gen. 10:3), or Ethiopian Jews (called “black Jews,” from the Negroid progenitor Cush, the son of Ham, Gen. 10:6,7). Although like persons in other racial groups, most members of the Jewish race could verbalize some general elements of racial diversity e.g., like “the leopards spots,” the “Ethiopian” has black “skin” (Jer. 13:23); like persons in other racial groups, in specific terms they can discern “the look” of their own race as opposed to others, even if in general they cannot consciously articulate anthropological data such as a “prognathism” or “the cephalic index.” See McGrath, G.B. (Myself), “Jewish Race or Religion,” *English Churchman*, (No. 7704) 22 & 29 Dec. 2006, p. 2.

found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century), (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 565 (9th century, independent); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Gothic Version (4th century); Georgian “2” Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (c. 500); and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The incorrect reading, “shall come forth,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); and (the independent) Codex 0250 (8th century). It is also found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (c. 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as Armenian Version (5th century).

The incorrect reading, “shall come forth (*exeleusontai*),” is in the main text of Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72). Westcott-Hort (1881) put the correct reading, “shall be cast out (*ekblethesontai*),” in the main text, but gave the incorrect reading, “shall come forth (*exeleusontai*),” as a footnote alternative. The correct reading, “shall be cast out (*ekblethesontai*),” is also found in the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993). However, the UBS 3rd edition (1975) and UBS 3rd corrected edition (1983), took the view that “there is a considerable degree of doubt whether the text” i.e., “*ekblethesontai*,” “or the apparatus” i.e., “*exeleusontai*,” “contains the superior reading.” With a major split between the two leading Alexandrian texts at Matt. 8:12, it is clear that neo-Alexandrian textual critics are internally divided, uneasy, and uncertain as to which way they should jump. Tischendorf jumped one way, and the last NU Text Committee jumped the other way; whereas Westcott-Hort sat on the fence. Bearing in mind the vacillating nature of neo-Alexandrian texts such as the NU Text, we cannot be sure which way a future NU Text Committee might jump, and whether or not the erroneous variant will once again enter a neo-Alexandrian’s critical text in the future. Unlike these big splits in the ever-changing neo-Alexandrian critical text; the Received Text’s reading here remains constant, tranquil, and dependable.

At Matt. 8:12, the correct reading is found in the ASV as, “shall be cast forth.” The correct reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. The incorrect reading is found in Moffatt’s Bible as “will pass,” where a footnote say that Moffatt was following the “reading *exeleusontai* with London Sinaiticus.” As to which way future neo-Alexandrian versions will go, we cannot be sure. But we can be sure that our AVs will continue to contain the correct reading at Matt. 8:12, “shall be cast out.”

**Matt. 8:13a** “and” (TR & AV) {B}

The TR’s Greek reading, “*kai* (and),” in the words, “Go thy way; and (*kai*) as thou hast believed, so be it” (AV) etc., is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., the purple parchment of Rosanno, Italy, Codex Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and the purple parchment of St. Petersburg, Russia, *et al*, Codex N 022 (6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, “*et* (and),” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century); and old Latin Versions f (6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Basil the Great (d. 379), and Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, a variant which omits “and” (Greek, *kai*; Latin, *et*), making the reading, “Go thy way; as thou hast believed, so be it” (ASV) etc., is a minority Byzantine reading, found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53). It is also found in old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), h (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and g2 (10th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation (c. 395) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

There is no good textual reason to doubt the representative Byzantine text, which must accordingly stand as the correct reading. Was its loss deliberate, and a typical scribal pruning regarded as a “stylistic improvement” that removed “unnecessary wordage” in order to create “a more succinct” text? Or was its loss accidental, coming from a paper fade of “*kai*”?

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 8:13a a “B,” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 8:13a, “and,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex 0233 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; and a manuscript of the Coptic Bohairic Version; together with the Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect reading which omits “and” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and (the independent) Codex 0250 (8th century). It is also found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions; as well as the Egyptian Coptic and

Coptic Bohairic Versions; and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century). The incorrect reading entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 8:13a, and so "and" is omitted in the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

**Matt. 8:13b** "his" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek reading, "*autou* ('his,' literally, of him')," in the words, "And his (*autou*) servant was healed in the selfsame hour" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, a variant reading which omits "his," so that reading is, "And the servant was healed" (ASV) etc., is followed by Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), a number of significant old Latin Versions, and the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Basil the Great (d. 379).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore correct. Thus we here see a good example of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. The origin of the loss of, "*autou* (his)," is speculative. Is this a typical paper fade? Or is this a typical pruning of "unnecessary wordage" as a scribe's "stylistic improvement"?

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 8:13b a "B," i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 8:13b, "his," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex 0233 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in some Syriac Curetonian Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect reading which omits "his" is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); (the independent) Codex 0250 (8th century); and the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*.

It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed in Gospels) and 1 (12th century, independent in the Gospels). It is also found in some Syriac Curetonian Versions; the Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Version; Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The incorrect reading which omits “his (*autou*),” is found at Matt. 8:13b in the main text of Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), and Nestle’s 21st edition (1952). However, “*autou*” was enclosed in square brackets in the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993), thus making it optional. It was omitted in the ASV which reads, “And the servant was healed . . .” (ASV); and also omitted in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV. However, reflecting the optional pliability in the uncertain and unclear NU Text, it is included in the NIV.

**Matt. 8:13c** “in the selfsame hour” (TR & AV) {B}

The TR’s Greek reading, “*en* (in) *te* (the) *ora* (hour) *ekeine* (that / selfsame)” i.e., “in the selfsame hour” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as Latin, “*in* (‘in,’ word 1) *hora* (‘hour,’ word 2) *illa* (‘that,’ word 3),” i.e., “in that hour” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century). Making no difference to the meaning, it is supported in Latin word order, 1,3,2, by old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), f (6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century), and thus the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron, as a codex of the Vulgate, here demonstrates some minor variation inside the Vulgate Codices. From the Latin support for this reading (with the same word order as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron), it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However there are two variants. The Greek reading, “*en* (in) *te* (the) *emera* (day) *ekeine* (that / selfsame)” i.e., “in the selfsame day” (*Variant 1*), is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53).

Another Greek reading, “*apo* (from) *tes* (of the) *oras* (hour) *ekeines* (that / selfsame)” i.e., “From the selfsame hour” (*Variant 2*), is also a minority Byzantine reading found in Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) and N 022 (6th century); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century). It is further found as Latin, “*ex* (from) *illa* (that) *hora* (hour),” in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), h (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), g2 (10th century), and c (12th / 13th century). *Variant 2* is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Eusebius (d. 339), Basil the Great (d. 379), and Chrysostom (d. 407); and the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as the correct reading against both Variants 1 and 2. The mechanism given to us by God of using the representative Byzantine Text as our starting point, and with reluctance, only moving away from it when compelled to do so by a good textual argument, reflects the brilliant character of God himself. It means that in the same way that e.g., a plant can lose a leaf, but then grow it back; or a human body can get a scratch, but it will heal; so too, individual manuscripts in the Byzantine tradition may due to accident or malice become damaged and give the wrong reading. Nevertheless, overall the Byzantine Text continues to give its representative reading; and so our starting point remains unimpaired, and will usually supply us with the correct reading. If however, some larger problem has arisen with the Byzantine Text, by the grace of God, the Lord raises up “a careful gardener” (neo-Byzantine textual analyst), and textual analysis can spot and resolve the problem, correcting it through readings inside the closed class of three witnesses, like the re-grafting of a branch back onto its parent tree, after it was broken off and for some time given independent life as a separate tree in the larger garden.

We cannot be certain as to the origins of *Variant 1*. But possibly the original had “*ora*” at the end of one line, with the next line starting with “*ekeine* (‘that’ / ‘selfsame’).” If so, if the “*ora*” at the end of the first line was missing due to paper loss, the scribe may have reconstructed the missing “*ora* (hour)” as “*emera* (day),” on the basis that this same terminology i.e., “*en* (in) *te* (the) *emera* (day) *ekeine* (that / selfsame)” is found at Luke 10:12; and is supported by the synonymous terminology of “*en* (in) *ekeine* (that / selfsame) *te* (the) *emera* (day)” in Matt. 7:22; 22:23 (cf. Mark 4:35; John 5:9; 14:20).

We cannot be certain as to the origins of *Variant 2*. Was the original manuscript’s “*auton* (of him) *en* (in) *te* (the) *ora* (hour) *ekeine* (that / selfsame),” damaged due to paper loss? If so, did the scribe see something like, “*autou::::::or:::::ekei:::*” and did he then reconstruct this as “*autou apo tes oras* (of him from of the hour),” on the basis that one finds similar terminology, “*apo* (from) *tes* (the) *oras* (hour) *ekeines* (that)” i.e., “from that hour” at Matt. 9:22; 15:28; 17:18 (cf. John 19:27)?

We cannot doubt that the representative Byzantine reading, with support from St. Jerome’s Vulgate is the correct reading. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 8:13c a “B,” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 8:13c, “in the selfsame hour,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in some Syriac Curetonian Versions; the Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century), and some independent manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; as well as in the Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); and the Ethiopic Version (c. 500). It is also found as Latin “*in* (in) *illa* (that) *hora* (hour),” in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

*Variant 1*, “in the selfsame day,” is found in Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent text); the Georgian Version (5th century), and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

*Variant 2*, “From the selfsame hour,” is found in (the mixed text type) C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Theta 038 (9th century); as well as the Syriac Palestinian Version (c. 6th century); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century), and some independent manuscripts of the Coptic Bohairic Version.

The correct reading entered the main text of the NU Text *et al.* However, the UBS 3rd edition (1975) and UBS 3rd corrected edition (1983), say “there is some degree of doubt” on this reading; although Metzger says the NU Text “Committee” considered “the external evidence” “to clearly be in support of the reading adopted in the text” (Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 21). The correct reading is found at Matt. 8:13c in the NIV and Moffatt, both of which have the same translation. But in harmony with the theory of “dynamic equivalence,” “very” is added without using italics to advise the reader of this addition, thus making the reading, “at (*en*) that very hour (*ora*)” (Moffatt Bible).

At Matt. 8:13c, the parent ASV correctly reads, “in (*en*) that (*ekeine*) hour (*te ora*)” (ASV), and this was followed in the NRSV. But the NASB, RSV, and ESV departed from the ASV’s translation, following Moffatt’s error of adding “very” (Moffatt Bible).

The NASB revisers also added this word but put “very” in italics to advise the reader of this addition. But they then omitted “in (*en*),” and so made the translation simply, “that very moment (*ora*)” (NASB 3rd ed.). The NASB translators may have considered they thus “dodged the issue” of whether it is the reading “in (*en*)” (TR & main text of NU Text) or “from (*apo*)” (Variant 2), that comes before “that” (NASB). But in doing so, they have thought themselves to be too clever “by half”; and “pride goeth” “before a fall” (Prov. 16:18). The reality is, that for a translation which professes to use formal equivalence, such as the NASB, to make such an omission in effect means that it accepts neither reading. Across three editions, the NASB has shown an unjustifiable uncertainty as to the readings, “in (*en*)” or “from (*apo*)”; giving rise to their repeated unwarranted omission of “in (*en*)” at Matt. 8:13c.

**Matt. 8:15** “unto them” (TR & AV) {B}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

*The First Matter.* There are often more variants that I analyze on a given reading. My tendency is to isolate those of interest in the contemporary battle of *Neo-Byzantine* *verse* *Neo-Alexandrian*, although some reference is also made to the historic hundreds of years of warfare in the pre-Vatican II battle of *Protestant Neo-Byzantine* *verses* *Latin Papist*. Of course, after the Vatican II Council, the Papists feeling that they had gotten the worst of it in their unsuccessful battle with the Neo-Byzantine School’s Received Text, hoped that by locking their sinking fortunes to the religiously liberal Protestants of the Neo-Alexandrian School, they might at last succeed where they had hitherto failed, in attacking the Received Text. Such are the devious techniques of the Roman Church, who trains slippery’n’slimy Jesuits at her Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome. One such slippery’n’slimy Jesuit who confuses the ancient Biblical tongue of Greece with the Neo-Alexandrian tongue of grease, was Cardinal Carlo Martini, an Italian “grease ball,” who was one of five members on the last NU Text Committee.

Inside the closed class of sources, here at Matt. 8:15, N 022 (6th century) incorrectly reads Greek, “*auton* (of them)” [*sic.*]. Hence no reference is made to this manuscript, *infra*.

*The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting): A Diatessaron conundrum for those interested in Diatessaron studies.* The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century), a Latin Vulgate Codex which is inside the closed class of sources, has Matt. 8:14,15 after Luke 7:10 and before Luke 7:11. It follows the Latin Vulgate’s correct reading, “*ministrabat eis*” (“ministered unto them”), *infra*. By contrast, outside the closed class of sources, Matt. 8:14,15 is not found in any form in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century). Did the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron add Matt. 8:14,15 to Tatian’s original Diatessaron format from the Vulgate, or did the Arabic Diatessaron remove Matt. 8:14,15 from Tatian’s original Diatessaron format?

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 8:15 the TR's Greek reading, "*autois* (unto them)," in the words, "and ministered unto them" (AV), is a minority Byzantine reading found in e.g., M 021 (*Codex Campianus*, 9th century, Paris, France); Minuscules 880 (Vatican City State, Rome, 11th century), 945 (Athos, Greece, 11th century, Byzantine outside of Acts & General Epistles), 119 (Paris, France, 12th century), 120 (Paris, France, 12th century), 217 (Venice, Italy, 12th century), 924 (Athos, Greece, 12th century), 998 (Athos, Greece, 12th century), 1200 (Sinai, Arabia, 12th century), 2127 (Palermo, Italy, 12th century, Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles); 477 (Trinity College, Cambridge University, England, 13th century), 482 (British Library, London, 13th century), 232 (Escorial, Spain, 14th century), 578 (Arras, France, 14th century), 802 (Athens, Greece, 14th century), 70 (Cambridge University, England, 15th century), 287 (Paris, France, 15th century), 288 (Oxford University, England, 15th century), and 745 (Paris, France, 16th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*ministrabat eis* (ministered unto them)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). The Greek reading is manifested in e.g., Stephanus's Greek NT (1550 & 1551) and Beza's Greek NT (1598).

By contrast, the Greek reading, "*auto* (unto him)," is followed by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also found as Latin, "*ministrabat ei* (ministered unto him)," in old Latin Version q (6th / 7th century); and as Latin, "*ministravit illi* ('ministered unto that [one], i.e., 'ministered unto him'),' in old Latin Version k (4th / 5th centuries). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

A textual problem here presents itself in the representative Byzantine reading. Though it would be possible to read Matt. 8:14 as meaning that Jesus went into "Peter's house" by himself, it would seem extraordinary that Jesus would so go "Peter's house" alone. Therefore, the more natural sense of the passage seems to be to read the words of Matt. 8:14, "when Jesus was come into Peter's house, he saw his wife's mother" (Matt. 8:14), as meaning that when Christ, who was evidently accompanied by St. Peter, "was come into Peter's house," and "he saw his wife's mother" (Matt. 8:14). But having followed the more natural sense of Matt. 8:14, we then find the representative Byzantine Greek reading, "ministered unto him (*auto*)," seems highly incongruous; for our expectation at Matt. 8:15, is that we would read, "ministered unto them (*autois*)."

The accuracy of this general conclusion as to the natural meaning of Matt. 8:14,15, is confirmed by comparative analysis with the parallel Gospel accounts in St. Mark's and St. Luke's Gospels. In Mark 1:29-31, St. Mark specifies that with "Simon and Andrew" (Mark 1:16) Christ first went into "the synagogue" (Mark 1:21); and then "they" came "out of the synagogue," and "they entered (*elthon*) into the house of Simon and Andrew, with James and John" (Mark 1:29) i.e., St. Peter (or Simon) was clearly present. The account ends by saying, "she ministered unto them (*autois*)" (Mark 1:31). So too in the parallel Gospel account of Luke 4:38,39, we read of a plurality of persons, for "they besought (*erotesan*) him for her" (Luke 4:38). The account then

ends, “she arose and ministered unto them (*autois*)” (Luke 4:39).

The textual difficulty presented by the representative Byzantine reading, “unto him (*auto*)” at Matt. 8:14, can only be remedied by adopting the minority Byzantine reading, which is supported by the Latin Vulgate, namely, “unto them (*autois*).” This is therefore the correct reading. We do not know how the variant “unto him (*auto*)” arose. Was it a deliberate change?

Did a scribe reading Matt. 8:14 superficially, think that Christ entered “into Peter’s house” by himself, and so deliberately changed “unto them (*autois*)” to “unto him (*auto*)”? Was it an accidental change? With e.g., the words “and” (*kai*) ministered (*diekonei*) unto them (*autois*)” coming on the end of a line, and looking something like *KAI DIEKONEI AYTOIC*, due to a paper loss, did the scribe see something like *KAI DIEKONEI AYT:::;, and thinking on a quick superficial reading of Matt. 8:14 that Christ entered “into Peter’s house” by himself, supplied what he thought was the missing letter, and thus added to “aut:::” the letter, “o,” hence originating by inadvertence, the reading, “ministered unto him (*auto*)”? Are the origins of this variant deliberate or accidental? We cannot be sure. We can only know that a change was made. It appears to have been a very ancient mistake, quite possibly originating with Origen.*

On the one hand, textual analysis favours the TR’s reading, “unto them,” which though having only slim support in the Byzantine Greek textual tradition, nevertheless enjoys impressive support in the Latin both from the learned church doctor, St. Jerome in his Vulgate, and also from a number of significant old Latin Versions dating from ancient times. But on the other hand, the reading “unto him,” is supported by the representative Byzantine Text, some old Latin Versions, and some ancient church writers. Balancing out these competing factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 8:15 a low level “B” (in the range of 66% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 8:15, “unto them,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), the (mixed text in Gospels) Minuscule 33 (9th century), (the independent text) Minuscule 565 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Minuscule 892 (9th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions; the Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect reading, “unto him,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); together with Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent text) and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the Gothic Version (4th century) and Armenian Version (5th century).

It entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 8:15. It is thus found in the ASV as, “And ministered unto him (*auto*).” It is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

The incorrect variant is also found in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). Dean Burgon’s Majority Text, with its burgeoning additions of every Greek manuscript under the sun, whether that manuscript be good, bad, or indifferent; together with his concomitant unqualified commitment to quantity of manuscripts, not quality of manuscript (for which reason he puts the best Byzantine Text manuscript on a par with the worst Alexandrian Text manuscript, or worst Western Text manuscript); is manifested in a footnote of the Burgonites’ NKJV, which says at Matt. 8:15 that both the Majority Text and NU Text support this variant. To the extent that by far the greater number of manuscripts are Byzantine, in practice Burgon’s Majority Text equates the Byzantine majority text; and since this is the proper starting point for any textual analysis, this means that in broad terms, the Burgonites tend not to go so far astray as the neo-Alexandrians. Nevertheless, we surely cannot doubt that the errors of the neo-Alexandrians and the errors of the Burgonites here unite in a common cause, first in an unwarranted attack on Saint Jerome’s Vulgate, and then in an unwarranted attack on the *Textus Receptus* and Saint James Version of the Bible. We just as surely cannot doubt that both groups are wrong to do so.

**Matt. 8:18** “great multitudes” (TR & AV) {A}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

In one of the Byzantine Text’s oldest intact manuscript, *Codex Freerianus* (5th century, Matt. 1-24; Luke 8:13-24:53), one finds at the page showing Matt. 7:11-20, the section containing Matt. 7:17. Part of this reads in the Received Text, “*outo pan dendron agathon karpous*.” One can see that at Matt. 7:17, the scribe first wrote, using the optional “s” at the end of *outo*, “*outos* (Even so) *pan* (every) *dendron* (tree).” But then with ellipsis from the *on* ending of “*dendron*” (tree) and “*agathon*” (good), his eye jumped to the “*on*” ending of “*agathon*” after he had looked down to write “*dendron*,” and then looked back up to the Byzantine text of the page he was copying from, and so he then wrote down, “*karpous*” (fruits). He then realized he had made an error. Hence he inserted a backward sloping mark (“/”) above the “*k*” of “*karpous*” (fruits), and wrote in the nearby right hand margin, “*agathon*” (good), indicating that this is where this missing word is to be inserted.

This is invaluable evidence for showing the problems of ellipsis with two words following each other that have the same Greek ending. Alas, copyists were not always as adroit as this scribe of Manuscript Washington was here at Matt. 7:17, and sometimes they did not detect their error. This fact appears to be relevant in understanding some elements in the textual transmission history of Matt. 8:18.

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 8:18, the TR’s Greek reading, “*pollous* (great) *ochlous* (multitudes)” (plural), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, 6th century), E 07 (*Codex Basilensis*, 8th century), G 011 (*Codex Seidelianus*, 9th century), M 021 (*Codex Campianus*, 9th century); and

Lectionary 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). It is further supported as Latin “*turbas* (multitudes) *multus* (great)” (plural), by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate 4th / 5th centuries), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), h (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported as Latin “*turbae* (multitudes) *multae* (great)” (plural), by old Latin Version k (4th / 5th centuries). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); and the ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367), Chromatius (d. 407), and Augustine (d. 430).

Additional support for this reading comes from *Variant 1*. For stylistic reasons that make no difference to the English translation, the Greek word order was reversed to “*ochlous* (multitudes) *pollous* (great),” in Byzantine Minuscule 108 (11th century) and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*).

Another Greek reading, “*ochlon* (multitude) *polun* (a great)” (singular) (*Variant 2*), reverses the word order, and uses the singular. This is a minority Byzantine reading, found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), and Lectionaries 524 (12th century) and 1074 (1290 A.D.). It is also followed as Latin, “*turbam* (a multitude) *multam* (great)” (singular), in old Latin Versions g1 (8th / 9th century) and c (12th / 13th century).

*Variant 3*, Greek, “*ochlous* (multitudes)” (plural), is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 184 (1319 A.D.).

Like St. Mark who uses the term, “*polun* (a great) *ochlon* (multitude)” in Mark 6:34, and then reverses this word order to “*ochlon* (a multitude) *polun* (great)” in Mark 9:14; so too St. Matthew uses the term “great (*pollous*) multitudes (*ochlous*)” in Matt. 8:18, but reverses this word order with “*ochloi* (multitudes) *polloi* (great)” in Matt. 4:25; 8:1; 13:2; 19:2. There is no good reason to doubt the Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as the correct reading.

The origins of the reverse word order of *Variant 1*, found in Minuscule 108 are speculative. While it is possible that it reflects a later influence on the Greek of the earlier Latin word order, this strikes me as improbable. In all likelihood, the Byzantine scribe of Minuscule 108 had no knowledge of the Latin. I think it more probable that the Byzantine scribe remembered two or three words at a time in his head as he wrote them down, and due to inadvertence wrote down “*ochlous* (multitudes) *pollous* (great),” rather than “*pollous* (great) *ochlous* (multitudes).” Whether or not he realized his mistake is conjectural, and it makes no difference to the sense of the passage.

Can the inadvertence of an eleventh century Byzantine scribe can be seriously regarded as reflecting a Greek variant reading of “*ochlous* (multitudes) *pollous* (great)” from ancient times?

Is it more likely that this is an 11th century reading of independent origins, although possibly slightly older, and copied out by this 11th century scribe?

The UBS textual apparatus (3rd ed., 3rd corrected edition, 4th revised edition), regards as two separate Greek variants, “*pollous* (great) *ochlous* (multitudes),” and “*ochlous* (multitudes) *pollous* (great).” With qualification, I think they can be so classified with respect to Minuscule 108 (*Variant 1*). Tischendorf’s textual apparatus also notes the different word order; and like the

UBS textual apparatus sees the Latin word order as supporting Minuscule 108. But with regard to the Latin, I do not share this view since the Latin was necessarily a translation from the Greek, and it seems far more likely to me that it was simply the accepted convention among Latin translators, to here translate the Greek “great (*pollous*) multitudes (*ochlous*),” as the Latin “*turbas* (multitudes) *multus* (great).” This was probably done as a Latin stylistic harmonization in St. Matthew’s Gospel, so as to make Matt. 8:18 read like the Latin “*turbae* (multitudes) *multae* (great),” translating the Greek “*ochloi* (multitudes) *polloi* (great)” in Matt. 4:25; 8:1; 13:2; 19:2.

Referring to “much people” (Mark 6:34, AV), or “a great multitude” (Mark 9:14, AV), St. Mark uses the terms, “*polun* (a great) *ochlon* (multitude)” in Mark 6:34, and reverses this word order with “*ochlon* (a multitude) *polun* (great)” in Mark 9:14. In Mark 6:34 Jerome’s Vulgate uses the same word order in the Latin as the Greek, “*multam* (a great) *trubam* (multitude);” but in Mark 9:14, Jerome’s Vulgate reverses the Greek word order, and reads, “*omnis* (all) *populus* (the people).” Yet no neo-Alexandrian scholar is so silly as to thereby suggest that St. Jerome’s reading at Mark 9:14 preserves a variant Greek reading of “*polun ochlon*,” even though such a reading is found in Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine text other than Mark’s Gospel which is independent text)<sup>85</sup>.

Therefore I do not agree with these neo-Alexandrians that the Latin word order here in Matt. 8:18 supports the Greek word order of Minuscule 108 (*Variant 1*). Surely no competent scholar could seriously try to drive such a wedge between the Byzantine Greek and Latin readings of Matt. 8:18; when the Latin tradition is so united across Jerome’s Vulgate and so many significant old Latin Versions in its reading, “*turbas* (multitudes) *multus* (great),” and is further supported in this word order by ancient Latin writers (Hilary, Chromatius, & Augustine). This was clearly the standard Latin reading and translation of the Greek. I for one do not doubt that the Latin and Byzantine Greek here support the same underpinning Greek reading.

The origins of *Variant 2* i.e., the singular, “a great (*ochlon*) multitude (*polun*)” are necessarily speculative. But it seems hard to ignore its similarity to “*polun* (a great) *ochlon* (multitude)” in Matt. 14:14, and “*ochlos* (a great) *polus* (multitude)” in Matt. 20:29; 26:47. One possibility is that the words of the original reading, “great (*pollous*) multitudes (*ochlous*),” came at the end of a line, but due to paper loss, a scribe simply saw an empty space ::::::::::::::::::::,

---

<sup>85</sup> Some other manuscripts with non-Byzantine parts outside the closed class of sources, that are used by neo-Alexandrians for determining the text, also read “*polun ochlon*” at Mark 9:14. Specifically, Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere) and 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere). Outside the closed class of sources, this word order is also found in the Armenian Version (but is this just a feature of the Armenian translation of a different Greek word order?).

possibly with some loose letters floating about nearby in his manuscript e.g., “p” (pi /  $\pi$ ), one or more “o” (omicron /  $\omicron$ ), one or more “l” (lambda /  $\lambda$ ), and one or more “s” (sigma /  $\sigma$  or  $\varsigma$ ). Whether with or without any such jig-saw pieces, he may have worked out the general meaning from context, and reconstructed this as “a great (*ochlon*) multitude (*polun*)” after considering Matt. 14:14; 20:29; 26:47.

The origins of *Variant 3* i.e., the plural “multitudes” (*ochlous*), are conjectural. But most probably it arose by ellipsis, when a scribe moved his eyes from the “ous” ending of “*Iesous* (Jesus)” to the “ous” ending of “*pollous* (great)” to the “ous” ending of “*ochlous* (multitudes),” in the Greek words, “*Iesous pollous ochlous*” (or at least these last two words if “*Iesous*” was abbreviated). I.e., as his eyes ran over “*pollous ochlous*” and then forward to some other words, but then he remembered to look back to “the ous ending” and seeing “*ochlous*,” wrote this down, thus inadvertently omitting “*pollous*.”

The attestation of both the Greek and Latin strongly supports the TR reading here at Matt. 8:18. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 8:18 an “A,” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 8:18, “great (*pollous*) multitudes (*ochlous*),” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is additionally found in the same word order as the Greek in the Ethiopic Version (Takla Haymanot Edition), as well as some independent manuscripts of the Slavic (Slavonic) Version; and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century) as “*turbas* (multitudes) *multus* (great).”

*Variant 1*, reverses the Greek word order to “*ochlous* (multitudes) *pollous* (great).” The UBS textual apparatus (4th revised ed.), takes the view that this reading finds further support in the reverse word order of the Ethiopic Version (Pell Platt edition) and some independent manuscripts of the Armenian Version. Is this correct? Or is this just a feature of these Ethiopic and Armenian translations which use a different word order as part of their translation?

*Variant 2*, the singular, “a great (*ochlon*) multitude (*polun*),” is found in an independent manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; some independent manuscripts of the Armenian Version, and an independent manuscript of the Ethiopic Version; as well as the Georgian Version (5th century).

*Variant 3*, the plural, “multitudes” (*ochlous*), is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian Texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine

elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.*

It seems to me, that in all likelihood *Variant 3* arose independently in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, from its arising in Lectionary 184, and in turn independently from its origins in London Sinaiticus. The independent development of the same error, on what are in all probability, at least three separate occasions, in my opinion points to the tricky pitfalls of ellipsis (discussed *supra*,) with the *ous* endings in the words, “*Iesous* (Jesus) *pollous* (great) *ochlous* (multitudes).” Nevertheless, especially in the case of London Sinaiticus, one cannot rule out the possibility that this is a typical Alexandrian pruning of the text, possibly with reference to *ochlous* elsewhere in St. Matthew’s Gospel (Matt. 5:1; 9:36; 13:36; 14:15; 15:39; 21:46; 27:20).

*Variant 4*, the singular, “multitude (*ochlon*),” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as some independent manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version. We know from the existence of *Variant 2*, that some manuscripts read, “a great (*ochlon*) multitude (*polun*).” Once again, it is possible that this variant arose by ellipsis when a scribe first wrote down “*ochlon* (great),” and then, perhaps distracted as he wiped his brow in the hot African sun, his eye jumped to the “*un*” ending of “*polun* (multitude),” i.e., confusing in a moment of time in his mind “*on*” and “*un*,” and he kept writing on. However, as with *Variant 3*, one cannot rule out the possibility that this is a typical Alexandrian pruning of the text, possibly with reference to *ochlon* elsewhere in St. Matthew’s Gospel (Matt. 9:23; 14:5; 15:10; 17:14; 21:26).

As seen by e.g., the TR’s attestation in St. Jerome’s Vulgate (5th century for earliest Vulgate Codices in the Gospels), and the existence of *Variant 2* in W 032 (5th century); while one group of manuscripts declined “*polus*” and “*ochlos*” as (masculine accusative) plural i.e., “*pollous* (great<sup>86</sup>) *ochlous* (multitudes<sup>87</sup>)” (TR); another group reversed the word order, and declined “*polus*” and “*ochlos*” as (masculine accusative) singular, i.e., “a great (*ochlon*<sup>88</sup>) multitude (*polun*<sup>89</sup>)” (*Variant 2*). Both readings evidently found their way to Alexandria. The fact that the London Sinaiticus scribe, evidently working from a manuscript reading, “*pollous* (great) *ochlous* (multitudes),” would arrive at *Variant 3*, “*ochlous* (multitudes);” and the Rome Vaticanus scribe, evidently working from a manuscript reading “*ochlon* (a great) *polun* (multitude),” would arrive at *Variant 4*, “*ochlon* (multitude),” is notable.

Did one of these Alexandrian scribes arrive at their text by ellipsis, and the other by pruning? Or did both arrive at their text by ellipsis? Or did both arrive at their text by pruning? We do not know for certain. We do know from other Alexandrian readings that good quality Alexandrian scribes were hard to come by; and it would seem that whoever were responsible for commissioning these two fellows really “pulled out” the proverbial “booby prize” with their

---

<sup>86</sup> Masculine plural accusative adjective, from *polus*.

<sup>87</sup> Masculine plural accusative noun, from *ochlos*.

<sup>88</sup> Masculine singular accusative noun, from *ochlos*.

<sup>89</sup> Masculine singular accusative adjective, from *polus*.

selection. Manuscript W (*Codex Freerianus*), is an eclectic text of the Gospels, in which e.g., Matt. 1-28 is Byzantine Text, and then Mark 1:1-5:30 is Western Text; or Luke 1:1-8:12 is Alexandrian Text and then Luke 8:13-24:53 is Byzantine Text, i.e., the compiler evidently got his underpinning manuscripts from different sources who used rival texts. We know from this that in fact the Byzantine Text, Western Text, and Alexandrian Text were circulating at the same time by the 5th century. We cannot be surprised that the Western Text was soon all but forgotten, the Alexandrian Text soon faded away into oblivion, and the Byzantine Text soon rose to prominence. Good quality scribes realized then, what textual scholars like Erasmus of Rotterdam realized when he learnt of many discrepancies between the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus and the Received Text, or Beza of Geneva realized when he learnt of the discrepancies between the Western Text's D 05 and the Received Text, or what we can realize today since the unhappy "rediscovery" of the Alexandrian Text in the 19th century i.e., both the Alexandrian and Western Texts are inferior texts created by an inferior quality scribe. The existence of *Variants 3 and 4* in the two leading Alexandrian Texts at Matt. 8:18, clearly shows us that!

At Matt. 8:18, the TR's reading "great (*pollous*) multitudes (*ochlous*)" is found in the main text of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72). While it also appears as a footnote alternative in Westcott-Hort (1881) which reads, "[*pollous*] *ochlous*," thus making the "*pollous*" optional and so also allowing for *Variant 3*, the main text of Westcott-Hort (1881) follows *Variant 4*. *Variant 4*, the singular, "multitude (*ochlon*)," is also found in the main text of Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). The NU Text Committee in the UBS 3rd edition (1975) and UBS 3rd corrected edition (1983) said of the reading in their main text, "a multitude (*ochlon*)" (*Variant 4*), that "there is a very high degree of doubt concerning the reading selected for the" NU "text." But the NU Text Committee of the UBS 4th revised edition (1993), were more confident, though still somewhat doubtful of this same reading, saying simply, "the Committee had difficulty in deciding which variant to place in the text." Metzger says that "despite its slender attestation" (*Rome Vaticanus*, and *some* independent manuscripts of the *Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version*; all of which are *outside* the closed class of sources; all of which were not generally accessible over the ages), the NU Text "Committee" "preferred" *ochlon*, claiming "the other readings are to be explained as amplifications made in order to emphasize the size of the crowd around Jesus" (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 21; 1994, p. 17).

In fact, there is no compelling evidence that scribes set about to fraudulently "inflate" the size of the multitudes around Jesus at Matt. 8:18, as here claimed by the NU Text Committee. St. Matthew's Gospel makes a distinction between a "multitude" e.g., Jesus "called the multitude (*ochlon*)" (Matt. 15:10), and something larger e.g., "there followed" Jesus "great (*polloi*) multitudes" (Matt. 4:25). Who would suggest on the basis of Matt. 15:10, that Matt. 4:25 was an "inflation"? Yet it is likewise supercilious to suggest that Matt. 8:18 is an "inflation," on the basis of manuscripts like *Rome Vaticanus*, and *some* independent manuscripts of the *Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version*, whose African reading was unknown throughout most of Christendom and generally inaccessible throughout most of Christendom until historically modern times. It is clear that the religious liberals of the NU Text Committee do not believe that "the Word" (Isa. 40:8) and "the truth" (Ps. 117:2) of God, endure "for ever" (Ps. 117:2; Isa. 40:8).

Notwithstanding the support for *Variant 4* in the contemporary NU Text; the reality is, that with the two major Alexandrian texts splitting and dividing over the reading at Matt. 8:18; neo-Alexandrians have been clearly fiddling, faddling, and fudging over what to do with the

Alexandrian reading of *Variant 4*. Tischendorf wanted nothing to do with It; whereas Westcott and Hort used it with qualification; whereas Metzger's and Aland's NU Text Committees uphold it on the basis of their religiously liberal "group think." In the future, will the NU Text swing back to Tischendorf's view, or will it stay with the 1993 NU Text Committee "group think"? Will it move to favour another variant? We do not know. Neither did the NU Text Committee.

The ASV, NASB, RSV, and NRSV, follow Tischendorf's view, and at Matt. 8:18 have the same reading as the TR. E.g., the ASV reads, "Jesus saw great (*pollous*) multitudes (*ochlous*) about him" (ASV). *Variant 2*, the singular, "a great (*ochlon*) multitude (*polun*)," is followed by the ESV, which reads, "a great crowd" (ESV). *Variant 3*, the plural, "multitudes" (*ochlous*), is followed by Moffatt as "crowds" (Moffatt Bible). *Variant 4*, "multitude (*ochlon*)," is followed by the NASB and NIV e.g., the NASB reads, "crowd" (NASB).

**Matt. 8:21** "his disciples" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek reading, "*ton* (the) *matheton* (disciples) *autou* (of him)," i.e., "his disciples" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text, e.g., Codices W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, 6th century), U 030 (*Codex Nanianus*, 9th century), V 031 (*Codex Mosquensis*, 9th century), S 028 (*Codex Vaticanus*, 10th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). It is further supported as Latin, "*discipulis* (disciples) *eius* (of him)" i.e., "his disciples," by Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions *aur* (7th century), *1* (7th / 8th century), *g1* (8th / 9th century), and *ff1* (10th / 11th century). It is also supported by the ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and *Speculum* (d. 5th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However, Greek "*auto* (his)" or Latin "*eius* (his)," is omitted, making on reconstruction, the Greek reading, "*ton* (the) *matheton* (disciples)" (*Variant 1*) in old Latin Version *a* (4th century), which reads simply, "*discipulorum* (of the disciples)" (*Variant 1*).

Another reading is Latin, "*discipulus* (disciple)" (*Variant 2*), in old Latin Versions *b* (5th century), *h* (5th century), *q* (6th / 7th century), and *c* (12th / 13th century). It is also omitted by the ancient church Latin writer, Chromatius (d. 407).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore correct. *Variant 1* is a one off. Its origins are necessarily speculative; but possibly a scribe looking at a Latin manuscript originally reading, Latin "*discipulis eius*," due to a paper loss, saw something like, either *discipul:::u:::* or *discipul:::u:::*, and reconstructed this as "*discipulorum*" (*Variant 1*). It is notable that for *Variant 2*, all four old Latin Versions read "*discipulus* (*Variant 1b*)." This looks like the "*discipul*" beginning of "*discipulis* (disciples)," followed by the "*us*" ending of "*eius* (his)." While the origins of *Variant 2* are also conjectural, it is possible e.g., that a Latin scribe looking at what was originally "*discipulis eius*," but which due to paper loss looked like "*discipul:::us*," was uncertain as to the reading, and so as to preserve it as he saw it, simply wrote down "*discipul us*," inadvertently narrowing the space between these two. Then a later Latin scribe, unaware of this earlier textual history, and failing to understand the earlier scribe's intended message, simply looking at "*discipul us*," took this to

be created by inadvertence, and contracted the space to form, “*discipulus (Variant 2)*.” We cannot be certain as to the origins of such variants, we can only be certain that they are variants from the original reading here found in the representative Greek Byzantine Text, and also here preserved for us in St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate.

The attestation of both the Greek and Latin here strongly supports the TR’s reading. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 8:21 an “A,” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 8:21, “his disciples,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex 0250 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (c. 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as the Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Version; Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (c. 500).

However, the incorrect reading, “the (*ton*) disciples (*matheton*)” (*Variant 1*), is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and the (mixed text in Gospels) Minuscule 33 (9th century). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century) and Slavic Version (9th century). I do not think the origins of this variant in the two leading Alexandrian Texts are related to its independent and distinctive presence in the old Latin Versions, *supra*. Rather, this looks like a typical Alexandrian pruning of the text, designed to create a “more concise” text, possibly made with some reference to “the disciples” elsewhere in St. Matthew’s Gospel, found as “the (*tous*) disciples (*mathetas*)” in Matt. 26:40, “the (*tois*) disciples (*mathetais*)” in Matt. 15:36; 26:26, and “the (*oi*) disciples (*mathetai*)” in Matt. 14:26; 17:6,19; 18:1; 19:13; 21:6,20; 24:3; 26:17,19,35,36,56.

This incorrect reading which omits “*auto* (his)” at Matt. 8:21, is found in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), and Nestle’s 21st edition (1952). This omission is followed in the ASV and Moffatt Bible.

However the NU Text, found in Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993), (like the earlier UBS 3rd and 3rd corrected editions,) places “*auto*” back in the main text, but in square brackets, i.e., making it optional. Metzger makes the staggering claim that “the support” of (in the order he lists them,) Rome Vaticanus, London Sinaiticus, Minuscule 33, old Latin Version a, and the Coptic Sahidic Version, “would” from the perspective

of his religiously liberal and neo-Alexandrian paradigm, “usually be regarded as exceptionally strong evidence” for the omission of “*auto* (his).” But he says the NU Text Committee, “was impressed by the possibility that *autou* [‘of him’] may have been deleted in order to prevent the reader from inferring that the *grammateus* [‘scribe’] of ver. 19 was one of Jesus’ disciples. On the other hand, it can be argued that it is because of the word *eteros* [‘another’ in verse 21], not *autou* [‘his’] that a reader might infer that *grammateus* [the ‘scribe’] of ver. 19 was a disciple of Jesus. Actually the absence of *autou* [‘his’] does not improve the sense, but rather makes the text more ambiguous” (Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 22; 1994, pp. 17-8).

It seems to me that the NU Text Committee is arguing itself around in circles here. Metzger is right to recognize that the presence of “*eteros* (another),” in the words, “And another of his disciples said unto him” (TR), or “And another of the disciples said unto him” (*Variant 1*); means that on this line of argument, one could still link “the disciples” of verse 21 to the “scribe” of verse 19. But at this point, the argument that “*auto* (his)” might have been pruned to avoid this conclusion must necessarily fail at the threshold, unless one can show that these manuscripts also omit “*eteros* (another),” which they clearly do not. Therefore the only way to maintain, with the NU Text Committee, that “*auto* (his)” may have been deleted in order to avoid this link; is by stipulating that the Alexandrian scribes of Rome Vaticanus and London Sinaiticus were incompetent buffoons, who tried to omit this implication by removing “*auto* (his),” but who lacked the competence to realize that in failing to also remove “*eteros* (another),” they had done “a botched job.” If on the one hand, these Alexandrian scribes were such incompetent buffoons, then one can safely dismiss their omission of “*auto* (his).” If on the other hand, this was not their thinking at all in omitting “*auto* (his),” (and I think it highly improbable that this was their rationale,) then one can safely dismiss the NU Text Committee’s chain of logic; in which instance, one would certainly not wish to trust their view that “*auto* (his)” can be omitted for any reason!

The NU Text’s slippery solution of allowing one to either include or omit “his” at whim in Matt. 8:21, is reflected in the fact that it is omitted in the NASB, RSV, and ESV; but included in the NRSV. Such vacillation is also evident in the NIV which originally read, “Another man, one of his (*auto*) disciples (*ton matheton*)” (NIV 1st ed.); but when revised, the *New Idiotic Version* was changed to, “Another disciple said to him” (NIV 2nd ed.). The NIV (1st ed.) clearly follows the NU Text option of including “his” (and thus agrees with the TR, albeit for the wrong reasons). But what does the NIV (2nd ed.) follow? If one believes in formal equivalence, the second edition of the NIV here follows neither. Though unravelling such painful NIV “dynamic equivalents” is hazardous, and at times debatable, it would appear that the second edition of the NIV has rejected its first edition’s reading, and adopted *Variant 1*.

**Matt. 8:25a** “his disciples” (TR & AV) {C}

The TR’s Greek reading, “*oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples) *autou* (of him),” i.e., “his disciples,” in the words, “and his disciples came to him, and awoke him” (AV), is a minority Byzantine reading, supported by Codices W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); the beautifully illustrated purple parchment, Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century); X 033 (*Codex Monacensis*, 10th century); Minuscules 262 (Paris, France, 10th century), 945 (Edinburgh University, Scotland, UK, 11th century), 1187 (Sinai, Arabia, 11th century), 267 (Paris, France, 12th century), 924 (Athos, Greece, 12th century), 1604 (Athos, Greece, 13th century); and written in brown ink with

colourful bright red illumination of key letters and section markers, Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). It is also supported by a number of other Lectionaries, for instance, 127 (9th century), 205 (10th century), 770 (10th century), 773 (11th century), 1424 (1011 A.D.), 253 (1020 A.D.), 384 (12th century), 1780 (13th century), and 184 (1319 A.D.). It is further supported in old Latin Versions b (5th century) and g1 (8th / 9th century); and also by old Version q (6th / 7th century), where the same Latin words as old Latin Versions b and g1, Latin, “*discipuli* (disciples) *eius* (his),” occur slightly later in the verse. A similar Greek reading is also found in Minuscule 1577 (Athos, Greece, 14th century).

Another reading which omits Greek, “*autou* (of him),” i.e., reading “*oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples)” (*Variant 1*), is found in the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Lectionary 2378 (11th century). It is also followed by old Latin Version h (5th century); as well as by the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339), and ancient church Latin writer, Chromatius (d. 407).

Another reading which omits Greek, “*oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples) *autou* (of him)” (*Variant 2*), is found in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is further followed by the ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420).

Another Latin reading has, “*ad* (to) *eum* (him) *discipuli* (disciples) *eius* (his)” immediately after “*Et* (And) *accesserunt* (they came),” i.e., “and his disciples came to him” (*Variant 3*). This reading is followed in old Latin Version m (8th / 9th century). It is further found in Latin Codices, R (8th century Vatican, 8th / 9th century Oxford, & 10th century Paris), D (8th / early 9th century Dublin), E (8th / 9th century London), and Ep (9th century Paris). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). In this same form, one finds it translated from the Greek in the King James Version (1611), which recognizes the clarity of this Latin form, whose support includes the celebrated *Codex Armachanus* or *Book of Armagh*, (Latin Codex D,) by adding “him” in the English translation in italics.

Unlike the term, “the apostles,” which is a unique designation (Matt. 12:2), the term “disciples” may require qualification, as in addition to Christ’s disciples, it is used in St. Matthew’s Gospel for “the disciples of John” (Matt. 9:14), i.e., “his [John Baptist’s] disciples” (Matt. 14:12); as well as the “disciples” of “the Pharisees” (Matt. 22:15,16). In St. Matthew’s Gospel, referring to Christ’s disciples as “his disciples” (Matt. 5:1; 8:21,23; 9:10,11,19,37; 10:1; 12:1,49; 13:36; 14:15,22; 15:12,23,32,33,36; 16:5,13,20,21,24; 17:10; 19:10,23,25; 23:1; 24:1; 26:1,8,45; 27:64; 28:7,8,9,13 ), is far more common terminology than referring to them as “the disciples.” Therefore, *prima facie*, “his disciples” is always the expected term. This more common term is found in more normative circumstances; and indicates the spiritual or physical closeness that Christ had to those who were specifically “his disciples.”

Some married couples have a custom that when speaking to each other, and sometimes others, they say that the children of the marriage are “my children” or “our children” when speaking favourably of them; but usually only to each other, “your children” when speaking unfavourably of them. E.g., a proud father may publicly say, “That’s my boy!” But in private, a wife might say to her husband, “Darling, *your* son is rolling around outside in the mud, *again!*”

In a manner not entirely dissimilar to, *though not identical with this*, in the subtle Greek nuances of St. Matthew's Gospel, the term "the disciples," as opposed to "his disciples," is used far less commonly, but specifically, is *sometimes* used when putting some distance between Jesus and the disciples, either for reasons of mental, emotional, spiritual, or physical proximity.

Concerning the former, i.e., mental, emotional, or spiritual reasons; we read, "And the disciples came, and said unto him, Why speakest thou unto them in parables?" (Matt. 13:10); here showing an understanding distance between Christ and "the disciples." The disciples had a strong emotional distance between them and Christ in Matt. 17:5,6, for "a bright cloud overshadowed them," and the Father spoke of the Son, "and when the disciples heard it, they fell on their face, and were sore afraid." In Matt. 17:13, "the disciples" should have known that John the Baptist was "Elias," and so it is with some disappointment, they are called, "the disciples."

In Matt. 17:19, "the disciples" were to some extent spiritually alienated from Christ, "and said" to "Jesus," "Why could not we cast him out?" Pride stood between Christ and "the disciples," when they came, "Saying, Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" (Matt. 18:1). The spirit of Christ, was not the spirit of "the disciples" who "rebuked" those that "brought unto him little children" (Matt. 19:13). A distance of sombre gravity, touching upon the death of our Lord existed, when he "took the twelve disciples apart in the way, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem: and the Son of man shall be betrayed." "And they shall condemn him to death" (Matt. 20:17,18).

There was some lack of spiritual discernment and understanding, "when the disciples saw" what had happened after Jesus cursed the fig tree, and "they marvelled, saying, How soon is the fig tree withered away!" (Matt. 21:19,20). Puzzlement and confusion put some distance between "the disciples" and Christ in Matt. 24:3, after the words of Matt. 24:2, and "the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us, when shall these things be?" etc. The fact that just after the Last Supper, "all the disciples forsook him, and fled" (Matt. 26:56), is previewed in the lack of immediate true spiritual closeness of "the disciples" (Matt. 26:17, possibly also here referring to a lack of immediate understanding; Matt 26:19, also an issue of geographic proximity; Matt. 26:26,35,36,40). Reference in Matt. 28:16 to "the eleven," tells of the isolation due to loss of one, obviously keenly felt at an emotional level, by this band of men.

Concerning the latter, i.e., physical proximity; we read, that after he "blessed" "the five loaves, and the two fishes," "the disciples" (in the AV "his" for the first reference is added in italics), moved geographically further and further away from Christ as they gave these loaves "to the multitudes" (Matt. 14:19). So too we see such a transition in Matt. 15:36, where Christ first gives "the seven loaves and the fishes" "to his disciples," who then become geographically more remote as "the disciples" give these "to the multitude." As they moved physically away from Christ, "the disciples went" in Matt. 21:6.

Concerning both, i.e., mental, emotional, or spiritual reasons, together with physical proximity; in Matt. 15:26 "when the disciples saw him walking on the sea, they were troubled, saying, It is a spirit," being both geographically distant, and also emotionally distinct from Christ whom they did not identify with, saying of him, "It is a spirit." Cf. Matt.26:19, *supra*.

Understanding this Matthean Greek nuance helps us better understand certain portions of St. Matthew's Gospel. E.g., in Matt. 8:21,22 the fact that the man is called "another of his

disciples,” means we can infer that in fact this man did as Christ said, and left “the dead to bury the dead,” even though we are not specifically told this. A subtle difference in the disciples mood and feeling of proximity to Christ is found in the contrast of “his disciples” being close to Christ when saying, “Declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field” (Matt. 13:36); as compared to the more chilling disposition of when “the disciples came, and said unto him, Why speakest thou unto them in parables?” (Matt. 13:10). So too the nuance is important, for distinguishing the godly way “his disciples” were “amazed,” but this put no distance between them and Christ in Matt. 19:25; compared to the way they “marvelled,” and this put a distance between them and Christ in Matt. 21:20. This Matthean Greek nuance tells of a rising emotional and spiritual chill, and certain mood changes in the narrative, as we go from “his disciples” in Matt. 24:1, to “the disciples” in Matt. 26:3; who were evidently somewhat perturbed at the prospect of the temple’s destruction mainly in 70 A.D., but totally (in the case of the foundations of Herod’s Temple forming the present Wailing Wall,) at the Second Advent. Though misguided, it was “his disciples” who wrongly “had indignation” in Matt. 26:8, indicating that they were sincerely misguided, and acting from genuine concern for what they wrongly thought were the proper teachings of Christ on this subject.

With this understanding of this Matthean Greek nuance in mind, it is clear that the representative Byzantine reading poses a textual problem. The “disciples” of Matt. 8:25 are certainly not physically remote from Christ, for they could scarce be more proximate, than when they “came to him, and awoke him.” Nor are they remote from him in their spiritual or emotional thinking towards Christ, for they came to him with this petition of closeness, “Lord, save us: we perish.” This is no way detracted from by Christ’s later response, “Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?” in Matt. 8:26, since it only goes to show, that as in Matt. 26:8, they were to some extent sincerely misguided in their assessment of the situation.

Given that in Matt. 8:25, the representative Byzantine Text reads, “the disciples came to him, and awoke him, saying, Lord, save us: we perish;” therefore immediately raises a textual problem for Matthean Greek. Even if, as in Matt. 26:8, his disciples were misguided as to their belief that they needed to awaken Christ, and in this sense, lacked faith (Matt. 8:26); nevertheless, these words of Matt. 8:25 are part of a narrative in which Christ’s disciples could scarcely be closer to Christ in both physically proximity, and in their deep emotional and spiritual reliance upon him to whom they say, “Lord, save us: we perish.” The consequence of this being, our natural expectation is that Matthean Greek will here read, “*oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples) *autou* (of him),” i.e., “his disciples,” and not the representative Byzantine Text’s, “*oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples)” (*Variant 1*).

In order to restore what was evidently the original reading of Matt. 8:25, and repair this gaping breach in the representative Byzantine Text Greek of Matt. 8:25, we must therefore adopt the minority Byzantine Greek reading, “his disciples,” which is therefore the correct reading. (Cf. commentary at Matt. 14:22c.)

To the proposition that *Variant 2* might be original, it should be remembered that on general principles we start with the representative Byzantine Greek Text, and only move away from it reluctantly where required by textual reasons to do so. The distance we move from the representative Byzantine Text i.e., *Variant 1*, to the TR’s “his disciples;” is less than the distance we would have to move to omit “the disciples” altogether i.e., *Variant 2*. Without a good textual reason to do, we cannot make such a prodigious movement and reject *Variant 1* in favour of

*Variant 2.* No such compelling textual reason here exists. Therefore we stand firmly in favour of the TR's "his disciples," as the appropriate repair work to the representative Byzantine text.

The origins of both *Variants 1* and *2* are speculative. Was the loss accidental from a paper fade? Was it deliberate? If the latter, might it be that in view of the fact that reference is made to "his disciples" in Matt. 8:23, both variants manifest a desire to prune away "unnecessarily repeated details" from Matt. 8:25. If so, those making this unwarranted decision evidently disagreed among themselves as to just how much to prune away, and this may account for the discrepancy between *Variants 1* and *2*.

Concerning *Variant 3*, Latin, "*ad (to) eum (him), discipuli (disciples) eius (his)*" i.e., "to him, his disciples." This is found in the *Book of Armagh* (9th century). Armagh, in Northern Ireland is famous as the religious centre founded by St. Patrick (d. 461), and is the home of two rival Cathedrals, both claiming to be the "true" successors of St. Patrick, the national (motif) saint of Ireland, and both called "St. Patrick's Cathedral." (The cross of St. Patrick, a red "X" shape, is found on the Union Jack, because it represents the fact that Northern Ireland is part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, although before 1922 it represented all of Ireland.) One of these rival Cathedrals called "St. Patrick's" is Protestant (Anglican *Church of Ireland*), and was formerly the Cathedral Church of the Anglican Archbishop and Primate of Ireland, James Ussher (Archbishop, 1625-1656); whereas the other Cathedral is Roman Catholic. I inspected both of them in 2001. However, I also visited Trinity College, Dublin, in southern Ireland, founded by the Protestant Queen Elizabeth the First in 1592, for education and "true religion;" which is where this famous manuscript, *Codex Armachanus*, is kept (as is also a Waldensian New Testament I inspected in the library's manuscripts room).

The Latin reading, "*ad (to) eum (him),*" was probably intended by the scribe of *Codex Armachanus* to be explanatory, and in this sense bears some similarity with the AV. But unlike the AV which clearly marks this out by using italics; the scribe failed to mark these words out by asterisks or other means, indicating that he was the originator of this explanatory gloss.

*Variant 3* was adopted by the Clementine Vulgate (1592), which followed *Codex Armachanus* in reading, Latin, "*ad (to) eum (him), discipuli (disciples) eius (his)*" i.e., "to him, his disciples." This shows the grave dangers of elevating the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, over the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. It is clear from textual analysis of the Greek that "him" is inferred, and so its addition as an explanatory scribal gloss is readily understandable. But by not recognizing the superiority of the maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, the Latin Church scribes found themselves in a precarious position since it seemed clear to them, and rightly so, that there was evidently some kind of stylistic deficit in the reading of the Latin Vulgate at this point (*Variant 2*).

But how to overcome this deficit from textual analysis of only the Latin, places one in perilous waters indeed. As to exactly how they reached their conclusion that the Latin reading of *Codex Armachanus* (9th century) was to be preferred over old Latin readings following the Greek Textus Receptus, or *Variant 1*, we cannot be sure. We only know, that by stubbornly refusing to accept that the lesser maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, must always be upheld and maintained in deferential respect to the greater maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, that the composers of the Clementine Vulgate (1592) adopted *Variant 3*.

On the one hand, textual considerations favour the TR's reading, which repairs an inappropriate and incongruous usage of "the disciples" in the representative Byzantine Text; and does so with the support of some fifth and late fifth / sixth century Byzantine manuscripts. But on the other hand, this better reading is both a minority Greek and minority Latin reading. Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading in Matt. 8:25a a high level "C" (in the range of 63% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading, but has a lower level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 8:25a, "his disciples," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century) and Minuscule 205 (15th century, independent text in the Gospels & Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is also found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (*c.* 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as the Georgian "1" (5th century) and Georgian "A" (5th century) Versions; the Ethiopic Versions (*c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries); and Slavic Version (9th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

*Variant 1*, "the disciples," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); as well as at the hand of a later "corrector" of (the mixed text type) Codex C 04. It is also found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It further occurs in the Armenian Version (5th century) and the Georgian Version "B" (5th century). It was adopted by the NIV and Moffatt. E.g., Moffatt reads, "So the disciples went and woke him up" (Moffatt Bible).

*Variant 2*, which omits "*oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples) *autou* (of him)," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as (the mixed text type) Minuscule 892 (9th century). It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.

This erroneous *Variant 2* entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 8:25. The ASV reads, "And they came to him, and awoke him." While this same reading was adopted by the NASB the NASB revisers were rightly uneasy about the fact that the first "him" (ASV) is supplied, and so should, like the AV, be in italics. They thus kept the ASV reading, but restored the "him" (AV) to italics. By contrast, the RSV, NRSV, and ESV translators went the other way, omitting the ASV's first "him." E.g., the ESV simply reads, "And they went and woke him" (ESV).

*Variant 3* adds the first "him" (*auto*), in "*auto* (to him) *oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples) *autou* (of him)," i.e., it reads without the first "him" it italics, "and his disciples came to him, and awoke him." Von Soden, the NU Text Committee, and Hodges & Farstad, all think is the most probable original reading of (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), although the

manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain. This reading is also found in the Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Version. It seems to me that there is no necessary relationship between the Latin reading of *Codex Armachanus*, *supra*, and these readings of non-Byzantine Greek Codex C 04 and this Coptic Version; nor any necessary relationship between non-Byzantine Greek C 04 and this Coptic Version. Rather, I think that these were in all probability three independent instances, where different scribes have all made the same explanatory scribal gloss for the same basic reason. The reason is certainly understandable, and also gave rise to the addition of the word "him" in italics in the AV.

*Variant 1* is also followed at Matt. 8:25a in the Burgonite majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). *Variant 2* was also followed by the old Latin Papists of the Douay-Rheims Version which reads at Matt. 8:25a, "And they came to him." Thus the Burgonites here find common cause with the likes of the religiously liberal, semi Neo-Alexandrian Moffatt; and further agree with the Latin Papists and the Neo-Alexandrians Proper of *Variant 2*, that "the *Textus Receptus* HAS to go here at Matt. 8:25a." Smiling at one another they declare, "United together, with our common strength we may at last succeed in striking down the hated *Textus Receptus*!" *But all to no avail. For cherubims stood guard over the OT Textus Receptus (Heb. 9:5), and to now strike down the NT Textus Receptus the Latin Papists, the Burgonites, the semi neo-Alexandrians, and the Neo-Alexandrians Proper must first vanquish the royal guardians who are the neo-Byzantine textual analysts. But here at Matt. 8:25a each Royal Guardian holds in his hand a "two-edged sword" (Heb. 4:12) that has never seen defeat, nor can ever see defeat, for it is energized and powered by the Holy Ghost. That "sword of the Spirit" (Eph. 6:17) now comes down to slice 'n' dice into a thousand and one little pieces the Latin Papists, the Burgonites, the semi Neo-Alexandrians, and the Neo-Alexandrians Proper. Hast thou not heard its thunders? They be these. "Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum!" "The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever!" "VERBUM DOMINI MANET IN AETERNUM!!" "THE WORD OF THE LORD ENDURETH FOREVER!!" "VERBUM DOMINI MANET IN AETERNUM!!!" "THE WORD OF THE LORD ENDURETH FOREVER!!!"*

**Matt. 8:25b** "us" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek reading, "*emas* (us)," in the words, "Lord, save (*so*son) us (*emas*): we perish," is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), K 017 (*Codex Cyprius*, 9th century), Pi 041 (*Codex Petropolitanus*, 9th century), Gamma 036 (*Codex Oxoniensis Bodleianus*, 10th century), and X 033 (*Codex Monacensis*, 10th century), Minuscule 180 (12th century, Byzantine other than in Acts); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). It is also supported as Latin, "*nos* (us), by Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), h (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Eusebius (d. 339), Chrysostom (d. 407), Cyril of

Alexandria (d. 444), and Hesychius (d. after 450); and ancient church Latin writers, Ambrose (d. 397), Gaudentius (d. after 406), Chromatius (d. 407), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430).

However, an alternative reading which omits Greek, “*emas* (us),” from “*sqson* (save) “*emas* (us),” and so simply reads, “*sqson* (save),” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 547 (13th century). It is also followed by the ancient Greek writer, Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must therefore stand as correct. To this, one may add that there is also a strong argument in favour of “*sqson* (save) “*emas* (us),” namely, in such contexts, in Matthean Greek, (and indeed more widely in NT Greek,) the Greek word, *sqzo* (“save”), generally has an object e.g., “Save (*sqson*) me (*me*)” (Matt. 14:30), or “Save (*sqson*) thyself (*seauton*)” (Matt. 27:40).

The origins of the variant are speculative. Was this an accidental loss due to a typical paper fade? Or with its mixed witness from Cyril of Alexandria, is it more probable that the omission of “*emas* (us)” is a typical Alexandrian pruning away of “superfluous detail,” designed to create “a less flowery” and “more succinct text”?

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 8:25b an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 8:25b, “us,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 157 (independent, 12th century) and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is further found in the Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Version (c. 500); Slavic Version (9th century); and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries).

However, the incorrect reading which omits “us,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, B 03 (*Codex Rome Vaticanus*, 4th century) and Aleph 01 (*Codex London Sinaiticus*, 4th century); as well as (the mixed text type) C 04 (*Codex Paris Ephraemi Rescriptus*, 5th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in some independent manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version.

From such sources, the incorrect reading entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 8:25b. Thus the Westcott-Hort (1881) based ASV reads, “Save, Lord.” The “us” is likewise omitted in the RSV and Moffatt’s Bible. The NASB revisers, while sharing the ASV translators view that “us” is not in the Greek, nevertheless resupplied it as an added word *in italics*. *Prima facie* it is found

in the NRSV, ESV, and NIV; however, since none of these translations use italics for added words, we cannot be certain if they agreed with the NASB translators and simply supplied it for stylistic reasons, or if they thought it was part of the original Greek. Whether because they omit the “us” (ASV, RSV, & Moffatt), or because they place it in italics (NASB), or because they do not use italics and we are left wondering which Greek reading they were following (NRSV, ESV, and NIV), we once again find such “new” or “modern” versions are making the Word of God less clear to the modern reader, not more clear, than it is in the AV.

**Matt. 8:28** “Gergesenes” (TR & AV) {A}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

Inside the closed class of sources, in Lectionary 2378 we read, “*Gergesin*” with a semi-circle in a ^ direction over the last two letters. The scribe of this Lectionary uses this symbol at the end of a line for “*on*” e.g., in this same Lectionary reading (Matt. 8:28-9:1) at the ends of lines for “*auton* (them)” (Matt. 8:30) and “*pollon* (many)” (Matt. 8:30). By contrast, since it is not at the end of a line, this scribe does not so use this abbreviation for “*choiron* (swine)” (Matt. 8:31). Hence the reading of Lectionary 2378 is “*Gergesinon*.” This is the same spelling also found in Codex Omega 045 (9th century); and it is a variant form of “*Gergesenon* (Gergesenes).” Hence I show Lectionary 2378 following the *Textus Receptus* reading, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources the variant spelling “*Gergesinon*” is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent) and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts* (Swanson), which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee*) Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent). Hence I also show these following the TR’s reading, *infra*.

Given the limited scope of detailed data available to me, (the work of Swanson, though limited in scope, is very good on this type of thing,) it remains possible that this variant spelling occurs more widely, both inside and outside the closed class of sources.

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 8:28, the TR’s Greek reading, “*Gergesenon* (Gergesenes),” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., *Codex Freerianus* (W 032, 5th century, Byzantine in Matt. 1:28; Luke 8:13-24:53), *Codex Basilensis* (E 07, 8th century); Minuscules 1505 (Athos, Greece, 11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels) and 597 (Venice, Italy, 13th century); *Sidneiensis Universitatis* Lectionary 2378 (11th century) and *Sidneiensis Universitatis* Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Apollinaris (d. 390) in a manuscript according to Epiphanius (d. 403), and Hesychius (d. after 450). It is also the most probable reading of a manuscript by the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339), where stylistic and contextual factors do not permit complete certainty

However, an alternative reading, Greek, “*Gadarenon* (Gadarenes)” (*Variant 1*), is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex Sigma 042 (6th century), Lectionary 253 (1020 A.D.), and Minuscule 1010 (12th century). It is also followed in a manuscript according to the ancient church Greek writer Origen (d. 254); as well as by the ancient church Greek writer,

Epiphanius (d. 403).

Yet another reading, Greek, “*Gerasenon* (Gerasenes)” (*Variant 2*), is found as Latin, “*Gerasenorum*,” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); and as Latin “*Gerasinorum*,” in old Latin Version k (4th / 5th centuries). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592) as “*Gerasenorum*.” It is also followed in a manuscript according to the ancient church Greek writer Origen (d. 254); and ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367), Ambrose (d. 397), and Chromatius (d. 407).

There is no good textual reason to doubt the representative Byzantine reading of Matt. 8:28, and so “Gergesenes” is clearly the correct reading of the better manuscripts.

Gergesa to the north, and Gadara to the south, are both on the east coast of the Sea of Galilee. When visiting this region, I saw the Decapolis (Matt. 4:25; Mark 5:20; 7:31) town of Gadara, and then went on to see the remains of the Byzantine Monastery (excavated in 1970 by Dan Urman and Vassilios Tzaferis of the Department of Antiquities and Museums in Israel), which is on what thus constitutes the traditionally identified site where Jesus met these two devil-possessed men. The site includes a cave or “tomb” which had been made into a Byzantine Chapel. As one stands at this tomb looking out towards the nearby clearly visible Sea of Galilee, one can also see to one’s left, a long hill with a steep incline going down into the Sea of Galilee; and this is the traditionally identified site that the herd of swine were feeding at when Jesus cast the devils into them, and they ran down into the sea (Matt. 8:31,32).

On the *Table of Nations*, “Sheba” and “Havilah” on the south-west of the Arabian Peninsula, are identified under both Ham’s son, “Cush” (Gen. 10:7); and Shem’s son, Arphaxad (Gen. 10:28,29). So too, Midian on the north-west of Arabia, is identified under both Shem’s son (in the Hebraic sense of descendant cf. Matt. 1:1), Abraham (Gen. 25:2,4); and Ham’s son, Cush (Hab. 3:7, Hebraic poetical parallelism between “Cushan” and “Midian”). Thus Zipporah is called both a Midianite (Exod. 2:16,21), and an “Ethiopian” (AV) or “Cushite” (ASV) (Num. 12:1). Evidently, the western strip along Arabia was regarded as a joint Hamite-Semite strip. In this sense, the Hebrew thinking about such borders, has some similarity with our modern thinking about the French-German border of Alsace-Lorraine.

With such Hebraic thinking in our minds, as one who has had the God given privilege of visiting Israel and seeing this site, I can testify that the region around the Sea of Galilee is, by modern standards, quite small. I travelled all around the Sea of Galilee, and if, unlike myself, one did not stop at various points, one could easily drive around it by car in less than a couple of hours. This is significant because it means that people from both the city of Gergasa and city of Gadara may well have used these “tombs” (Matt. 8:28; Mark 5:2,3,5; Luke 8:27,) to bury their dead. If so, on the Hebraic thinking of shared border regions, both would have had a territorial interest in the place of these tombs, and so one could refer to the region as either “the country of the Gergasenes” (Matt. 8:28) through reference to Gergesa, or to “the country of the Gadarenes” (Mark 5:1; Luke 8:26) through reference to Gadara.

“Gergesenes (*Gergesenon*)” in Matt. 8:28, contrasts with “Gadarenes (*Gadarenon*)” in

Mark 5:1; Luke 8:26,37; see commentary at these verses). It is clear from Origen (d. 254), that efforts were early made to assimilate these three readings from at least the third century. Scribes unaware of the Hebraic thinking of shared border regions found in Matt. 8:28; Mark 5:1; Luke 8:26,37; might wrongly see a tension between these Synoptic Gospel accounts. The reality is, that different Gospels sometimes give a different character development or emphasis to the same story. While I think Matt. 8:28-34; Mark 5:1-20; Luke 8:26-40 are all telling the same story, at times they recount different elements of it. E.g., St. Matthew refers to “two” devil-possessed men (Matt. 8:28), whereas both St. Mark and St. Luke focus on just one “man” (Mark 5:2; Luke 8:27) of these two. Such selective character development is sometimes a feature of the different Gospels (cf. commentary at Matt. 8:8a).

Sadly, some scribes struggling to find a “harmonization” of “parallel gospel readings,” might sometimes be prepared to make deliberate editorial changes to remove what they wrongly saw as “conflicts” between the gospel accounts. *Variant 1* “Gadarenes (*Gadarenon*),” appears to be an attempt to assimilate the reading of Matt. 8:28, to that of Mark 5:1; Luke 8:26,37. Possibly this was deliberate. Possibly it was accidental, when due to a paper fade / loss, “*Gergesenen*” looked something like, “*G:::enon*,” and on the basis of Mark 5:1; Luke 8:26,37, a scribe wrongly, but sincerely, concluded that this must have originally read, “*Gadarenon*.”

Concerning *Variant 2*, the reading “Gerasenes (*Gerasenen*),” appears to have entered the text by a multi-stepped process. The scribe responsible was apparently aware of the fact, that like Gadara (Mark 5:1; Luke 8:26,27), “Geresa” was also a Decapolis (“the ten cities) city. Hence while the mutual defence league of the Decapolis existed, there was a sense in which e.g., the region of the “Gadarenes” (Mark 5:1; Luke 8:26,27), might also be called, the region of the “Gerasenes” (*Variant 2*). Both “Gergesenes (*Gergesenen*)” and “Gerasenes (*Gerasenen*)” start with “*Ger*” and then after a space of one (Gerasenes) or two (Gergesenes) letters, both end in “*enen*.” If due to a paper fade / loss, “*Gergesenen*” looked something like, “*Ger::enen*,” a scribe who was aware from memory, or from what another told him, that “the reading in Matthew’s Gospel is not the same as Mark’s and Luke’s Gospel,” may have determined the general area on the basis of Mark 5:1; Luke 8:26,37, and then conjectured that because Gadara and Geresa were both Decapolis cities, and St. Mark makes specific reference to this fact (Mark 5:1,20), that Matt. 8:28 “must be” the “Gerasenes” of *Variant 2*.

Of course, in the final analysis we cannot be certain as to how and why *Variants 1* and *2* arose; whether by accident or design. We only know that they did so arise. In the Latin text, the reading “Gerasenes” (*Variant 2*), appears to have later been consciously standardized throughout the synoptic Gospels (Matt. 8:28; Mark 5:1; Luke 8:26,37). The desire for standardization of “Gadarenes (*Gadarenon*)” (*Variant 1*), seems to have also occurred with Greek Codex Sigma 042 (6th century) adopting this reading at Matt. 8:28, in harmony with its representative Byzantine reading of “Gadarenes (*Gadarenon*)” at Mark 5:1 (and while this manuscript only contains St. Matthew’s and St. Mark’s Gospels, this decision would no doubt also have been influenced by the same reading at Luke 8:26,37).

The representative Greek Byzantine Text has no good textual argument against. It has attestation as early as Origen (d. 254), who supported it while referring to the existence of the rival readings of *Variants 1* and *2*. *Variant 1* is an obvious assimilation to Mark 5:1; Luke 8:26,27. *Variant 2* is an obvious Latin standardization decision, thereafter uniformly followed in the Latin Text and by the ancient church Latin writers. Taking into account these factors, on the

system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 8:28 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 8:28, "Gergesenes," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further followed in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian "2" Version (5th century); Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries); and Slavic Version (9th century).

*Variant 1*, "Gadarenes (*Gadarenon*)," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as the Georgian "1" Version (5th century). While "Gadarenes" appears in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), the readings of the three synoptic gospel accounts are so interwoven, that one could not safely attribute it to Matt. 8:28.

*Variant 4*, "Gazarenes (*Gazarenon*)," is found only in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). Probably this was a correction following a paper loss of the "d" (delta) from *Variant 1* by a "z" (zeta). I.e., sitting down in north Africa, the Alexandrian scribe of London Sinaiticus did not know the topography of the Asiatic Sea of Galilee area very well, and not being one "to be fussed about minor details in the text," to him, "Gazarenes" sounded "as good as anything else." Thus I would consider that *Variant 4* essentially supports *Variant 1*, indeed such neo-Alexandrian textual critics as Tischendorf and the NU Text Committee have cited *Variant 4* in support of *Variant 1*.

Following in the footsteps of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952), the erroneous *Variant 1* entered the contemporary NU Text. Thus the ASV reads "Gadarenes." *Variant 1* was also followed in the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV (all four of which give footnote alternatives of the TR's reading and *Variant 2*), together with the NASB and Moffatt Bible.

*Variant 2*, "Gerasenes (*Gerasenon*)," is found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions; and is also found as a variant reading in the margin of the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version. The Latin Text's "*Gerasenorum*" (*Variant 2*) is unsurprisingly found in the Douay-Rheims. It was translated from the Latin into English as

“Gerasens” (rather than “Gerasenes,”) in the Romish *Rheims-Douay Version* (NT 1582 & OT 1609/10). Thus once again, we are reminded of the great dangers in elevating the lesser maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, over the greater maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. For we Christians of the holy Protestant faith, textual analysis must revolve around the Greek, and we take the reading at Matt. 8:28 of our Authorized Versions, translated from the Greek, “Gergesenes (*Gergesēnon*),” and not the reading of the Latin Church’s Douay-Rheims Version, translated from the Latin, as “Gerasens (*Gerasēnon*).”

At Matt. 8:28, *Variant 1* is the “chariot” that the neo-Alexandrian textual critics hope to drive over the Received Text with; and *Variant 2* is the “horse” that those who elevate the Latin over the Greek, hope to ride over the Received Text with. Both groups, act in a pincer movement, against their common enemy of the Greek Received Text. Now “some trust in chariots, and some trust in horses: but we” trust in “the name of the Lord our God. They are brought down and fallen: but we are risen, and stand upright. Save, Lord: let the king hear us when we call” (Ps. 20:7-9).

**Matt. 8:29** “Jesus” (TR & AV) {A}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

Inside the closed class of sources, the Latin, “*Ihesu* (Jesus),” is found in the Sangallensis Diatessaron. But due to Diatessaron formatting, the Sangallensis Diatessaron’s amalgamation of synoptic gospel readings at this point, makes it impossible to tell if the source is Matt. 8:29, or Mark 5:7, or Luke 7:28, or some combination thereof. Therefore, no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources though “Jesus” is found in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); the Diatessaron’s amalgamation of synoptic gospel readings at this point makes it impossible to tell if the source is Matt. 8:29, or Mark 5:7, or Luke 7:28, or some combination thereof. Therefore, no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 8:29, the TR’s Greek, “*Iēsou* (Jesus),” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), K 017 (9th century), M 021 (9th century); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century). It is further supported as Latin, “*Iesu* (Jesus),” by old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), e (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as Latin Codices L (7th / 8th century), M (8th century & 9th century), D (8th / early 9th century), B (8th / 9th century & 9th century), K (9th century), and V (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Eusebius (d. 339) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and the ancient church Latin writer, Quodvultdeus (d. c. 453).

However, “Jesus (Greek, ‘*Iēsou*,’ Latin, ‘*Iesu*),” is omitted in a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further omitted in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate

(5th century), and old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), l (7th / 8th century), m (Munich 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is also omitted by the ancient Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Eusebius (d. 339); ancient Latin writers, Cyprian (d. 258) and Victorinus-Pettau (d. 304); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as correct. The origins of the variant are conjectural. Analysis of Manuscript Washington (W 032) and Lectionary 2378 helps us to better understand how this omission of “Jesus” may have occurred due to accident (ellipsis), rather than design (“stylistic” pruning). At Matt. 8:29, “*IECOY*” (“*Iesou*”) is abbreviated by its first and last letters i.e., upper case “*IY*” (W 032), or lower case, “*u*” with a line on top (Lectionary 2378). Both manuscripts are in continuous script, and so in e.g., W 032, the “*COF*” (“*sou*,” i.e., “to thee”) is followed by “*IY*” (Jesus), and then by “*YIE*” (“*uio*,” “Son”), in the words, “What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God?” It thus looks thus, “...*COIYYIE* ... .” It thus becomes easy to see how the “*IY*” (Jesus) could be lost due to ellipsis, between the “*P*” ending of “*COF*” and the “*Y*” start of “*YIE*.” Thus a scribe may have been thinking about the “*P*” ending of “*COF*” and the “*Y*” start of “*YIE*,” as he wrote, then his mind may have become befuddled, and he may then have left out the interim “*IY*” signifying “Jesus.” Alternatively, “*IY*” (Jesus) may have been lost from a paper fade.

There is no good textual argument against the representative Greek Byzantine reading at Matt. 8:29. The TR’s reading is also well attested to in the Latin, so that notwithstanding its omission in the Vulgate, it was included in the Clementine. It thus has good support in both the Greek and Latin. Moreover, textual analysis shows how it could be easily lost by ellipsis. Therefore, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 8:29 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 8:29, “Jesus,” is found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century) and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century), and some of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Versions. It is also found in the Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect reading, which omits “Jesus” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); and the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* The omission also occurs in the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century), Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Version, and some of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Versions.

The incorrect reading was adopted by the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 8:29. It is omitted in the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

**Matt. 8:31** “suffer us to go away” (TR & AV) {B}

The TR’s Greek reading, “*epitrepson* (‘thou suffer,’ imperative) *emin* (us) *apelthein* (to go away),” i.e., “suffer us to go away” in the sentence, “If thou cast us out, suffer us to go away into the herd of swine,” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, “*permitte* (suffer) *nos* (us) *ire* (to go),” in old Latin Version q (6th / 7th century).

However, another Greek reading, “*epitrepson* (thou suffer) *emin* (us) *eiselthein* (to enter) *eis* (into),” i.e., “suffer us to enter into” (the “*eis*” / “into,” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) (*Variant 1*).

Another Latin reading, “*jube* (‘thou command,’ imperative) *nos* (us) *ire* (to go),” is found in old Latin Versions h (5th century) and f (6th century) (*Variant 2*).

Yet another reading is Greek, “*aposteilon* (‘thou send,’ imperative) *emas* (us)” (*Variant 3*). *Variant 3* is further found as a Latin reading, “*mitte* (‘thou send,’ imperative) *nos* (us),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for *Variant 3*, this reading is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592); although unlike the Latin Vulgate, the Clementine adds “*hinc* (hence)” before it (i.e., “If thou cast us out hence”), which further manifests Latin Codex B (8th / 9th century, Paris & 9th century Bamberg). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine Text’s reading, which must therefore stand as correct.

With respect to *Variant 1*, the TR’s Greek *apelthein* is from *apo* (“away”), and *erchomai* (*eltho*) (to “come” / “go”), and so here means, “to go away.” The origin of *Variant 1* is speculative. *Variant 1*’s Greek *eiselthein* is from *eis* (“into”) and *erchomai* (*eltho*) (to “come” / “go”), and so here means, “to go into” or “to enter.” Manuscript Washington (W 032) helps us better understand one possible way that this variant may have originated; since in *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), we find the previous word, “*emin*” (“us” in “suffer us”) is abbreviated so as to leave off the last letter i.e., the “n.” Thus in a continuous script manuscript *that did not use this abbreviation*, with a paper loss of the “n” from *emin* and the “ape” from *apelthein* i.e., a loss of “*nape*,” there would be a loss of four letter spaces. Did a later scribe reconstruct this as “*emieis*,” and then either that same scribe, or a later scribe, decide to jettison the stylistic abbreviation of “*emin*” as “*emi*” by “reintroducing” the final “n”? Or was a simple paper loss of three letters (the “ape” of “*apelthein*”), “reconstructed” by a scribe as four letters (the “*eise*” of “*eiselthein*”), bearing in mind both scribal variations of handwriting and the fact that we know

scribes sometimes “squeezed” words or letters in by making them smaller (e.g., at the ends of lines in A 02 at page Matt. 26:73-27:28, or more generally in Lectionary 2378 at p. 92a)?

It is also notable that one finds forms of *Variant 1*’s Greek *eiselthein* in close proximity to Matt. 8:31 at e.g., Matt. 5:20 (“enter,” AV), Matt. 7:13 (“Enter ye,” AV), and Matt. 10:5 (“enter ye,” AV). Moreover, in Mark 5:12, we read, “Send us into (*eis*) the swine,” and in Luke 8:32,33 “they besought him that he would suffer them to enter (*eiselthein*) into (*eis*) them,” and then “the devils” “entered (*eiselthen*) into (*eis*) the swine.” These devils evidently besought Jesus repeatedly, therefore I do not think one should try to so precisely harmonize these three Gospel accounts either with regard to what is said of the devil’s words in Matt. 8:31 and Mark 5:12 since they said both, or the summary of this in Luke 8:32. Influenced by these other accounts, did either the scribe of Codex Rossanensis (Sigma 042), or an earlier scribe in a manuscript line that the scribe of Codex Rossanensis was copying from, introduce the error of *Variant 1* as a reconstruction following a paper loss or a detected paper fade? Alternatively, was this a deliberate “stylistic” change designed to artificially create a “parallel gospel account” with Mark 5:12; Luke 8:32? Was this change deliberate or accidental? Either way, it is clearly wrong.

*Variant 2*, the Latin “*jube* (command) *nos* (us) *ire* (to go),” is regarded by textual apparatuses of Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993), as supporting the TR’s reading. While this is partly correct since the Latin words, “*nos* (us) *ire* (to go),” clearly support the TR’s Greek words, “*emin* (us) *apelthein* (to go away),” nevertheless, it is also partly incorrect. The Greek “*epitrepson* (suffer)” is from *epitrepeō* meaning, “permit,” or “let,” or “allow” (e.g., “*epitrepson moi*” i.e., “suffer me” in Luke 9:59; Acts 21:39); whereas the Latin “*jube* (‘command,’ active present imperative verb, 2nd person singular)” is from *jubeo* (*iebeo*) meaning to “bid” (e.g., “*jube me*” i.e., “bid me” in Matt. 14:28); or to “order” or “decree” or “command” (e.g., “*Jube ergo*” i.e., “Command therefore” in Matt. 27:64; or “*jubes me*” i.e., “commandest me” in Acts 23:3). The presence of Latin “*jube*” in old Latin Versions h and f, is therefore qualitatively different to the Latin, “*permitte* (suffer)” of old Latin Version q. While we cannot be sure as to this Latin variant’s origins, we can be sure that its usage of “*jube*” is wrong.

*Variant 3*, the Greek, “*aposteilon* (send) *emas* (us),” or the Latin, “*mitte* (send) *nos* (us),” is found earlier in the Latin manuscripts than the Greek manuscripts. However, the fact that it is found in Cyril of Alexandria means it possibly originated in the Alexandrian school of scribes. If so, while we cannot be sure of its origins, it was possibly a deliberate “stylistic improvement” of the text by a scribe in the Alexandrian School.

However, it also seems possible that the Greek and Latin forms of this variant are independent accidental errors, bearing no manuscript line connection. E.g., due to a paper loss or fade, it is possible that the Greek “*epitrepson* (suffer) *emin* (us) *apelthein* (to go away),” looked something like “*:p::t:::son em:::~::~:*”. If this was at the end of a line, the original “*apelthein*” may have protruded more than usual. This phenomena can be seen e.g., in Manuscript Washington on the last line of a page with the protrusions of “*autou*” (his) at Matt. 5:28, or “*ischei*” (abbreviating *ischein*, “might”) at Matt. 8:28; or in the normal sections of a page with the protrusions of “*toi*” in “*oligopistoi*” (little faith) in Matt. 8:26, or “*eipe*” (abbreviating *eipen*, “said”) in Matt. 10:2. If so, its usage by Cyril of Alexandria may reflect an erroneous reconstruction of the text following damage to it. If so, it may also reflect some reference to *apostello* (send) in the Matthean Greek of Matt. 10:16; 11:10; 13:41; 21:3; 23:34; 24:31.

Quite independently of this Greek textual history, it is possible that the Latin found in old Latin 1, “*permitte* (suffer) *nos* (us) *ire* (to go),” also suffered in transmission. Due to a paper loss, or paper fade, did the Latin scribe see a blank space where the “*per*” had been, followed by “*mitte nos :::*”? Did he then copied this as “*mitte nos*”? Alternatively, was “*per*” at the end of a previous line, or possibly jutting out from the left of the page on new line? If so, did a scribe not realize a faded “*per*” was missing? If “*per*” (if so quite possibly coming at the end of a line) and /or “*ire*” had faded, did a scribe take these to be stylistic paper spaces? (Or had *per* faded and he simply took this for a stylistic space, with “*ire*” at the end of a line that juttet out, and so he did not realize its loss?) Did the first scribe leave paper spaces to indicate his uncertainty, and were these then misunderstood by a subsequent scribe to be stylistic spaces, and so omitted by him? We cannot now be sure of the precise details, but it looks to me like something of this kind may well have transpired; so that the change was quite possibly accidental, rather than deliberate. If so, it may have seemed to the scribe that “*mitte*” was consistent with other Latin parts of St. Matthew’s Gospel, for instance, it is used like these devils, by *the* Devil in the Latin of Matt. 4:6, “cast (*mitte*) thyself down;” or by Christ in Matt. 17:27, “cast (*mitte*) an hook.”

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading, “suffer us to go away” at Matt. 8:31 a “B” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 8:31, “suffer us to go away,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as the Gothic Version (4th century) and Armenian Version (5th century).

However, the incorrect reading, *Variant 3*, is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 892 (9th century, mixed text type); and the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century), Egyptian Coptic Versions, and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The erroneous *Variant 3*, “send us away” (ASV) entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 8:31. It is thus found in the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, and Moffatt’s Bible. E.g., it appears in the Moffatt Bible as “send us.”

**Matt. 8:32a** “the herd of swine” (TR & AV) {A}

The Greek reading of the *Textus Receptus* (TR), “*ten* (the) *agelen* (herd) *ton* (-) *choiron*

(of swine),” in the words, “they went into the herd of swine,” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Codices W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), the purple parchment, Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), the purple parchment, N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). It is further supported as Latin, “*gregem* (the herd) *porcorum* (of swine),” by old Latin Versions h (5th century) and f (6th century).

However, an alternative reading, Greek, “*tous* (the) *choirous* (swine),” may be reconstructed from the Latin, “*porcos*” (swine). This Latin reading is found in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine Text, which is thus the correct reading. The origins of this variant are speculative. Did a scribe deliberately shorten the reading to “the swine” as a “stylistic improvement,” on the basis that “the herd of swine” was “redundant” since these same words appear in the previous verse 31, as Greek, “*ten* (the) *agelen* (herd) *ton* (-) *choiron* (of swine),” and Latin, “*gregem* (the herd) *porcorum* (of swine)”? Alternatively, due to a paper fade, did “*ten agelen ton choiron*” look something like “*t choir*”? Was this then “reconstructed” by a scribe as “*tous choirous*,” with the earlier space understood as a stylistic paper space? If so, did this scribe do so making some reference to the “*tous choirous*” of Mark 5:12 and Luke 8:33?

The TR’s reading has strong support from the Greek, and some notable support as a minority Latin reading. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 8:32a an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 8:32a, “the herd of swine,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Gothic Version (4th century); and Armenian Version (5th century).

However, the incorrect reading, “*tous* (the) *choirous* (swine),” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), where a later change was made to this original manuscript reading; Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type in the Gospels), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), and 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels). It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century); Egyptian Coptic Versions; and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

With support from the two leading Alexandrian manuscripts, “the swine” (ASV) unsurprisingly entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 8:32a. From here, it went into the NASB,

RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

**Matt. 8:32b** “of swine” (TR & AV) {B}

The TR’s Greek reading, “ε (the) *agele* (herd) *ton* (-) *choiron* (of swine),” in the words, “the whole herd of swine ran violently down a steep place into the sea,” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, a variant which omits, Greek, “*ton* (-) *choiron* (of swine),” and reads only, “ε (the) *agele* (herd),” is a minority Byzantine reading, found e.g., in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century). It is also found as Latin, “*totus* (whole) *grex* (herd),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as correct. The origins of the variant are conjectural. Possibly the omission of “*ton* (of the) *choiron* (swine),” at Matt. 8:32b was a deliberate “stylistic improvement,” aimed to “trim away unnecessary wordage” since it was already known that this “herd” was a “swine” herd.

However, we know from Manuscript Washington (W 032) that a relatively short section was sometimes left out by a scribe due to inexplicable inadvertence. For instance, at the page showing Matt. 23:34-24:3, we see that at Matt. 24:2, the scribe wrote, “*ou me* (not) *aphethe* (shall be left) *lithos* (a stone),” and then realizing he had left out, “*ode* (here),” wrote this in between the lines, starting the “o” of “*ode*” in between the “ε” of “*aphethe*” and “*l*” of “*lithos*,” thereby indicating where “*ode*” should be inserted. No apparent reason for this omission is evident, other than it was a fairly short section, and so if momentarily distracted, whether by fatigue, illness such as a head cold, or external stimulus, a scribe might accidentally omit a short section. In the case of Matt. 24:2, the scribe of *Codex Freerianus* (W 032) later realized his mistake. But this did not always occur. Thus it is possible that due to inadvertence such a small section as Matt. 8:32b was omitted in that minority Byzantine manuscript line omitting these words, and that from here it also entered the Latin text.

Of course it is also possible that these words were lost from a paper fade, and the resultant paper space was taken to be a stylistic gap from the previous scribe. A deliberate or accidental omission? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure, that either way, under the good Providence of God the correct reading was preserved for us in the representative Byzantine Greek Text.

On the one hand, the TR’s reading has support from the representative Byzantine Text, and the goodly church doctor and Bishop of Constantinople (398-407), St. John Chrysostom. But on the other hand, these words are omitted in a minority Byzantine reading and the Latin Text. Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 8:32b a “B” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading

and has a middling level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 8:32b, “of swine,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); together with Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text type). It is further found in the Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Version, and Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century)

However, the incorrect reading which omits “of swine” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), where a later change was made to this original manuscript reading; Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text in the Gospels), 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels), 157 (12th century, independent), and 13 (13th century, independent). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century), Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

With support from the two leading Alexandrian manuscripts, the erroneous reading, which omits, “*ton (-) choiron* (of swine),” predictably entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 8:32b. The trimmed down verse reads in the ASV, “the whole herd rushed down” (ASV). This omission is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

**Matt. 9:2b** “thee” (TR & AV) {A}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

*The First Matter.* Matt. 9:2a, “thy sins be forgiven (*apheontai*),” is briefly discussed in Appendix 3, Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14); where some reference is also made to the wholesome doctrine of both Articles 2, 4, & 11 in the *Apostles’ Creed* and Sections 1 & 2 of the *Reformation Motto*. (See also Matt. 9:5.)

*The Second Matter.* In modern times we know that writing styles vary. This same reality is also clear to those of us who study old Greek manuscripts such as *Codex Freerianus* (W 032, 5th century), Lectionary 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*), or Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). E.g., here at Matt. 9:2b, Lectionary 2378 follows the TR’s reading, but in its handwritten script, the “σ” shaped looking “s” (sigma) of “*soi* (thee),” joins in running writing to the first letter of the next word, which is the “α” (alpha) of “*ai* (the)” (in “the sins,” the definite article is not here translated into English), and the remaining “oi” of “*soi*” is then placed above the line joining these two letters. By contrast, in Lectionary 1968, the “σoi” is more conventionally written across the line. Either way, the meaning is the same.

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 9:2b, the TR’s Greek reading, “*apheontai* (have been forgiven) *soi* (‘thee,’ literally, ‘unto thee’),” in the words, “thy sins be forgiven thee (*soi*)” (Matt. 9:2b, AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th

century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as Latin, “*tibi* (‘thee,’ literally, ‘to thee’),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation; and Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation.

However, “thee” is omitted as a minority Byzantine reading in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53). It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

No good textual argument may be adduced against the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore the correct reading. The evidence from Origen is that both readings were circulating at an early time. Was this a deliberate omission of “thee” by a scribe seeking to “stylistically improve” the text, by making “a more succinct” reading? Alternatively, we know from *Codex Freerianus* (W 032) that short words were sometimes accidentally omitted, as seen by the initial omission of “*ode* (here)” at Matt. 24:2, which was then added in between the lines. Was “*sou* (thee)” likewise omitted by such a scribal accident, or by a paper fade? Was it by design or by accident? We do not know. We only know it was lost from the text.

The TR’s reading has solid support from the Greek and Latin, and the earliest writers who refer to the variant, also refer to the TR’s reading. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 9:2b an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 9:2b, “thee,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 788 (11th century, independent text), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text type). It is further found in all the Syriac Versions e.g., the much celebrated Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century), whose general, though not absolute faithfulness to the TR, is a source of much discomfort and irritation to the neo-Alexandrians.

However, the incorrect reading which omits “thee” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text in the Gospels) and 892 (9th century, mixed text type).

From this Alexandrian base, the omission of “thee” entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 9:2b. Thus the ASV simply reads, “thy sins are forgiven.” The same omission is also unsurprisingly found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

**Matt. 9:4a** “and ... knowing” (TR & AV) {C}

#### *Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

The Byzantine manuscripts are divided between the readings, *idon* and *eidos*, though favour the former over the latter. This division is reflected in our Sydney University Lectionaries which divide one, one, each way. Scrivener's Text (1881, 1894), like Swanson's reference to the "Textus Receptus" (in *H Kainē Diatheke*, [*The New Testament*,] Oxford, 1873), follows Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550) in reading, Greek, "*kai* (and) *idon* ('seeing,' second aorist active participle, nominative singular, from *oida*);" which is followed in the Vulgate's Latin as, "*vidisset* ('he seeing,' active subjunctive pluperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *video*)," or some old Latin Versions as "*videns* ('seeing,' present active participle, nominative singular, from *video*)." By contrast, Elzevir (1633) reads Greek, "*kai* (and) *eidos* ('knowing,' perfect active participle, nominative singular, from *oida*)." We cannot doubt that the TR of the AV was the latter; for Matt. 9:4 reads, "and Jesus knowing their thoughts" (AV); not "And Jesus seeing their thoughts."

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 9:4a, the TR's Greek reading, "*kai* (and) *eidos* (knowing)," in the words, "And (*kai*) Jesus knowing (*eidos*) their (*auton*) thoughts (*enthumeseis*)" (AV), is a sizeable minority Byzantine reading with support from Codices M 021 (*Codex Campianus*, 9th century, with the spelling, *idos*) and Pi 041 (*Codex Petropolitanus*, 9th century). It is further supported in Minuscules 672 (9th century, Athens, Greece), 262 (10th century, Paris, France), 945 (Byzantine outside of Acts & General Epistles, 11th century, Athos, Greece), 1187 (Sinai, Arabia, 11th century), 1207 (11th century, Sinai, Arabia), 76 (12th century, Paris, France), 245 (12th century, Moscow Russia), 270 (12th century, Paris, France), 673 (12th century, Athens, Greece), 924 (12th century, Athos, Greece), 1355 (12th century, Jerusalem, Israel), 291 (13th century, Paris, France), 482 (13th century, British Library, London, UK), 597 (13th century, *Biblioteca San Marco*, Venice, Italy), 1604 (13th century, Athos, Greece), 235 (14th century, Copenhagen, Denmark), and 1354 (14th century, Jerusalem, Israel); together with Lectionaries 253 (1020 A.D., St. Petersburg, Russia), 813 (1069 A.D., Patmos Island, Greece), 547 (13th century, Vatican City, Rome), 1223 (13th century, Athens, Greece), 184 (1319 A.D., British Library, London, England, UK), and 1968 (1544 A.D., Sydney University, New South Wales, Australia). It is also supported by von Soden's Kr group of manuscripts which on a generalist count represents c. 18-20% or about one-fifth of the 914 exclusively Byzantine text manuscripts in von Soden's K group; or on a more precise count of Gospel manuscripts in the K group c. 22.5-25% of the Gospel manuscripts<sup>90</sup>. Therefore this is a sizeable minority Byzantine reading. It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

But an alternative reading, Greek, "*kai* (and) *idon* (seeing)," thus making the reading, "And (*kai*) Jesus seeing (*idon*) their thoughts," is the majority Byzantine reading e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53). With the same meaning, the reading, Greek, "*idon* (seeing) *de* (and / but)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century). It is also found as Latin, "*Et* (and) *vidisset* (seeing)" in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th /

---

<sup>90</sup> See Textual Commentary, Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) at Matt. 5:31a & 12:29, & Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), at Matt. 20:15c.

9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), c (12th / 13th century); or as Latin, “*Et (and) videns (seeing),*” in old Latin Versions d (5th century), f (6th century), and q (6th / 7th century); or as Latin, “*videns (seeing) autem (but)*” i.e., “but seeing,” in old Latin Versions a (4th century) and h (5th century). From the Latin support for this reading, the Vulgate’s reading is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also followed by the ancient church Latin writers, Chromatius (d. 407), Jerome (d. 420), Augustine (d. 430), and *Speculum* (d. 5th century).

However, the representative Byzantine reading poses a notable textual problem. The terminology, “seeing (*idon*) their thoughts (*enthumeseis*),” looks like the incongruous combination of a woman with a red and white spotted blouse (which on my values of Christian modesty should be above the breast-line), and a non-matching green and blue striped skirt (which on my values of Christian modesty should be below the knee). This curious combination of “seeing (*idon*)” and “thoughts (*enthumeseis*),” not only looks like bad Matthean Greek, but also looks like bad NT Greek *per se*. Elsewhere in St. Matthew’s Gospel, we read in Matthean Greek at Matt. 12:25, “*eidōs (knowing) de (and) Iēsous (Jesus) tas (the) enthumeseis (thoughts) auton (of them)*” i.e., “And Jesus knew (*eidōs*) their thoughts (*enthumeseis*).”

By contrast, St. Luke never uses St. Matthew’s combination of “*eidōs (knowing)*” and “*enthumeseis (thoughts)*.” Rather he uses the terminology of “*epignous (perceived)*” and “*dialogismous (thoughts)*” (Luke 5:22), or “*edei (knew)*” and “*dialogismous (thoughts)*” (Luke 6:8), or “*idon (perceiving)*” and “*dialogismon (thought)*” (Luke 9:47), or “*eidōs (knowing)*” and “*dianoemata (thoughts)*” (Luke 11:17). Therefore the terminology of Matt. 9:4a looks at best, like a curious hybrid between some elements of Matthean Greek (Matt. 12:25) and some elements of Lucan Greek (Luke 9:47); although I think this is a quaint coincidence, and that Matt. 9:4a owes nothing to the importation of a Lucan influence by a latter scribe.

Since this combination of “seeing (*idon*)” and “thoughts (*enthumeseis*)” is unidiomatic Matthean Greek, and unidiomatic NT Greek *per se*, it draws attention to itself as an improbable, though admittedly not impossible, reading. By contrast, the idiomatic Greek reading at Matt. 9:4a, “knowing (*eidōs*)” and “thoughts (*enthumeseis*),” which is supported by that most learned church doctor and bishop, St. John Chrysostom (c. 346- 407)<sup>91</sup>, looks very much like the probable reading. The son of an army officer, who studied both law and theology, St. Chrysostom’s surname, which was earned from his clear and precise preaching and teaching, means, “golden-mouthed.”<sup>92</sup> We cannot doubt that this Greek speaking “golden-mouthed” saint, has here preserved the clear and idiomatic reading of the text.

I think it highly improbable that most scribes would have changed “*idōs (knowing)*” “thoughts (*enthumeseis*)” to “seeing (*idon*)” “thoughts (*enthumeseis*)” at Matt. 9:4a as some kind

---

<sup>91</sup> St. Chrysostom in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1860 Paris First Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 57, p. 359 (Gospel of St. Matthew, Homily 29:2) (Greek); Schaff, P., (Editor), *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, [first series.] *op. cit.*, Vol. 10, p. 196 (Gospel of St. Matthew, Homily 29:2). St. Chrysostom later paraphrases this as, “he knew (*edei*) the (*ta*) secrets (*aporreta*) of all men,” in Migne, *op. cit.*, p. 419 (Gospel of St. Matthew, Homily 37:1) (Greek); Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 243 (Gospel of St. Matthew, Homily 37:1).

<sup>92</sup> Greek *chrysostomos* (golden-mouthed) is from *chruseos* (golden) and *stoma* (mouth).

of “stylistic improvement,” since this terminology is so unidiomatic of the NT Greek. Nevertheless, since we cannot be certain that all scribes were competent, and indeed the evidence indicates that some were incompetent; it is not safe to attribute such competence to all scribes. Thus we cannot totally disallow for the possibility that this was a deliberate scribal change. Nevertheless, since not even the most incompetent Alexandrian scribe would be likely to think of “*idon* (seeing)” “thoughts (*enthumeseis*)” as a “stylistic improvement” of “*eidōs* (knowing)” “thoughts (*enthumeseis*),” I think that on this occasion we can safely stipulate that on the balance of probabilities, “seeing (*idon*)” must have entered the text by inadvertence, rather than a deliberate desire to change the text from “*eidōs* (knowing)” to “*idon* (seeing).”

Fortunately, Manuscript Washington (W 032) helps us better understand how this variant may have arisen, since in Matt. 9:4a we find “*O IHCOYC*” (*o Iēsous*, Jesus) abbreviated to “*OIC*” (with a bar over these letters), and so like Matt. 9:2, Matt. 9:4a reads, “*KAIIDONOIC*” (“*KAI*[and]*IDON*[seeing]*O*[-]*IC*[Jesus]”). If the original script was also in capital letters and continuous script, it may have read on one line, “*KAIE*,” and on the next line, “*IDQCOIC*.” The “*E*” at the end of “*KAIE*,” may have been lost due to a paper loss or fade; and either in the same or a subsequent manuscript, due to ellipsis, “*KAIIDQCOIC*” (“and Jesus knowing”) may have become the gobbledegook, “*KAIIDQC*” i.e., a “trumpet” that gives “an uncertain sound” (I Cor. 14:8). A later scribe, realizing an error had been made, without thinking the matter through very carefully, probably then reconstructed Matt. 9:4a from context as “*KAIIDONOIC*” (“and Jesus seeing”), being influenced by the slightly earlier Matt. 9:2, which also uses the terminology, “*KAIIDONOIC*” (“and Jesus seeing”). If so, his evidently hasty decision to repair Matt. 9:4a by simple recourse to Matt. 9:2, does not say much for the quality of textual analysis of the relevant scribe. Sadly, the standard of some copyists left something to be desired.

On the one hand, textual analysis supports the TR’s minority Byzantine text reading, “*kai* (and) *eidōs* (knowing),” at Matt. 9:4a, which has support from the ancient church Greek writer, St. Chrysostom. It was followed by the King James Version translators, and the Elzevirs of Leiden. But on the other hand, “*kai* (and) *idon* (seeing),” is the representative Byzantine text reading, and is followed in the Latin text, and by several ancient church Latin writers. It was also followed by Erasmus, Stephanus, and Beza. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 9:4a a middling “C” (in the range of 56% +/- 2%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading, but has a lower level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 9:4a, “*kai* (and) *eidōs* (knowing),” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); and as “*eidōs* (knowing) *de* (and / but)” in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* Translating from either “*kai* (and) *eidōs* (knowing)” or “*eidōs* (knowing) *de* (and);” it is additionally found in the celebrated Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century); as well as the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions; Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century);

and Georgian “1” and “2” Versions (5th century).

However, the incorrect reading, “*kai* (and) *idon* (seeing),” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* Translating from either “*kai* (and) *idon* (seeing)” or “*idon* (seeing) *de* (and / but);” it is further found in some independent manuscripts of the Palestinian Syriac Version; the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century), and Slavic Version (9th century).

With the two major Alexandrian texts split down the middle between these two readings, the neo-Alexandrians have been in a painful quandary as to which way they should go. The NU Text split one way, with the reading “*kai* (and) *idon* (seeing)” in the main text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993), and the TR’s reading, “*kai* (and) *eidōs* (knowing),” reduced to a footnote reading. But like the earlier Nestle’s 21st edition (1952) which places “*eidōs* (knowing)” in the main text, (with “*idon* / seeing” in a footnote), both the NASB and NIV split the other way; and so for the wrong reasons, adopted the right reading at Matt. 9:4a (although the NIV’s style of “dynamic equivalence” omits the “*kai*” / “and”). Reflecting this internal neo-Alexandrian tension and split, the Westcott-Hort text places “*eidōs*” (“knowing,” ASV) in the main text, and “*idon*” (“seeing,” ASV ftn.) in a footnote reading; and this is followed in the ASV which reads, “And ... knowing” in the main text, while an ASV footnote says, “Many ancient authorities read ‘seeing.’” The ASV’s main text and footnote dichotomy was followed by its elder son, the RSV, and the RSV’s younger son, the ESV. The NRSV followed Rome Vaticanus, but with the somewhat loose, “perceiving” (NRSV), in what was possibly an abortive bid to find something of a “common ground” translation between the two variants. The semi neo-Alexandrian, Moffatt, appears to have used the Western Text as “the argument clincher” in this Alexandrian dispute (probably to some extent also influenced by the Latin and Palestinian Syriac Version), and hence Moffatt followed the variant, “Jesus saw what they were thinking” (Moffatt Bible).

For partly related, and partly unrelated reasons, the issue of whether Matt. 9:4a reads “*eidōs* (knowing)” or “*idon* (seeing),” has been a matter of dispute in both the neo-Byzantine camp and the neo-Alexandrian camp. For we neo-Byzantines who accept the Received Text, this difficult matter was conclusively settled in the seventeenth century, with the work of the King James Version translators and the Elzevirs of Leiden. For neo-Alexandrians, the matter is something of an open, festering, sore, attracting the flies of many different “new” versions.

**Matt. 9:5b** “[Thy] sins be forgiven thee” (TR & AV) {B}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

*The First Matter.* Matt. 9:5a “thy sins be forgiven (*apheontai*),” is briefly discussed in Appendix 3, Volume 1; where some reference is also made to Articles 2, 4, & 11 of the *Apostles’ Creed*, and Sections 1 & 2 of the *Reformation Motto*. (See also Matt. 9:2a.)

*The Second Matter.* Von Soden's "K" group has 983 manuscripts, of which *c.* 949 are Byzantine, i.e., *c.* 914 are exclusively Byzantine and *c.* 35 are Byzantine text in parts only. But only 165 of those in his Kx group were counted for this reading, *infra*. Subtracting the 513 Kx manuscripts in von Soden's K group from the 983 manuscripts, yields a total of 470 manuscripts; and then adding back in the 165 from the Kx group counted for this reading, means a total of 635 manuscripts are of relevance to us here at Matt. 9:5b from the K group. With the TR's reading supported by 62 of these (S 028 is in von Soden's K1 group), this means that 62 out of 635 manuscripts in K group or *c.* 9.7% of manuscripts support the TR's reading. Factoring in an error bar of 10% due to the generalist nature of von Soden's groups' methodology, means the figure could be as low as *c.* 8.7%. Therefore, we can say in broad-brush terms *c.* 9% or more precisely about 9% or 10% of the K group manuscripts follow the TR's reading, and since *c.* 93% of K group is exclusively Byzantine and *c.* 96.5% of K group manuscripts are Byzantine or Byzantine in part, and these proportions would apply generally in the count, we can in broad-brush terms use these figures for a more general Byzantine text count. I.e., the K group sample is big enough, even at this reduced number of manuscripts, to be more generally representative of the larger number of Byzantine manuscripts.

On the one hand, these type of figures may be criticized as being "rubbery." E.g., this K group count does not distinguish between manuscripts which do and do not include St. Matthew. But given that *c.* 90% of these manuscripts cover the Gospels (with some manuscript vacancies), this does not much matter for generalist purposes in the Gospels, although for calculations in the Apostolos (Acts to Jude) one would need to very specifically factor this issue in with revised much smaller overall figures for K group manuscripts. But on the other hand, these "rubbery" figures are good enough for generalist purposes in showing a rounded number at about 9% or 10% of all manuscripts in the K group (most of which include the Gospels), and on the basis that *c.* 90% of the K group includes Gospel readings, this overall figure for the K group broadly reflects the percentage of the Gospel group manuscripts inside the K group also.

For those seeking a more accurate count it would be necessary to further subdivide the K group into those with or without this reading. To give the reader an idea of the difference between these two calculations, let us examine the K group in further detail. In more precise terms, inside the K group (excluding about half a dozen manuscripts *in dubio*), there are about 120 manuscripts in  $\delta$  group (all of NT, although some may be incomplete), about 120 manuscripts in  $\alpha$  group (Apostolos, i.e., Acts to Jude), and about 740 manuscripts in  $\epsilon$  group (Gospels). Thus  $\delta$  group is *c.* 12%,  $\alpha$  group is *c.* 12%, and  $\epsilon$  group is *c.* 76%. Since  $\delta$  group covers the NT (for our generalist purposes omitting reference to various manuscript vacancies), with regard to Gospel manuscripts,  $\delta + \epsilon = c. 120 + c. 740 = c. 860$  manuscripts or *c.* 88% of K group; and for Acts to Jude,  $\delta + \alpha = c. 120 + c. 120 = c. 240$  or *c.* 24% of K group. Applying these more precise figures here at Matt. 9:5b would mean 860 Gospel manuscripts minus 513 Kx manuscripts yields a total of 347 manuscripts; and then adding back in the 165 from the Kx group counted for this reading yields 512 manuscripts. With the TR's reading supported by 62 of these, this means that 62 out of 512 manuscripts in K group or *c.* 12% support the TR's reading. Factoring in a 10% error bar for von Soden's generalist groups means the percentage could be as low as just under 11%. In rounded numbers this more precise figure of *c.* 11-12% compares with the less precise figure of *c.* 9-10%.

Whether for the Gospels one uses the whole K group, or 88% of it, makes no appreciable

difference to the big picture. All figures remain somewhat “rubbery” anyway because of projections as to the exact number of Byzantine manuscripts in them (discussed in Volume 2, Matt. 15-20, Preface, “\* Determining the representative Byzantine Text”). While it is true that I use somewhat “rubbery” figures from von Soden (here and elsewhere in these textual commentaries), I do so on the basis that I think some *very broad-brush guide* is of interest and value. And that, rather than the exact mathematical figure count, is the only point that really matters. If he so wish, let the reader ignore these type of mathematically imprecise “rubbery” and broad-brush calculations, he will find it makes absolutely no difference to my basic textual analytical result. That is because *it is clear that whatever the precise count would be, the TR’s reading will remain a relatively small, albeit significant, minority Byzantine reading.*

Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005) all here follow the majority Byzantine text reading, “*sou* (of thee)” (*Variant 1*) over the TR’s reading, “*soi* (to thee).” But whereas Burgon & Miller (1899) state *Variant 1* unequivocally; Hodges & Farstad (1985) say the text is seriously divided between these two readings, and Robinson & Pierpont (2005) say the text is significantly divided between these two readings. It is unusual for Robinson & Pierpont to make such a statement when the manuscript support in favour of the majority text (*Variant 1*) is this strong. Why have they done so on this occasion?

#### *Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 9:5b, the dative in the Greek reading, “*soi* (‘to thee,’ dative singular, personal pronoun, from *su*),” in the TR’s “*apheontai* (be forgiven) *soi* (to thee) *ai* (the) *amartiai* (sins),” i.e., “[Thy] sins be forgiven thee” (AV), is a sizeable minority Byzantine reading. It is supported by Codices Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, 6th century), U 030 (*Codex Nanianus*, 9th century), Pi 041 (*Codex Petropolitanus*, 9th century), S 028 (*Codex Vaticanus*, 10th century); Minuscules 399 (9th / 10th century, St. Petersburg, Russia), 880 (Vatican City State, Rome, 11th century), 119 (Paris, France, 12th century), 120 (Paris, France, 12th century), 217 (Venice, Italy, 12th century), 267 (Paris, France, 12th century), 443 (Cambridge University, England, UK, 12th century), 924 (Athos, Greece, 12th century), 1355 (12th century, Jerusalem, Israel), 1375 (Moscow, Russia, 12th century), 2127 (Palermo, Italy, 12th century, Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles); 477 (Trinity College, Cambridge University, England, 13th century), 482 (British Library, London, UK, 13th century), 232 (Escorial, Spain, 14th century), 578 (Arras, France, 14th century), 1354 (14th century, Jerusalem, Israel), 70 (Cambridge University, England, 15th century), 287 (Paris, France, 15th century), 288 (Oxford University, England, 15th century), 745 (Paris, France, 16th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). Moreover, Von Soden’s Kx group contains 513 manuscripts of which *c.* 94% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine (in the Kx parts), *c.* 4% are Byzantine only in specific parts, and *c.* 2% are outside the closed class of sources; and of the 165 of these counted for this reading, 61 or *c.* 37% followed the TR’s reading, and 104 or *c.* 63% followed the variant. The TR’s reading is also supported as Latin, “*tibi* (‘to thee,’ dative singular, personal pronoun, from *tu*),” in the Latin by Codex J (*Codex Foroiuliensis*, 6th / 7th century, Cividale), and old Latin Version z (*Aureus*, 8th century, Stockholm). More specifically, it is found as Latin, “*dimittuntur* (they are forgiven) *tibi* (to thee) *peccata* (sins),” i.e., “[Thy] sins are forgiven thee,” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions d (5th century) and aur (7th century); and as Latin “*dimissa sunt* (they have been forgiven) *tibi* (to thee) *peccata* (sins),” i.e., “[Thy] sins have been forgiven thee,” in old Latin Version b (5th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Clement of

Alexandria (d. before 215).

However, an alternative reading, *Variant 1*, uses the genitive in the Greek reading, “*sou* (‘of thee’ or ‘thy,’ genitive singular, personal pronoun, from *su*),” reading, “*apheontai* (be forgiven) *sou* (thy, literally, of thee) *ai* (the) *amartiai* (sins),” i.e., “Thy (*sou*) sins be forgiven.” This is the majority Byzantine reading, e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Lectionary 2378 (11th century). It is also found in the Latin as, “*remittuntur* (they are remitted) *peccata* (sins) *tua* (thy),” i.e., “Thy sins are remitted,” in old Latin Version k (4th / 5th centuries).

Another Latin reading, *Variant 2*, adds “*tua* (thy)” after “*peccata* (sins),” per *Variant 1*, while unlike *Variant 1* retaining the “to thee” (Latin, *tibi*) of the TR. There are three minor Latin sub-variations within *Variant 2*. *Variant 2a*, “Thy sins have been remitted (*remissa sunt*) thee (*tibi*),” is supported by old Latin Versions a (4th century), h (5th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). *Variant 2b*, “Thy sins are remitted (*remittuntur*) thee (*tibi*),” is supported by old Latin Version q (6th / 7th century). *Variant 2c*, “Thy sins are forgiven (*dimittuntur*) thee (*tibi*),” is supported by old Latin Versions f (6th century), l (7th / 8th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). From the Latin support for this latter reading, *Variant 2c* is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592), which reads, “*Dimittuntur* (they are forgiven) *tibi* (thee) *peccata* (sins) *tua* (thy)” i.e., “Thy sins are forgiven thee<sup>93</sup>.”

The representative Byzantine reading (*Variant 1*), “*apheontai* (be forgiven) *sou* (thy, literally, of thee) *ai* (the) *amartiai* (sins),” i.e., “Thy (*sou*) sins be forgiven,” poses a serious textual problem at Matt. 9:5. In Matt. 9:2, Christ first says, “*apheontai* (be forgiven) *soi* (to thee) *ai* (the) *amartiai* (sins) *sou* (thy),” i.e., “Thy sins be forgiven thee.” Then in Matt. 9:5 he is clearly quoting his own words, for he asks, “whether it is easier, to say,” what he has just said, “or to say, Arise, and walk?” Therefore, the natural expectation is that he must use all, or some of the exact words he has spoken. Yet in the representative Byzantine reading, this corresponding parallelism does not occur, and so the Greek of Matt. 9:5 clangs on the ears, when we read, “*apheontai* (be forgiven) *sou* (thy, literally, of thee) *ai* (the) *amartiai* (sins).” The only way to remedy this stylistic incongruity, is to adopt the minority Greek Byzantine and relevant Latin reading. This then brings the expected stylistic harmony between Christ’s words in Matt. 9:2, “*apheontai* (be forgiven) *soi* (to thee) *ai* (the) *amartiai* (sins) *sou* (thy),” i.e., “Thy sins be forgiven thee;” and the quotation of this in Matt. 9:5 as, “*apheontai* (be forgiven) *soi* (to thee) *ai* (the) *amartiai* (sins),” i.e., “[Thy] sins be forgiven thee.”

The origins of *Variant 1* are speculative. But it should be noted that the difference between the TR and *Variant 1* may be reduced to just one letter. The TR’s “*COF*” (*soi*, “to thee”), became *Variant 1*’s “*COY*” (*sou*, “of thee”). With either a paper fade or markings on the parchment, “*COF*” may have been “reconstructed” as “*COY*” by a hasty scribe. It is also possible that a fatigued scribe, simply got a letter wrong.

---

<sup>93</sup> Colunga and Turrado’s Clementine Vulgate (Michael Tweedale’s Electronic Internet Edition) here agrees with Merk’s *Novum Testamentum* as to the basic Latin reading. The Latin textual apparatus of Merk’s *Novum Testamentum* shows some further manuscript support for, and against, the inclusion of “*tua*” here. Of 31 Latin Vulgate Codices (i.e., Merk’s “Codices Vulgatae,”) that Merk uses for the Gospels (6th to 10th centuries, and one from the 13th century), only 9 include “*tua*,” although support for its inclusion is stronger among the old Latin Version.

Yet another possibility is found through reference to *Codex Freerianus* (W 032). Here at Matt. 5:44, “*tous*” (the) became “*tou*.” The scribe appears to have become confused, possibly first writing “*TOYC*” (*tous*), and then putting a cross in the middle of the “*C*” to make it the “*E*” of the next word, “*EXTHPOYC*” (*exthrous*, “enemies”). So likewise here at Matt. 9:5, a scribe writing “*APHEQNTAI* (*apheontai*, “they be forgiven”) *COI* (*soi*, “to thee”) *AI* (*ai*, “the) as “... *APHEQNTAICOIAL*...,” may have gotten confused with all the iotas (I / ι), and written out “... *APHEQNTAICOAL*... .” If so, a later scribe detecting that an error had been made, may have hastily reconstructed this as “... *APHEQNTAICOYAL*...,” and thus the reading “*COY*” (*sou*, “of thee”), may have entered the text by a two-staged process.

Of course, in the final analysis, we cannot be certain exactly how *Variant 1* entered the text; we can only be sure that it did enter the text. But given the intrinsic improbability that an exact quote, i.e., the TR, would be changed to an inexact quote i.e., *Variant 1*, I think that on this occasion we can stipulate that the likelihood of deliberate change is sufficiently improbable, to in all probability be safely ruled out. Therefore, on the balance of probabilities, the change from “*soi*” (to thee) to “*sou*” (of thee) was accidental. This conclusion has important corollary ramifications for how we look at *Variant 2*.

Specifically, it explains why, even though the English translation, “Thy sins” is the same; in fact there is an important stylistic difference between the *Variant 1* “thy” (*sou*) which comes immediately after “*apheontai* (be forgiven),” and the original quote of Matt. 9:2 and the Latin reading of *Variant 2*, where “thy (Greek, *sou*; Latin, *tua*)” comes at the end of the clause after “sins (Greek, *amartiai*; Latin, *peccata*).” It means that notwithstanding the accidental corruption of the TR’s “*soi* (to thee)” to the representative Byzantine reading’s “*sou* (of thee),” the original representative Byzantine Text lacked “thy (Greek *sou*)” at the end of the clause after “sins (Greek *amartiai*).” Where it present, the scribal error of changing “*soi* (to thee)” to “*sou* (of thee)” at the beginning of the clause after “*apheontai* (be forgiven),” would not have occurred, since then the clause would have read “thy” (twice), i.e., “Thy thy sins be forgiven.”

Unlike *Variant 2*, the TR’s summary form of Matt. 9:2 found in the minority Byzantine Greek and as a Latin reading of Matt. 9:5b, lacks the “thy (Greek, *sou*; Latin, *tua*)” at the end of the clause after “sins (Greek, *amartiai*; Latin, *peccata*).” As previously determined, *supra*, it is also absent in the representative Byzantine reading, which does not include “*sou*” (thy) at the end of the clause after “*amartiai*” (sins). There is no good textual reason to doubt the representative Byzantine reading at this point, since Christ’s quote in Matt. 9:5 need not be a comprehensive quote of Matt. 9:2, to be a stylistically congruous quote. E.g., in quoting the fifth commandment, Christ does not say, “Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee” (Exod. 20:12); but rather he uses a summary form, “Honour thy father and [thy] mother” (Matt. 19:19). Or in quoting the ninth commandment, Christ does not say, “Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour” (Exod. 20:16); but once again, he uses a summary form, “Thou shalt not bear false witness” (Matt. 19:18). Therefore the representative Byzantine reading’s lack of “*sou*” (thy) after “*amartiai* (sins),” must stand as correct; and in this particular, the correct reading at this point is therefore also preserved in the TR’s minority Byzantine Greek reading and also found in the Latin.

The origins of the addition of “thy (Latin, *tua*)” after “sins (Latin, *peccata*)” in *Variant 2*,

are necessarily conjectural. Certainly, they look like an assimilation with the “*tibi* (to thee *peccata* (sins) *tua* (thy))” of the Latin Matt. 9:2; or a Latin translation of a Greek assimilation of the “*sou* (to thee) *ai* (-) *amartiai* (sins) *sou* (thy)” of Matt. 9:2. But it is also possible that they are a conflation of the two Greek readings i.e., the TR and *Variant 1*. However, were this the case, the fact that the Latin Matt. 9:5 so clearly replicates the Latin of Matt. 9:2 with “*tibi* (to thee) *peccata* (sins) *tua* (thy),” means that any such conflation by an inferior quality Latin scribe, seeking to “harmonize” the two variants, still did so through reference to the Latin of Matt. 9:2. Alternatively, possibly this was not the Latin scribe’s conflation and assimilation, but rather a Latin translation of a Greek conflation and assimilation of the “*sou*” (thy) and “*sou*” (thee) by an inferior quality Greek scribe of Matt. 9:25 to Matt. 9:2, which the Latin scribe simply translated. Was this a simple assimilation of Matt. 9:5b to Matt. 9:2 by a Latin scribe? Or was this a Latin translation of a simple assimilation of Matt. 9:5b to Matt. 9:2 by a Greek scribe? Or was this an original Latin conflation of the two Greek readings which were harmonized through reference to Matt. 9:2 by the Latin scribe? Or was this a Latin translation of an original Greek conflation of the two Greek readings which were harmonized through reference to Matt. 9:2? We cannot be sure which of these is correct. But whichever of these four alternatives alternative is taken, it is clear that in the final analysis the *Variant 2* reading of Matt. 9:5b is an assimilation made with some reference to Matt. 9:2.

It is worthy of note, that in English translation, *Variant 2* forms a useful addition, wisely included in italics in the Authorized Version, indicating it is not part of the actual text i.e., “[Thy] sins be forgiven thee” (AV). On the one hand, the TR’s reading at Matt. 9:5b, “[Thy] sins be forgiven thee” (AV), is a minority Byzantine Greek reading. But on the other hand, it is strongly favoured by textual analysis, and it has impressive support over time and through time from St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate. Balancing out these considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading a “B” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 9:5, “[Thy] sins be forgiven (*apheontai*) thee,” or “[Thy] sins are forgiven (*apheontai*) thee,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (*Codex Regius*, 8th century), (the independent) Codex G 012 (*Codex Boernerianus*, 9th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (*Codex Sangallensis*, 9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text in the Gospels), 788 (11th century, independent text), 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels), and 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude). It is further found in the Gothic Version (4th century).

However the incorrect reading, *Variant 1*, “Thy (*sou*) sins be forgiven (*apheontai*),” or “Thy (*sou*) sins are forgiven (*apheontai*),” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text type). In its further corrupted form, not necessarily affecting English translation, on one manuscript line as, “Thy (*sou*) sins are forgiven (*aphientai*)” (see *Preliminary Textual Discussion*), *Variant 1* is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is also found on another manuscript line (*aphientai* = *aphiontai*), as “Thy (*sou*) sins are forgiven (*aphiontai*)” (see *Preliminary Textual Discussion*), in both one of the two leading Alexandrian

texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century), and also the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). To this it must be added, both Tischendorf (8th edition) and Swanson consider a later “corrector” of London Sinaiticus made this read, “*aphientai*,” and consider the original reading was “*aphiontai*.” By contrast, the NU Text Committee of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition considered the original reading of London Sinaiticus was “*aphientai*.” Who is correct?

The incorrect *Variant 1* at Matt. 9:5b was adopted by the NU Text *et al* as, “Thy (*sou*) sins are forgiven (*aphientai*)” (ASV). It is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

*Variant 1* is also found in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005), *supra*.

**Matt. 9:8** “they marvelled” (TR & AV) {B}

The TR’s Greek reading, “*ethaumasán* (they marvelled),” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Codices Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, 6th century), G 011 (*Codex Seidelianus*, 9th century); and Minuscules 1505 (1084 A.D., Byzantine in the Gospels), 1006 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Revelation), 180 (12th century, Byzantine other than in Acts), 1010 (12th century), 1292 (13th century, Byzantine outside of the General Epistles); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, an alternative reading, Greek, “*ephobethesan* (they feared)” (*Variant 1*) is a minority Byzantine reading, found in Codex W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53). It is also followed as Latin, “*timuerunt* (they feared),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is further found in the ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367), Chromatius (d. 407), and Augustine (d. 430). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

It is omitted altogether, with the following word, “*kai* (and)” (*Variant 2*), in a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex X 033 (10th century); and by the ancient church Greek writer, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation (c. 395).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore the correct one. The origins of these two variants are conjectural. In the Greek, “ph” is one letter (φ / phi), and “th” is one letter (θ / theta). The difference between “*ethaumasán*” (they marvelled) and “*ephobethesan*” (they feared), is the difference of five or six letters. Due to a paper loss or paper fade, did “... *ethaumasán* ...” look like “... *e::::::san* ...”? Did then a scribe supplying what he thought were the “missing letters,” add “*phobethe*” and so “reconstruct” this as “... *ephobethesan* ...” (*Variant 1*)? If so, was he influenced by the Matthean Greek which uses “*ephobethesan*” (they feared) at Matt. 17:6; 21:46; 27:54, especially Matt. 27:54, where having reverentially “feared (*ephobethesan*) greatly,” this led to “the centurion, and they that were with him” making a profession of faith in Christ, saying, “Truly this was the Son of God”?

With regard to *Variant 2*, did a scribe looking at “*oi* (the) *ochloi* (multitudes) *ethaumasán* (marvelled) *kai* (and) *edoxásan* (glorified),” write “*ochloi* (multitudes),” and then after some distraction, remembering in his head he was up to the “*e*” something “*asan*,” and seeing the “*e*” beginning and “*asan*” ending of “*edoxásan*,” then write this down without thinking too much about the matter? If so, it remains possible that this happened more than once, and so the manuscripts of *Variant 2*, being separated by more than half a millennia, may be unrelated. Of course, we cannot be sure as to whether or not these are the origins of *Variants 1* and *2*, though we can be sure that they are erroneous.

On the one hand, the TR’s reading at Matt. 9:8, “they marvelled (*ethaumasán*),” is supported by the representative Byzantine Text, has no good textual argument against it, and has ancient church Greek writer support from the learned church doctor, St. Chrysostom. But on the other hand, the Latin text strongly supports the minority Byzantine reading, “they feared (*ephobethésan*).” Weighing up these considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 9:8 a “B” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 9:8, “they marvelled,” is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (*Codex Ephraemi*, 5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (*Codex Regius*, 8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (*Codex Sangallensis*, 9th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (*Manuscript Munster*, 8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (*Codex Coridethianus*, 9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent text outside of the non-Byzantine General Epistles’ text, 11th century), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text type).

It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Slavic Version (9th century).

However, the incorrect *Variant 1*, “they feared,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text in the Gospels), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is further found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Palestinian (*c.* 6th century) Versions; as well as the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect *Variant 1*, entered the NU Text *et al.* The NU Text Committee claimed that copyists substituted “they marvelled (*ethaumasán*)” for “they feared (*ephobethésan*),” because “superficial readers and copyists, failing to see the deep meaning of ‘were afraid’ (i.e., ... a profound sense of awe ...), substituted ...what seemed to be a more appropriate word” (Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1994, p. 20). This neo-Alexandrian reasoning logic will not withstand strict scrutiny when subjected to comparative analysis of the Greek text and Latin text. When we examine the Latin Text, we find that for the type of reasons here suggested by the NU Text Committee, old Latin Version f (6th century), added the adverb, “*admirantes*,” so as to

make Matt. 9:8 read, “*admirantes timuerunt*” i.e., “they feared with admiration,” or “they feared with wonder.” But the other old Latin Versions read simply, “*timuerunt*” i.e., “they feared.” If this was the response of Latin scribes to “they feared,” then one might expect a similar response from Greek scribes, i.e., some small number may have modified the Greek, “*ephobethesan*” (“they feared”), possibly changing it to “*ethaumasasan*” (“they marvelled”), but most could have been expected to have left it. If most Latin scribes could understand the meaning of reverential “fear” in Matt. 9:8, why, on the NU Text Committee’s logic, could not most Greek scribes?

From the NU Text *et al.*, the erroneous reading entered the (Westcott-Hort based) American Standard Version as, “they were afraid” (ASV). This rendering was retained in the RSV and ESV. The variant is also found in the NASB, NRSV, and NIV at Matt. 9:8. However, seemingly influenced by the NU Text Committee’s logic, they did not translate “*ephobethesan*” as “they feared;” but rather developed Moffatt’s type of translation, “were awed” (Moffatt Bible).

The NIV and NRSV translation is the same, and reads in e.g., the NRSV, “they were filled with awe” (NRSV). It is found in the NASB as, “they were awestruck” (NASB 3rd ed.).

However, while most Latin scribes and Greek scribes using this reading had no difficulty in understanding a reverential fear, nor the NASB, NRSV, and NIV translators, it seems the ASV, RSV, and ESV translators did, since they followed in the footsteps of their ancestor ASV which read, “they were afraid” (ASV). While the words of the NU Text Committee were not apt in describing the way most Latin and Greek scribes following this reading understood it; it must be admitted that they are apt in describing the way the ASV, RSV, and ESV translators understood it here, i.e., “superficial readers” such as the ASV, RSV, and ESV translators, “failing to see the deep meaning of ‘were afraid,’” (Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1994, p. 20), thought it meant, “they were afraid” (ASV).

#### **Matt. 9:10** “Jesus” (AV) {-}

##### *Preliminary Remarks.*

*The First Matter.* I have reconsidered this reading again for the revised Volume 1, in conjunction with the addition of citations from the two Sydney University Lectionaries, and am very glad I did so. The pages of Lectionary 2378 are vellum (probably lamb skin), whereas those of Lectionary 1968 are paper. Here at Matt. 9:10, a small hole about 1 to 2 letter spaces in the vellum of Lectionary 2378 clearly existed at the time the scribe wrote in it. With respect to “to (with) *Iesou* (Jesus),” *infra*, to the left of this small hole is the omega ( $\omega$  /  $\underline{o}$ ) and above it the tau ( $\tau$  /  $t$ ), then comes the hole, and then to the right of the hole is “w / *iu*” with a line over it to midway in the second letter indicating abbreviation i.e., “*Iesou* (Jesus).” I thank the Lord “that all things work together for good to them that love God” (Rom. 8:28), as this acts like a big arrow highlighting the “to (with) *Iesou* (Jesus),” and thus most clearly brings it to my attention.

*The Second Matter.* Since textual issues are not at stake here, I shall deal with all matters under “Principal Textual Discussion,” *infra*, i.e., without making some of the normative distinctions between texts inside and outside the closed class of sources.

##### *Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 9:10, the TR’s Greek reading, “*autou*” literally meaning “of him,” although

translatable into English here as “he;” does not constitute an area of textual disagreement between the neo-Byzantine *Textus Receptus* and neo-Alexandrian texts. It is the majority Byzantine reading e.g., Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It may be literally translated as, “And it came to pass, as he (*autou*) sat at meat in the house.” Indeed, Tyndale (1534) translated it simply as “he.” But if we consider the larger verse, we find the reading is, “And it came to pass, as he (*autou*, masculine singular genitive personal pronoun, from *autos*) sat at meat in the house, behold, many publicans and sinners came and sat down with Jesus (*to Iesou* i.e., *to* = masculine singular dative article, from *o* + *Iesou* = masculine singular dative noun, from *Iesous*<sup>94</sup>) and his disciples.” The reading “*to* (with) *Iesou* (Jesus)” is also the majority Byzantine reading, e.g., (in both instance abbreviating the *Iesou* to “*iu*” with a bar on top,) Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). Once again this is not an area of disputation between the neo-Byzantine *Textus Receptus* and neo-Alexandrian texts.

At this point of where the noun, “Jesus,” is located in Matt. 9:10, the Latin of the Vulgate *et al* resembles the Greek, and so the verse is rendered from the Latin in the Douay-Rheims as, “And it came to pass as he was sitting at meat in the house, behold many publicans and sinners came, and sat down with Jesus and his disciples” (Douay-Rheims). So likewise, on what for our purposes is the same text here at Matt. 9:10, the ASV renders this, “And it came to pass, as he sat at meat in the house, behold, many publicans and sinners came and sat down with Jesus and his disciples” (ASV). However, for reasons of English style we find that a rearrangement is made by the King James translators, so that the “Jesus” comes at the beginning of the verse. Thus the AV reads, “And it came to pass, as Jesus sat at meat in the house, behold, many publicans and sinners came and sat down with him and his disciples” (AV). *This is not a textual issue but one of translation style.*

In Reformed Anglican liturgical worship, as in Non-Conformist Protestant Churches, segments of the Gospel are sometimes read. Christians are given a liberty to either keep or not keep certain holy days (Rom. 14:5,6). In the Reformed Anglican tradition, the Gospel reading at the Communion Service for *Saint Matthew the Apostle’s Day* (21 September), is Matt. 9:9-13. The lessons in the 1662 prayer book are from the King James Version. We read in “The Preface” printed at the front of the prayer book, that “for a more perfect rendering of such portions of holy Scripture, as are inserted in the liturgy; ... [these] are now ordered to be read according to the last Translation.” The “last Translation” was the King James Version, and since the 1662 Caroline prayer book came into force as an Act of the Parliament that received the royal assent of the king, Charles II (Regnal Years: King *de jure* of the three kingdoms, 1649-1685; King *de facto* of Scotland, 1649-1650/1; King *de facto* of England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1660-1685); and since the prayer book also had the support of the *Church of England* Convocations; this meant that the King James Version became the Authorized Version by authorization of King, Parliament, and Convocation, and hence its enduring designation as “the Authorized Version.”

The first part of this Gospel reading, Matt. 9:9,10, reads, “And as Jesus passed forth from thence, he saw a man, named Matthew, sitting at the receipt of custom: and he saith unto him, Follow me, And he arose, and followed him. And it came to pass, as Jesus sat at meat in the

---

<sup>94</sup> Because the Greek form of “*Iesous* (Jesus)” is transliterated from Aramaic, it is a quasi second declension noun, i.e., nominative = *Iesous*; vocative, genitive, and dative = *Iesou*; and accusative = *Iesoun*.

house, many publicans and sinners came, and sat down with him and his disciples.”

In the private reading of God’s Word, it is possible from the latter part of Matt. 9:10 to work out that the “he” of Matt. 9:10a is Christ, from the “with Jesus, and his disciples” of Matt. 9:10b. But in the public reading of God’s Word, if one first hears, “And it came to pass, as he (*autou*) sat at meat in the house” (ASV), then one might immediately think that the “he” in fact refers to St. Matthew. To avoid such misunderstanding as might otherwise ensure in the public reading of God’s holy Word, for the purposes of English translation the Authorized Version translators thus placed “Jesus” at the beginning of the text here at Matt. 9:10. This translation practice is followed in the NKJV and NIV.

On the one hand, it must be said that the more literal word order for where “Jesus” is located in the Greek of Matt. 9:10 is found in the ASV, NASB (1st ed. & 2nd ed.), and RSV. But on the other hand, such translations here lack the clarity of the AV as it must also be said that in the public reading of Holy Scripture this stilted literalism may produce unnecessary confusion.

By contrast, the practice of making the Greek proper noun, “*Iesou* (Jesus),” work double-time at Matt. 9:10, found in Tyndale’s first edition, “And it came to pass, that Jesus sat at meat in his house. And lo, many publicans and sinners, came and sat down also with Jesus, and his disciples” (Tyndale, 1526); and thereafter in e.g., the revised Geneva Bible, “And it came to pass, as Jesus sat at meat in his house, behold, publicans and sinners, that came thither, sat down at the table with Jesus and his disciples” (Geneva Bible, 1560); has been reintroduced in modern times with the NASB (3rd ed.). The ESV places “Jesus” at these same two places in the main text of Matt. 9:10, with a footnote stating at the first, “Jesus,” “Greek ‘he’,” i.e., on the one hand, the ESV translators do not want to make the Greek proper noun, “*Iesou* (Jesus),” work double-time here at Matt. 9:10; but on the other hand, they see the value in the clarity of having “Jesus” at the start of this verse here at Matt. 9:10, and so they supply it, as it were, “in italics,” via this ESV footnote, and these ESV translators should be commended for stating they are supplying something they do consider to be in the Greek.

Most confusingly, without any footnote explanations, the NRSV entirely eliminates the Greek proper noun, “*Iesou* (Jesus),” here at Matt. 9:10. Thus the NRSV reads, “And as he sat at dinner in the house, many tax collectors and sinners came and were sitting with him and his disciples” (NRSV). What does the NRSV mean here? Does it mean Matthew came and sat with his disciples? Or does it mean Jesus came and sat with his disciples? Based purely on the English, we do not, and nor do those benighted persons using the NRSV, who are left guessing.

Two such NRSV users might be sitting down in a church pew discussing Matt. 9:10 from their New Revised Standard Versions. “Oh, I think it means Matthew,” one NRSV user might say, “because it talks about Matthew in the verse before.” “Oh no,” the second NRSV user might reply, “I think it means Jesus for exactly the same reason.” “I know,” the first NRSV user might say, “Let’s look up the church’s old King James Versions, you know, the ones we put in the church’s back cupboard all those years ago.” “Okay,” the second NRSV user might reply, and as they walk to the back cupboard he might say to the first one, “Actually, even though I haven’t looked at the King James for years, I know it’s quite accurate.” “Yea,” the first one replies, “Maybe we shouldn’t have been so quick to get rid of ’em by shelving them in the church’s cupboard?” And as the second one then opens the church’s old cupboard door, they both look at each other aghast, “OH NO! SOMEBODY’S THROWN OUT ALL THE KING

JAMES BIBLES!!! I wonder when that was done?"

"Return, ye backsliding children, and I will heal your backslidings. Behold, we come unto thee; for thou art the Lord our God" (Jer. 3:22). "Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls" (Jer. 6:16).

**Matt. 9:12a** "Jesus" (TR & AV) {A}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

The TR reads, "*o* (-) *de* (but) *Iesous* (Jesus) *akousas* (hearing) *eipen* (said)," i.e., (with "that" in italics as added,) "But when Jesus heard *that*, he said" (AV). This is changed in Lectionary 2378 to, "*De* (but) *o* (-) *is* (Jesus) *eipen* (said)," etc. . The loss of "*akousas* (hearing)" may e.g., have occurred due to ellipsis on the final "s" (sigma) (in Lectionary 2378 the final "s" is Greek, "σ" not Greek, "ς") of "*is* (Jesus)" and "*akousas* (hearing);" or perhaps the "*akousas* (hearing)" was lost in an undetected paper fade. Whatever its origins, and notwithstanding the rearrangement in word order of the first two words, it is clear that for my purposes here at Matt. 9:12a that Lectionary 2378 supports the TR's reading, *infra*.

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 9:12a, the TR's Greek reading, "*Iesous* (Jesus)," in the words, "But when Jesus heard [that], he said" etc., is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, abbreviating "ἰησοῦς" to "ἰσ" with a bar over the "σ") and 1968 (1544 A.D., abbreviating "ἰησοῦς" to "ἰς" with a bar on top). It is further supported as Latin, "*Iesus* (Jesus)," by Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century); and notwithstanding variations in the beginning of this verse, it is also supported by old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592), which here follows the Vulgate's reading, "*At* (but) *Iesus* (Jesus) *audiens* (hearing) *ait* (he said)" i.e., adding "that" in italics after "*audiens* ('hearing,' present active participle of *audio*)," "But Jesus hearing [that], said" etc. .

However, "Jesus" is omitted in a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 248 (13th century); as well as in old Latin Version d (5th century).

There is no good textual reason to doubt the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand. When using Greek "*akousas*" ('having heard,' i.e., 'when heard,' first aorist active participle, nominative singular, from *akouō*), Matthean Greek generally specifies the name of, or description of, the person hearing (Matt. 2:3; 4:12; 8:10; 11:2; 14:13; 19:22). Thus the minority Greek reading and minority Latin reading, clangs on the ears as bad Greek (i.e., bad underpinning Greek in the case of the minority Latin). The manner in which "Jesus" dropped out is necessarily speculative. Possibly it was a deliberate "stylistic improvement," in which "Jesus" was regarded as "redundant" since his name is mentioned in Matt. 9:9.

But possibly it was an accidental omission. Manuscript Washington (W 032) helps us understand one possible way it may have happened, because in it, “*IECOYC*” (*Iesous*) is abbreviated as “*IC*” with a bar over it. The relevant section reading “*O (-) DE* (but) *IC* (Jesus) *AKOYCAC* (having heard) *EIPEN* (he said),” was probably in continuous script i.e., “*ODEICAKOYCACEIPEN*.” The “*E*” (epsilon) is the same shape as the “*C*” (sigma), with a bar added in the middle. Did a scribe write the “*ODC*” of “*ODE*,” and before he had time to cross the “*C*” to make it an “*E*,” was distracted by some external stimulus? Did he then quickly return to where he remembered he was up to, looked quickly at the “*C*,” and taking it for the “*C*” of “*IC*,” keep writing? Did his script come to thus look like, “*ODCAKOYCACEIPEN*”? Did a later scribe, detecting an error, take the “*DC*” to be the common “*DE*,” either “correcting” the original manuscript on which this error was made by adding the bar to the “*C*” to make it an “*E*,” or writing it out as “*DE*” in a later manuscript? If so, since “*EIPEN*” means, “he said,” the passage still made sense as, “But when he heard [that],” and so did he then drawn a conclusion that this was “*DE*” with some reference to the “*DE*” of Matt. 9:6; 10:2 *et al*? Was the omission deliberate or accidental? We cannot be sure. We only know for sure that the original read “Jesus.”

The TR’s reading has solid support from the Greek and Latin, and is the reading favoured by textual analysis. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 9:12a an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 9:12a, “Jesus,” is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in the (mixed text in the Gospels) Minuscule 33 (9th century); the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the Family 13 Manuscripts, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Syriac Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Gothic Version (4th century).

However, the incorrect reading which omits “Jesus,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); and Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type). It is also omitted in the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions; and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect reading entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 9:12a, and hence, following the ASV forbear version, “Jesus” is omitted in the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NASB’s 1st and 2nd editions. However, to some extent reflecting its ancient support in e.g., the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century), Gothic Version (4th century), and Codex C 04 (5th century,

mixed text), it was restored to the text in the NASB's 3rd edition; and has been included in both editions of the NIV. Its presence in the Latin *and Syriac* may have been the decisive factor behind Moffatt's decision to include it at Matt. 9:12a, "When Jesus heard it" (Moffatt Bible).

**Matt. 9:12b** "unto them" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek reading, "*autois* (unto them)," in the words, "he said (*eipen*) unto them (*autois*)," is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, "*eis* (unto them)" in old Latin Version a (4th century); and as Latin "*illis* ('unto those [ones], plural ablative demonstrative from *ille*, i.e., 'unto them')" in old Latin Versions h (5th century), f (6th century), and q (6th / 7th century). It is also found in some Vulgate manuscripts with independent readings.

However, "unto them" is omitted as a minority Byzantine reading in Codex X 033 (10th century). It is also omitted in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, its omission is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further followed by the ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine Greek Text, which is therefore the correct reading. In Matthean Greek, "*eipen* ('he said,' aorist indicative active, 3rd person singular verb, from *legō*)" tends to be used with a dative, such as e.g., "*autois* (unto them)" (Matt. 3:7; 8:10; 9:2; 11:3; 14:2; 15:3; 16:2; 17:4; 19:4; 20:4; 21:21; 24:2; 26:1; 27:17; 28:5). When this is not the case, there is a specific stylistic reason for doing so. Specifically, to prevent stylistic confusion i.e., with a nearby other "them" (Matt. 2:8), or "him" that is not included in any "to them" that would be placed after "he said" / "*eipon*" (Matt. 18:3); or because the context is a dialogue between two clearly specified persons lacking any interim comment (Matt. 4:4); or because the "*eipon*" is itself part of a wider quote (Matt. 25:12). None of these exceptions apply to Matt. 9:12. There is no other nearby "them" or "him" that this might be confused with; we have a clear interim comment in Matt. 9:12, "when Jesus heard that;" and this is not part of a wider quote. Therefore, the absence of "he said" / "*eipon*" in the minority Greek reading and majority Latin reading, clangs on the ears as non-Matthean Greek.

The origins of this omission are speculative. Does the gap in time and language between the minority Byzantine reading and Latin reading indicate they are unrelated readings? Was it lost from an original Greek manuscript by inadvertence e.g., a paper fade, especially if it was protruding to some extent to the right hand side of the page, or taken to be a stylistic paper space?

Certainly in the case of the mysterious disappearance of "*autois*" from Codex X 033, I think this a likely explanation of its origins. In the case of the Latin text, does this reflect either an earlier Greek manuscript which was pruned on the basis that "unto them" was "redundant," or such a pruning when it later entered some Latin manuscripts?

The TR's reading has strong support from the Greek, and no good textual argument against it. Indeed, a good textual argument exists in its favour. Under these circumstances, we cannot doubt that the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, results in a strong certainty

for the representative Byzantine Text's reading. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 9:12b an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 9:12b, "unto them," is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in the (mixed text in the Gospels) Minuscule 33 (9th century); the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the Family 13 Manuscripts, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Syriac Harklean h (616) Versions; the Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Gothic Version (4th century); and Armenian Version (5th century).

The incorrect reading which omits "unto them," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the mixed text type) Minuscule 892 (9th century). It is further found in the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

From here, the erroneous omission of "unto them" at Matt. 9:12b was adopted into the NU Text *et al*. Hence it is omitted in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV; as it was in the earlier ASV which reads simply, "he said, They" etc. .

**Matt. 9:13** "to repentance" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek reading, "*eis* (to) *metanoian* (repentance)," in the words, "but sinners to repentance," is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as Latin, "*ad* (to) *paenitentiam* (repentance)," in old Latin Versions g1 (8th / 9th century), g2 (10th century), and c (12th / 13th century, reading Latin "*in*," also meaning "to," rather than Latin "*ad*"); as well as in Latin Codices Q (Kenanensis, 7th / 8th century), Th (Theoulfianus, 9th century), and H (Hubertianus, 9th / 10th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Basil the Great (d. 379) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, these words are omitted in a minority Byzantine reading found in e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), V 031 (9th century; although a marginal reading has "*eis metanoian*"), and Gamma 036 (10th century; although a marginal reading has "*eis metanoian*"). They are also omitted in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). They are

also omitted by the ancient church Greek writer, Basil the Great (d. 379); the ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore correct. Indeed, these same words are found at e.g., Luke 5:32, where their presence is undisputed. The fact that St. Basil refers to both readings indicates that the omission came from an early time. Were these words deliberately omitted as a “stylistic improvement” on the basis that they were “redundant”? Alternatively, the Greek, “*metanoian* (‘repentance,’ singular accusative, first declension feminine noun, from *metanoia*),” means to *U-turn* or *turn away from* one’s sins, and so conveys the idea of a person having a *change of heart* in their attitude to their sins. Did this message of “repentance,” so fundamental to the Gospel (Matt.3:2; 4:17; Acts 2:38), prick the unregenerated heart of an unconverted scribe, who felt inclined to remove these words, ostensibly on the basis that they were “redundant”?

Was this omission accidental? *Codex Freerianus* (W 032) often uses paragraphing which not infrequently matches some of the later verse divisions of our Bibles, first formally compiled by Stephanus of Geneva in 1551. From this it is clear that Stephanus made reference to some established verse divisions, even though they had not previously been specifically numbered as “verses.” E.g., at the page of Manuscript Washington (W 032) showing Matt. 9:12-18, we find no spacing between the end of verse 12 and the beginning of verse 13, which is in a continuous script without any break. However, a space varying in size between just over half a line down to a space of about one letter length is left at the end of all other verses i.e., verses 13 (just over half a line), 14 (about 1 letter length), 15 (about half a line), 16 (about 6 letters length), 17 (about a third of the line), and 18 (about 4 letters length). With the exception of verse 17, which is left-hand justified with the rest of the page, following the space gap at the end of verse 16; we find that the next line starts with a slight protruding indentation, about one letter in length in which the first letter of the new paragraph i.e., verses 14,15,16,18 is further left than the rest of the left-hand justified page. Therefore did a paper fade occurred over these words which occur at the end of this verse? If so, did a later copyist simply think the space left at the end of the verse was e.g., about half a line’s length, rather than the original 5 letter spaces length?

Rightly, it may be said that one knows a person is serious about the Gospel which “is the power of God unto salvation” (Rom. 1:16), given by “grace alone” through “faith alone” i.e., the “*sola gratia*” and “*sola fide*” of the Reformation Motto (Gal. 3:11; Eph. 2:8,9; Philp. 3:8,9), when that person is genuinely concerned about the forgiveness of their sins, defined primarily through reference to the Decalogue (Deut. 5:6-21; I Tim. 1:8-11). For man is “dead in sins” until the Lord starts to quicken him (Eph. 2:5; Ezek. 16:6). “For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me. Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.” “But I am carnal, sold under sin” (Rom. 7:9-12,14).

Though different sins beset different persons in different degrees, in this society *some* more common sins of commission include e.g., narcissism (1st commandment, “lovers of their own selves,” II Tim. 3:2); worship of the god of materialism (1st and 2nd commandments, Matt. 6:24; Col. 3:5); worshipping rock’n’roll “idols” (2nd commandment), whose chord pattern

repeating, loud rhythmic beating music, is designed to deaden the higher spiritual and intellectual faculties, and instead work up fleshly lusts (7th & 10th commandments, Gal. 6:8), and whose ungodly (1st & 2nd commandments) and unholy (4th commandment) lyrics and images, seek to accentuate this devilish goal. Or foul language such as blasphemous exclamations taking the Lord's name in vain (3rd commandment); unrighteous hatred, unwarranted anger or violence (6th commandment, Matt. 5:21,22); and abortion (other than as a necessary act of self-defence in order to save the mother's life) (6th commandment, "without natural affection," Rom. 1:31; II Tim. 3:3). Or sexual impurity (7th and 10th commandments, Matt. 5:27,28); sex role perversion (commonly called "feminism,") (female lust for male roles, Isa. 3:12; I Tim. 2:8-15; Titus 2:3-5; I Peter 3:5-7); gluttony (lust, 1st & 10th commandments, Phil. 3:19); drunkenness (lust, 1st & 10th commandments); and a general "love" of "the world" (I John 2:15-17) and "worldly lusts" (Titus 2:12). *Some* more common sins of omission include, e.g., a failure to love the brethren (I John 3:13-15), manifested in, for instance, a desire to enjoy "the communion (fellowship) of saints (believers)" (Article 10, *Apostles' Creed*, I John 1:7), by assembling together (Heb. 10:25) every Sunday (4th commandment, John 20:1,19-23,26-29; Acts 20:7). Or robbing God (8th commandment) the honour due to him (1st commandment) in public worship (I Cor. 14:23) every Sunday (4th commandment, Luke 24:1; Acts 2:1; 20:7; I Cor. 16:2). There are Scriptures where the term "sinners" is used with an implied reference to repentance (e.g., Matt. 11:19; I Tim. 1:15). This type of understanding is also found in Article 11 of the *Apostles' Creed*, "the forgiveness of sins;" where the concomitant teaching of repentance is implied and understood through reference to various Scriptures.

However, such an unqualified usage of "sinners" is inappropriate here at Matt. 9:13, because the parallelism with needing "a physician" who cures the "sick" (Matt. 9:12), contextually means that if "sinners" lacks the needed "repentance," there is no "physician" present, and so the stylistic parallelism is destroyed. This conclusion is also indicated from the fact that Christ makes a "call" (*kalesai*) to such "sinners" (Matt. 9:10,11), i.e., a "call" to repentance. The effect of these two stylistic factors is that without the words "to repentance," this reading poses a serious textual problem as being both incongruous with the expectation of a "call," and also stylistically incomplete when juxtaposed with the complementary imagery of "a physician" who cures the "sick." However, if "to repentance" was lost from Matt. 9:13 by a paper fade, to a superficial scribal copyist, *prima facie*, the passage might still seem to make sense through a misapplication of e.g., Matt. 11:19, and thus its omission may have gone undetected.

On the one hand, the TR's reading at Matt. 9:13 has the support of the representative Byzantine Text, has no good textual argument against it, and indeed, has a good textual argument in its favour. It has the support of some ancient church writers, and a minority Latin text. But on the other hand, the minority Byzantine reading has some ancient Greek support, the support of a majority Latin text, some ancient church writers; and the early support of St. Basil can be found for both readings. Balancing out these considerations, the textual argument is decisive in raising this from what would otherwise be a low level "B" (in the range of 66% +/- 1%), up to a high level "B" (in the range of 71%-74%). Thus on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 9:13 a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 9:13, “to repentance,” is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century); and a marginal reading of the Syriac Harclean h Version (616), which differs from the reading of its main text. It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions, as well as some of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Versions.

The incorrect reading which omits, “to repentance,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); together with Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text in the Gospels), 565 (9th century, independent); and the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.*

It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Syriac Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as some of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Versions; and Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect reading which omits “to repentance,” entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 9:13. Hence this omission is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV; as it was in the earlier ASV, which ends the sentence quite abruptly with simply, “but sinners” (ASV).

#### **Matt. 9:14** “oft” (TR & AV) {A}

##### *Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

The Greek word, *polus-e-u*, from which we get English words starting with “poly” (e.g., polytheistic, polygamous, or polyglot), is a fairly elastic word in the Greek, meaning “much,” “many,” “oft,” “frequently,” etc. . Therefore, it might be reasonably be translated into Latin as either, “*multa*” or “*multum*” (much), or “*frequenter*” (oft / frequently). Thus e.g., the Douay-Rheims Version, translated the Latin adverb, “*frequenter*” as “often,” which is the same English translation one finds in the King James Version as “oft” from the Greek plural adjective, “*polla*.”

Hence at Matt. 9:14, the textual apparatus of Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72), rightly shows the Greek reading, “*polla*” as supported by both Jerome’s Vulgate and the old Latin Versions. With respect to the Alexandrian text’s London Sinaiticus, Tischendorf says its original reading omits “*polla*,” but that a first “corrector” added the plural, “*pukna*” (‘oft’ / ‘frequently,’ adverb from *puknos-e-on*) (*Variant 2, infra*), in the manner that one find’s in Luke’s account, and that a second “corrector” then made this “*polla*” (oft / frequently). As to the basic facts, Tischendorf is correct. However, the textual apparatus of the UBS 3rd edition (1975), 3rd corrected edition (1983), and 4th revised edition (1993), claims that the aberrant Greek reading, “*pukna*”(oft / frequently), is followed by the Latin Vulgate and those old Latin Versions reading “*frequenter*” (oft / frequently); whereas the TR’s Greek reading, “*polla*” (oft / frequently), is followed by those old Latin Versions reading “*multa*” or “*multum*” (much). The textual apparatus of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) is not as dogmatic in this assertion,

placing a question mark after the proposition that the Vulgate and a part of the old Latin Versions follow the Greek reading, “*pukna*.”

On the one hand, it is certainly possible to translate the Greek “*pukna*” as the Latin “*frequenter*,” as occurs in Luke 5:33 of the Latin Vulgate. But on the other hand, no textual support for Greek “*pukna*” at Matt. 9:14 exists outside one manuscript, namely, London Sinaiticus, which everyone agrees originally had neither “*pukna*” nor *polla*” after it. Therefore, the more natural conclusion to draw, is that a scribe inserted “*pukna*” at Matt. 9:14 in London Sinaiticus as an assimilation from Luke 5:33, and this is a one-off occurrence. Hence, the balance of probabilities strongly favour the proposition that the Latin Versions reading “*frequenter*” are translating the Greek “*polla*” of many manuscripts, rather than the Greek “*pukna*” of just one obscure, and clearly tampered with, Alexandrian manuscript.

The NU Text’s desire either to assert as an uncertain possibility (Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition), or to assert as a fact (UBS 3rd, 3rd corrected, & 4th revised editions), the claim that the Latin Versions using the adverb “*frequenter*” are in fact following a manuscript line found in the Greek adverb “*pukna*” of a first “corrector” of London Sinaiticus, is, on the balance of probabilities, a highly unlikely possibility. It is a sad example of how those who think so highly of the two leading Alexandrian Texts, like to presume that others, such as the Latin translators, shared their focused fascination with these aberrant Alexandrian texts. The reality, recognized by even their fellow neo-Alexandrian, Tischendorf, is that the most natural conclusion to draw is that in the process of translating from Greek to Latin, the elasticity of the Greek “*polla*” (oft / frequently), gave rise to Latin scribes representing this in various ways by “*multa*” or “*multum*” (much), or “*frequenter*” (oft / frequently).

The UBS 3rd & 3rd corrected editions, like the UBS 4th revised edition, says the Greek “*pukna* (oft / frequently)” is made by a first “corrector” of London Sinaiticus, and thereafter “*polla* (oft / frequently)” was made by a second “corrector.” These fact reminds us that altering the text, this way and that, was a feature of life among the Alexandrians. Given the Neo-Alexandrians pin so much on just two Alexandrian Texts, this really should be a matter of greater concern to them than it is. But instead, we find that the Neo-Alexandrians have “taken a leaf out of the book” of the old Alexandrian School of scribes, as they too “correct” the texts.

Whereas the UBS 3rd & 3rd corrected editions confidently claim that the Greek “*pukna*” is followed by the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century), and the Greek “*polla*” is followed by the Armenian Version (5th century); by contrast, the UBS 4th revised edition just as confidentially claims that the Greek “*pukna*” is followed by the Armenian Version (5th century); and describes as “doubtful” the possibility that the Syriac Sinaitic Version also is following “*pukna*.” Have the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century) and Armenian Version (5th century) mysteriously changed their readings between the time of publication of the UBS 3rd corrected edition (1983) and UBS 4th revised edition (1993)? Clearly not! The reality is, that since both “*pukna*” and “*polla*” mean the same basic thing i.e., “oft” / “frequently,” it is highly speculative as to which of these two sources a Syriac or Armenian Version is getting them from. While dogmatism on the matter is unwise, it seems to me that given one has no clear citation of “*pukna*” in any source, that in all likelihood, it is an aberrant reading located exclusively in the Alexandrian text’s London Sinaiticus. While that may be an unpalatable conclusion for neo-Alexandrians who wish to believe that their two leading Alexandrian texts are at the umbilicus of the world of textual transmission, and so such a “correction” by the first “corrector” of London

Sinaiticus “*just had*” to be followed by someone, in fact, the evidence does not support such pretentious neo-Alexandrian claims. “Pride Goethe ... before a fall” (Prov. 16:18).

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 9:14, the TR’s Greek reading, “*polla* (oft),” in the words, “the Pharisees fast oft,” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). It is further supported as Latin “*frequenter* (oft / frequently),” by Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported as Latin “*multum* (much),” by old Latin Version k (4th / 5th centuries); and as Latin “*multa* (much)” by old Latin Version d (5th century).

It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Basil the Great (d. 379) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and the ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367), Chromatius (d. 407), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430).

However, a variant reading (*Variant 1*), omitting “*polla* (oft),” and thus making the words, “the Pharisees fast,” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscules 27 (10th century) and 597 (13th century); and also in the ancient church Greek writer, Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore correct. Is the aberrant reading from Cyril of Alexandria a typical Alexandrian pruning of “an unnecessary word”? Or is it a typical paper fade? With strong support from the Greek and Latin, the TR’s reading stands sure. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 9:14 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 9:14, “oft,” was inserted by a second scribal corrector, in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (c. 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions, together with some manuscripts of the Sahidic Version. It is also found in the Georgian “1” and “A” Versions (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (c. 500).

The incorrect reading (*Variant 1*), which omits “oft” (*polla*), is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; as well as the Georgian “B” Version (5th century).

Another reading (*Variant 2*), which reads “*pukna*” (oft / frequently), rather than “*polla*” (oft / frequently), was inserted by a first “corrector” in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). This was evidently as assimilation to Luke 5:33, and has no verifiable support in any other manuscript.

The presence of this reading in the Latin, the Western (Greek) Text, and Syriac, appear to have proven too much of an enticement for the semi neo-Alexandrian, Moffatt, who on this occasion jettisoned the Alexandrian reading in favour of this non-Alexandrian reading. *On this occasion*, for the wrong reasons, Moffatt arrived at the right answer. He renders Matt. 9:14, “Why do we and the Pharisees fast a great deal (*polla*)?” (Moffatt Bible).

The NU Text places “oft” (*polla*) at Matt. 9:14 in square brackets, making the decision to follow either the TR or the incorrect *Variant 1* a fairly equal option; whereas the earlier Nestle’s 21st edition (1952) put *polla* in a footnote. Unlike the parent ASV which in following Westcott-Hort’s text that had “*polla* (oft)” as a footnote alternative; decided to include “oft” (ASV) in the main text, with a footnote saying, “Some ancient authorities omit ‘oft’” (ASV ftn), a format followed by the NRSV; or unlike the RSV which omitted “oft” in the main text, but made reference to it in a footnote, a format followed in the ESV; the NASB exercised the NU Text option to omit “oft” at Matt. 9:14, as did also the NIV.

In the 19th century the *two* leading Alexandrian texts were brought from the great obscurity of a dark corner on the Arabian Peninsula (*Codex Sinaiticus*), and a dark, dingy, shelf of the Pope’s Library (*Codex Vaticanus*) that had been last dusted when in the early 16th century some citations of it were gotten for Erasmus, who upon examining these readings rightly realized that *Codex Vaticanus* was a badly corrupted text. On the basis of reasonable statistical projections from the large sample of about 1,000 manuscripts in von Soden’s K group of which more than 90% are Byzantine text (Robinson & Pierpont), or the even larger sample of about 1,500 manuscripts in von Soden’s I and K groups of which more than 85% are Byzantine text (Hodges & Farstad), we know that the TR’s reading here has the strength of several thousand Byzantine manuscripts. Yet it seems the combined strength of *two* out of *two* leading Alexandrian texts was worth more to the NASB and NIV translators than the reading of *several thousand* Byzantine texts *against which there is no good textual argument!* “Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools” (Rom. 1:22).

**Matt. 9:22** “turned [him] about” (TR & AV) {B}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

In Saint Jerome’s Vulgate, for the Greek *epistrephe*, the Latin, *conversus*, is used in the spiritual sense of repenting of sins, or spiritual turning around in the opposite direction. I.e., “turn again” in Luke 17:4, “And if he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day *turn again* to thee, saying, I repent: thou shalt forgive him.” This is an element of the *Lord’s Prayer*, “And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive everyone that is indebted to us” (Luke 11:4). So too, the Latin *conversus* is used for the Greek *epistrephe* i.e., “converted” in Luke 22:32, where Jesus says to Simon, “I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art *converted*, strengthen thy brethren.” By this we are reminded that mere religious knowledge, or religious practices, are not enough. We must by God’s grace, repent of our sins, as defined primarily through the Decalogue (Exod. 20:1-17; Rom. 7:7; I Tim. 1:8-11), accept

Jesus as Lord, and be *converted*. We must have faith alone in Christ (Rom. 1:17; Philp. 3:8,9), who saves us by his grace alone (Eph 2:8,9). This is the true meaning of belief in Christ (Acts 4:12; Rom. 10:8-13; I Cor. 12:3), as found in Articles 1 & 2 of the *Apostles' Creed*, "I believe ... in Jesus Christ ... our Lord;" and Sections 1 & 2 of the threefold Reformation Motto, "*sola fide, sola gratia*" (Latin, "faith alone, grace alone").

On the one hand, in the Gospels, the Latin *conversus* is also used for the Greek *epistropheis* in Mark 5:30 ("turned him about"); 8:33 ("when he had turned about"); and John 21:20 ("turning about"). But on the other hand, the Latin *conversus* is used for the Greek *strapheis* in Matt. 16:23 ("he turned"); Luke 7:9 ("turned him about"); 7:44 ("he turned"); 9:55 ("he turned"); 10:23 ("he turned him"); 14:25 ("he turned"); 22:61 ("turned"); 23:28 ("turning"); and John 1:38 ("turned").

In general, the Latin *conversus* is also found in the Latin Text at Matt. 9:22, e.g., Jerome's Latin Vulgate and the Clementine Vulgate. But since it can be used to translate either the Greek *epistropheis* or *strapheis*, it is not referred to it in the principle textual discussion, *infra*.

#### *Principal Textual Discussion.*

In Matt. 9:22, the TR's Greek reading, "*epistropheis* ('having turned about,' aorist passive participle, nominative singular, from *epistropho*)," i.e., "turned [him] about" (AV) or "turned around" (NKJV) in the words, "But Jesus turned him about, and when he saw her" (AV), is made up of the preposition, *epi* (about / around), and the verb, *stropho* (turn). It is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.).

But a variant reading, without the preposition, reading simply as the participle, "*strapheis* ('turning,' aorist passive participle, nominative singular, from *stropho*)," i.e., "But Jesus turning and seeing her" (ASV), is a minority Byzantine reading. It is found in Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) and N 022 (6th century); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as correct. The origins of the variant are conjectural and so we cannot be certain about them. However, Manuscript Washington helps us better understand how this variant may have come about by accident, rather than design. Written in continuous script in capitals, "*IECOYC*" / "*Iesous*" (Jesus) is abbreviated by the first and last letters as "*IC*" with a bar on top of it. Therefore the line reading "*O (-) DE* (but) *IC* (Jesus) *EPICTRAPHEIC* (having turned about)," would have looked something like, "... *ODEICEPICTRAPHEIC... .*" Did a scribe first copy out, "... *ODEIC*"? Was he then momentarily distracted by an external stimulus, e.g., did he move a flickering lamp further right of the page as he copied out the manuscript by night, while remembering in his head, "I'm up to the *IC*" (i.e., abbreviating "*IECOYC*" / "Jesus")? With his finger or a marker at approximately the right spot, did this then slip forward by a very small amount? Or was he perhaps simply remembering in his head the point at which he was up to without such a marker? Then looking quickly back from the right side of the line back to the left side of the line, till he came to the "*IC*" of "*EPICTRAPHEIC*," did he then think in his head, "*CTRAPHEIC* is where I'm up to," and so wrote down this and kept going? Since the passage still made sense, is this how such an accidental variant come to survive?

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 9:22 a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 9:22, "*epistropheis* (having turned about)," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text type). It is further found in the *Family I Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.*

However, the incorrect reading, "*strapheis* (turning)," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text in the Gospels), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), and 788 (11th century, independent text); together with the Family 13 Manuscripts, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.*

The incorrect reading, "*strapheis* (turning)," entered the NU Text *et al.* at Matt. 9:22. Thus at Matt. 9:22 the reading of "*strapheis*," is found in the ASV's, "But Jesus turning (*strapheis*) and seeing her" (ASV). It is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

The unstable mind of Moffatt, was nothing if it was not inconsistent and incoherent. His two-armed pincer approach meant that at times he would abandon his Alexandrian text based pincer arm principles; and without rhyme or reason, switch over to his non-Alexandrian text based pincer arm, in which his own subjective "feel" for the text seems to have guided his religiously liberal form criticism. While to some extent all neo-Alexandrians use such a two-armed pincer approach, Moffatt does so far more than most (albeit still less than 10% of the time), for which reason he is best classified as a Semi Neo-Alexandrian rather than a Neo-Alexandrian Proper. When so operating, as here at Matt. 9:22, Moffatt was prepared to accept "amendments" from absolutely anywhere, including the thin air of speculation by some 19th or 20th century religiously liberal's mind, whether his own or another's. On this occasion, choosing to forsake the Alexandrian text pincer arm principles that more generally characterize most of his NT text; and *perhaps* influenced by its presence in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), the giddy'n'dizzy religiously liberal mind of Moffatt appears to have been set off by the words "turned round" like a merry-go-round with wooden horses, so that he fluked the correct reading, "Then Jesus turned round (*epistropheis*), and when he saw her he said" etc. (Moffatt Bible). "... Oh well! ... I guess even Moffatt can have 'the horse gambler's luck' of some fluke wins!"

**Matt. 9:24** "He said unto them" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek reading, "*Legei* ('He said,' literally, 'He says,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *legō autois* (unto them)," is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported in two similar Latin readings with minor differences, as Latin, "*dicebat* ('he said,' literally, 'he was saying,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *dico eis* (unto them)" in old Latin Version f (6th / 7th century); and as Latin, "*dixit* ('he said,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *dico ad* (unto) *eos* (them)," in old Latin Version g1 (8th / 9th century).

However, an alternative reading (*Variant 1*), that omits "*autois* (unto them)," and reads, "*Elegen* ('He said,' literally, 'he began to say,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *legō*)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). The Latin reading, "*dicebat* ('he said,' literally, 'he was saying,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular, i.e., a continuous action in past time)," is found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), q (6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found as Latin, "*dixit* ('he said,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular, i.e., a simple past action)," in old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), h (5th century), and c (12th / 13th century).

It is further followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

Another reading (*Variant 2*), simply omits "*autois* (unto them)," and reads, "*Legei* (He said)." This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex N 022 (6th century).

St. Matthew often uses the indicative active present, 3rd person singular Greek verb of *legō* i.e., *legei* ('he said,' literally, 'he says'), in such contexts. It is translated as "said" or "he said" in the AV at Matt. 14:31; 21:13; 26:18; 27:13; 28:10; and as "saith," "he saith," or "saith he" in the AV at Matt. 4:6; 8:4; 9:6; 12:13; 15:34; 16:15; 18:22; 19:8; 20:6; 22:8. Its usage here at Matt. 9:24 is within the normative bounds of Matthean Greek. There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore correct.

The origins of these variants are conjectural. It is possible that these were deliberate "stylistic improvements," although the general professional standards of the Byzantine scribes being against this, I think this an unlikely, though not an impossible, possibility. More probably, I think the variants arose accidentally. In *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), the Greek Alpha starting the next word after "LEGEI", i.e., "AYTOIC" (*autois*), is very poorly formed, and looks like a lambda ("L" / "λ"), with only a small protrusion at the top (i.e., it looks like a triangle, with no bottom bar on the triangle, with a slight protrusion from the right bar of the triangle at the top, "Λ"). If such a poorly formed lambda was written a little bit more closely than normal after the "I" of LEGEI in a continuous script, this could look like an "N." If, as in Manuscript Washington (W 032), this came at the end of a line, and there was a paper fade of the letters, "YTOIC" of "AYTOIC," a scribe may have written out, "LEGEN" without thinking about the matter much. A later scribe then looking at this, and realizing a mistake had been made, may have added the "E" before "LEGEN" to get the present "ELEGEN" of *Variant 1*. In doing so, he may have been influenced by the "ELEGE" of Matt. 9:21 (TR), which has the optional "N" on the end of it in Manuscript Washington i.e., "ELEGEN" (she said), which is just three verses above; and possibly he was also influenced by the "ELEGE (TR) of Matt. 14:4, which likewise has the optional "n" at the end in Manuscript Washington as "ELEGEN" (said).

The origins of *Variant 2* might also be found in a paper fade of “AYTOIC” (*autois*). Alternatively, they may have been lost due to ellipsis. I.e., copying out the words, “LEGEI (He said) AYTOIC (to them) ANACHOREITE (Give place)” the original line in continuous script would have looked something like “.. *LEGEIAYTOICANACHOREITE* ... .” A scribe may have written, “.. *LEGEIA*,” when distracted by an external stimulus, in which he remembered “I’m up to the “A.” Then quickly looking back from the right to the left side of the line, he saw the “A” of “*ANACHOREITE*” and kept writing. We have clear evidence from Manuscript Washington that relatively short words such as “*AYTOIC*” could sometimes drop out from inadvertence, since the scribe of Manuscript Washington reinserted words so left out at e.g., Matt. 7:17 where the scribe left out “*AGATHON*” (good) (seemingly due to ellipsis of on “*ON*” ending with the previous word, “*DENDRON*” / tree), but then realizing his mistake, reinserted the word in the margin with a textual apparatus mark showing where it should be inserted. Did the same type of thing therefore happen here at Matt. 9:21, thus giving rise to *Variant 2*?

On the one hand, the Greek text strongly favours the reading, “*Legei* (He said) *autois* (unto them);” and there is no good textual argument against it. But on the other, in general the Latin text follows the minority Greek reading of *Variant 1*, “*Elegen* (He said ),” in omitting, “*autois* (unto them).” The absence of any textual problem with the Greek reading, which is clearly within the normativity of Matthean Greek, must be decisive in this instance. The greater maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, means that on this occasion the Latin followed variant cannot be seriously entertained. But nor can the Latin be seriously ignored, so that its effect on this occasion is to reduce what would otherwise be an “A” reading to a “B” reading. Thus on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 9:24 a “B” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 9:24, “unto them,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text type). It is further found in all extant Syriac Versions e.g., the celebrated Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century).

However, the incorrect *Variant 1*, which omits “unto them,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text in the Gospels), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), and 788 (11th century, independent text); together with the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in all extant Egyptian Coptic Versions e.g., the Sahidic Version (3rd century); as well as the Gothic Version (4th century); and Ethiopic

Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect *Variant 1* reading, “He said (*elegen*),” entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 9:24. (“He said” / “*elegen*,” is sometimes placed at the very end of Matt. 9:23, rather than at the very start of Matt. 9:24.) It is thus found in the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

**Matt. 9:26** “hereof” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek reading, “*aute*, (‘hereof.’ literally, ‘this’),” in the words, “And this (*aute*) fame went abroad,” or “And the fame hereof (*aute*) went abroad” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); Minuscules 1010 (12th century) and 1242 (13th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, “*haec* (‘hereof, literally, ‘this’), in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However, an unclear variant is found in old Latin Version d (5th century). This reads, Latin, “*Et* (and) *exivit* (went abroad) *fama* (fame) *eius*.” The Latin *eius* (*ejus*) might mean “his” (see e.g., “his brethren,” as “*fratres eius*” in Matt. 1:2) i.e., “His fame went abroad,” referring to Christ. If so, this would be Greek *autou* (of him). The Greek, “*autou* (of him)” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 2378 (11th century) (*Variant 1*). Or Latin *eius* might mean “her” (see e.g., “her husband” as “*vir eius*” in Matt. 1:19) i.e., “The fame about her (literally, ‘of her’) went abroad,” referring to the maid. If so, this would be Greek *autēs* (of her) (*Variant 2*)<sup>95</sup>.

There is no good textual argument against the reading of the representative Byzantine Text, which must therefore stand as correct. It is possible that e.g., the Greek “*aute* (hereof)” was at the end of a line, and due to a paper loss it simply read “...*aut*.” If so, a scribe might have “reconstructed” this as “*autou*” (*Variant 1*), possibly with some reference to the Matthean Greek of the nearby “*autou*” in Matt. 9:24, “And they laughed him (*autou*) to scorn.” Alternatively, a scribe may have “reconstructed” this as “*autēs*” (*Variant 2*), possibly with some reference to the Matthean Greek of the nearby “*autēs*” in Matt. 9:25, “and took her (*autēs*) by the hand.” Another possibility, is a paper loss or fade of “*haec*” in a Latin manuscript. This may have led a Latin scribe to reconstruct this as “*eius*,” possibly with some reference to the usage of *eius* in the Latin translation of Matthean Greek, either in the nearby Matt. 9:21, “his (*eius*) garment;” or Matt. 9:25, “and took her (*eius*) by the hand.” We cannot be certain as to origins of the Latin variant. If it was translated from the Greek, we cannot be sure what the underpinning Greek

<sup>95</sup> According to Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition, the reading here of N 022, “cannot be determined with absolute certainty,” but they think there is “a high degree of probability” that the reading is *autēs*. On the one hand, Cronin agrees with this assessment, since in his *Text of Codex N* (in Robinson’s *Texts and Studies*), he gives *autēs* as the reading. But on the other hand, Swanson disagrees with this assessment, since in his text of N 022, he gives *aute* as the reading.

text read i.e., *Variant 1* or *Variant 2*? If it was a “reconstruction” from a damaged Latin text, we cannot be sure what the meaning of the Latin text was meant to be i.e., *Variant 1* or *Variant 2*? We only know that it was changed from the original Greek “*autē*” (hereof).

With strong support from both the Greek and Latin, and no good textual argument against it, the TR’s reading stands sure. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 9:26 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 9:26, “*autē* (hereof),” is found (sometimes with different accents, which are added and so not part of the original text,) in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text type); and the Family 13 Manuscripts, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is further found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as the Gothic Version (4th century); the Georgian “B” Version (5th century); and Armenian Version (5th century); and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

*Variant 1*, “*autou* (his),” is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century), and a manuscript of the Coptic Bohairic Version; the Georgian “A” Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (6th century, Rome & Pell Platt).

*Variant 2*, “*autēs* (of her),” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century), (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text in the Gospels), 157 (12th century, independent); and the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is further found in the Syriac Palestinian Version (c. 6th century); Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and a manuscript of the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The split between the two major Alexandrian texts at Matt. 9:26 was considered by the NU Text Committee. For the wrong reasons they selected the correct reading. In their deliberations, they concluded that “*autē*” (hereof) was the correct reading because *e pheme* (the fame) *autē* (hereof), formed a “more difficult expression,” and so was “alleviated by scribes” making the reading into either *autou* (of him) (*Variant 1*) or *autēs* (of her) (*Variant 2*) (Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 25). The structure of the terminology in Matt. 9:26, “*e* (‘the,’ untranslated) *pheme* (‘fame’) *autē* (‘this’),” is comparable with the structure of the terminology in Matt. 13:54, “*e* (‘the,’ untranslated) *sophia* (‘wisdom’) *autē* (‘this’).” Both Matt.

9:26 and Matt. 13:54 have a singular nominative first declension feminine noun (*sophia* or *pheme*), followed by *aute* (this). Nobody suggests that the terminology, “*ε* (-) *pheme* (‘fame’) *aute* (‘this’)” in, “Whence hath this man this wisdom?” (Matt. 13:54) is difficult terminology, and there are no textual variants on it itemized in the textual apparatuses I have consulted. Why then should the terminology, “*ε* (-) *pheme* (‘fame’) *aute* (‘this’ / ‘hereof’)” in Matt. 9:26, “And the fame hereof went abroad” be deemed to be a “difficult expression”? I think it is an expression posing no obvious textual difficulties within the parameters of Matthean Greek.

Nevertheless, it is an interesting fact that these neo-Alexandrians on the NU Text Committee would form the view that Alexandrian scribes such as those who produced *Variant 2*, “*autēs* (of her),” found in *Rome Vaticanus*, would, like the Western Text scribes of D 05, producing *Variant 1*, “*autou* (his),” be prepared to have NT terminology “alleviated.” Though I do not consider there was any textual tension in the Received Text’s reading of Matt. 9:26 to be “alleviated,” I would agree with these neo-Alexandrians that the Alexandrian scribes were certainly prepared to make “stylistic improvements,” when it took their fancy to do so.

Thus for the wrong reasons, the NU Text *et al* followed the TR’s reading at Matt. 9:26, which is here also followed by *London Sinaiticus*. This followed in the neo-Alexandrian tradition of Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle’s 21st edition (1952), both of whom also made “*aute* (hereof)” the main text reading, with both providing a footnote alternative of *Variant 2*, “*autēs* (of her).” Hence for erroneous reasons, the correct reading was followed by the ASV as, “And the fame hereof” (ASV); and also by the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

**Matt. 9:27a** “him” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek reading, “*auto* (him),” in the words, “two blind men followed him (*auto*),” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, “*eum* (him),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported as Latin “*illum* (‘that [one],’ singular masculine accusative, demonstrative from *ille* i.e., ‘him’)” in old Latin h (5th century).

However, “him” (Greek, *auto*, Latin, *eum* / *illum*), is omitted in a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 126 (11th century). It is further omitted in old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), d (5th century), and the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century), which as a codex of the Vulgate, here shows an interesting variant that *might* reflect an earlier form in an old Latin Version which this Diatessaron has assimilated into its more general Latin Vulgate readings. It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore correct. The words, “*ekolouthesan* (followed) *auto* (him)” at Matt. 9:27a, clearly conforms to Matthean Greek elsewhere (Matt. 8:1; 19:2). The origins of the omission of “*auto*” are speculative. Certainly scribes sometimes omitted short words accidentally, though it is not always clear how they overlooked the word in question. E.g., at this same section of Manuscript

Washington (*Codex Freerianus*), we find that the scribe (or an earlier scribe in the line of manuscripts that he was copying from,) omitted “*ekeithen* (thence).” Was he thinking in his mind, “*paragonti* (when departed) *ekeithen* (thence),” and because he was running over it in his mind, wrongly thought he had already written it down? Did he then omit it because he was so focused on getting down the next words, “*tō* (-) *IY* (Jesus)?” Then realizing his error, did the scribe simply write “*ekeithen* (thence)” after the “*tō* (-) *IY* (Jesus),” thus preserving the text’s meaning? Did something similar happen with the omission of “*autō* (him)” in some manuscripts, but unlike the scribe of *Codex Freerianus* (or the earlier scribe of this manuscript line), did the scribe fail to detect his error, and so “*autō* (him)” was lost from the text in that manuscript line? Alternatively, was “*autō* (him),” simply lost in an undetected paper fade?

With solid support from the Greek and Latin, and no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, the TR’s reading is clearly correct. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 9:27a an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 9:27a, “him,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0250 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text in the Gospels), 565 (9th century, independent), and 1071 (12th century, independent).

It is further found in all extant Syriac Versions e.g., the Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century); as well as Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the incorrect reading, omitting “him,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); and Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type).

With the two leading Alexandrian texts in disagreement, neo-Alexandrians have divided on whether or not “*autō* (him),” should be in the text at Matt. 9:27a. It is included in the main text of Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72), but it omitted from the main text of Nestle’s 21st edition (1952), which refers to it in a footnote. Westcott-Hort omitted it, though gave it as a footnote alternative. The NU Text Committee of e.g., Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993), sought to steer a middle road between these two opinions by including “*autō*” in the main text, but enclosing it in square brackets, thus making its inclusion or omission an equal option.

The option to include this word at Matt. 9:27a, was followed by the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. However its inclusion in these translations, being based on such an unstable and indecisive neo-Alexandrian textual base means we cannot be sure as to whether or not future editions of the NASB and NIV might decide to follow the alternative NU Text option, and omit “him” here. Certainly the option to omit “him” was followed by both the New English Bible (1961-70), and its successor, the Revised English Bible (1989).

**Matt. 9:27b** “[Thou] Son of David, have mercy upon us” (TR & AV) {A}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

In Latin, the declension for the vocative which is used for address, is the same as the nominative declension, except in the case of a second declension masculine singular. In such instances, either noun’s or adjective’s “-us” suffix becomes “-e;” or nouns with an “-ius” suffix e.g., *filius* (son), *infra*, and the adjective, *meus* (my), have an “i” suffix when in the singular i.e., “*mi* (my) *fili* (son).” A well known example of this is found in Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar*, where Caesar says to Brutus, “*Et* (Also) *tu* (thou), *Brute!* (O Brutus!)” (Act 3, Scene 1, Line 77). “*Brute*” here is in the vocative singular, whereas “*Brutus*” would be a nominative singular noun.

However, in the relevant passage here at Matt. 9:27, while “*filius*” is a second declension masculine noun with an “-ius” suffix, it is declined as a genitive singular, i.e., “*fili* (Son of) *David* (David).” Therefore the Latin does not help in resolving the primary textual issue here presented in the Greek. Hence no reference is made to the Latin, *infra*.

*Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 9:27b, the TR’s Greek, “*Yie* (‘Son,’ masculine singular vocative, second declension noun),” is from Greek *uios* declined in the vocative, which is used for address. This makes “Son” a word of address i.e., “[Thou] Son of David, have mercy upon us” (AV). This reading is supported by about half of the Byzantine texts, e.g., Codices E 07 (8th century), F 09 (9th century), S 028 (10th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine outside of Mark), 2 (12th century), 579 (13th century, Byzantine outside of Mark & Luke); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century). This basic usage of the vocative, “*Yie* (Son),” is also found in N 022 (6th century) (see *Variant 2, infra*); as well as Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) (see *Variant 3, infra*). The TR’s reading is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

An alternative Greek reading, “*Yios* (‘Son,’ masculine singular nominative, second declension noun),” (*Variant 1*), is from Greek *uios* declined in the nominative, which is used for a subject in a sentence. This makes “Son” part of the description, not a term of address i.e., “Have mercy on us, [thou] son of David.” This reading is supported by about half of the Byzantine texts, e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), G 011 (8th century, abbreviating “*Dabid*” to “*Dad*”), U 030 (9th century), and Pi 041 (9th century, abbreviating “*Dabid*” to “*Dad*”). It is also followed by the early mediaeval church writer Pseudo-Athanasius (6th century) whose writings are preserved in Greek and / or Latin works; and the early mediaeval church Greek writer John of Damascus (d. before 754).

Another reading, using the vocative, Greek, “*Kurie* (O Lord) *Yie* (Son)” (*Variant 2*), i.e., “O Lord, [thou] Son of David,” is a minority Byzantine reading. It is found in N 022 (6th century).

Another reading, which uses the vocative for “Son” but adds “Jesus,” i.e., “*Iesou* (Jesus) *Yie* (Son) *Dad* (abbreviation of *Dabid* / *Dauid* meaning ‘David’)” (*Variant 3*) i.e., “Jesus, [thou] Son of David,” is a minority Byzantine reading. It is found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century).

Since these men are said to have “followed him, crying” (Matt. 9:27), the vocative in

which Christ is then specifically addressed as “*Yie* (Son),” is surely more expected, since they clearly know of Christ’s presence, seen in the fact that they “followed him” (cf. *Yie* in Matt. 8:29; Mark 5:7; Luke 8:28; Acts 13:10; Heb. 12:5; or, *Kurie, Yie* i.e., ‘O Lord, thou son,’ in Matt. 15:22). This *prima facie* makes the vocative expected and so the more probable reading. It is then also followed by a vocative usage of Lord in Matt. 9:28, “*Nai* (yea), *Kurie* (‘Lord,’ vocative from *Kurios*).” This conclusion is confirmed by stylistic analysis of similar situations, recorded not only in Matthean Greek, but more widely, in Marcan and Lucan Greek.

In St. Matthew’s Gospel, we read in Matt. 20:30 of “two blind men sitting by the way side,” who “when they heard that Jesus passed by, cried out, saying, Have mercy on us, O Lord (*Kurie*, vocative), thou son of David.” In St. Luke’s Gospel we also find a similar situation where a “blind man” is “told” “that Jesus” “passeth by.” “And he cried, saying, Jesus, thou son (*uie*, vocative) of David, have mercy on me. And they which went before rebuked him, that he should hold his peace: but he cried so much the more, Thou Son (*Yie*, vocative) of David, have mercy on me” (Luke 18:35-39). As in Matt. 9:28, this is then followed by vocative usage of Lord in Luke 18:41, “Lord (*Kurie*).”

A *prima facie* exception to this style is found in Mark 10:46-52. Here, in recounting an element of the same drama as Matt. 20:30-34 and Luke 18:35-43, in the Mark 10:46-52 account, “when” “blind Bartimaeus” “heard that it was Jesus of Nazareth” who “came to Jericho,” “he began to cry out, and say, “Jesus (*Iesou*, genitive), son (*uios*, nominative)<sup>96</sup> of David, have mercy on me. And many charged him that he should hold his peace: but he cried the more a great deal, Thou son (*Yie*, vocative) of David, have mercy on me.” As in Matt. 9:28; Luke 18:41, at Mark 10:51 he later addresses Christ as “Lord,” which here is Aramaic, “*Rabboni*,” and so indeclinable in Greek, but contextually in the vocative. However, bearing in mind that in Mark 10:46 blind Bartimaeus simply knows of Jesus general presence, the absence of the vocative is natural and expected, since he is calling out blindly (quite literally), waiting and hoping that Jesu<sup>97</sup> will pass by. But when from the peoples’ reaction to silence him he realizes that Christ is near enough to hear him, he then moves to the vocative. Hence in time Mark 10:47 most probably came before Matt. 20:30 and Luke 18:38. (Though as to which came first, Matt. 20:30 or Luke 18:38; I leave the reader to ponder.) Thus by contrast, in Matt. 9:27 “the two blind men” clearly knew Jesus could hear them since they “followed him,” and so the vocative, “Thou son (*uie*),” is expected; in Matt. 20:30 the “two blind men” specifically “heard that Jesus passed by,” and so the vocative “Lord (*Kurie*)” is expected; and in Luke 18:35-39 the people specifically “told” the blind man, “that Jesus of Nazareth passeth by,” and so the vocative “Thou son (*uie*)” is expected (twice).

Thus the *prima facie* exception of Mark 10:47, actually goes to prove the rule that the vocative is expected, and the nuance of the Greek in Mark 10:47 tells us that Bartimaeus was first calling out blindly, but then when he learnt Jesu was near, very specifically changed to the vocative so as to address him. This means, that a clear textual problem exists because half of the Byzantine manuscripts put “Son” in the nominative as, “*Yios*,” at Matt. 9:27b, and this textual

---

<sup>96</sup> Removing the AV’s “Thou” from this quote, which the AV places in italics as added. The Greek literally reads, “the (*o*) son (*uios*).”

<sup>97</sup> “Jesu” is a Latin form of “Jesus.” It is e.g., found in the *Gloria* near the end of *The Communion Service* in the *Anglican Book of Common Prayer* (1662).

problem so created can only be remedied by adopting the reading found in the other half of the Byzantine manuscripts that put “Son” in the vocative as, “*Yie*,” which is thus the correct reading.

The origins of the variants are in the realm of speculation. *Variant 1*, is the best supported of the three minority Byzantine readings, *supra*, and possibly arose as a scribal “reconstruction” after the loss of the epsilon (“e”) ending of *Yie* due to a paper fade at the end of a line, or on a line with a bit more space than usual till the next letter. If so, the scribe possibly did so with some superficial reference to the “*Yios (Son) Dabid (of David)*” in Mark 10:47.

But with regard to *Variants 2 and 3*, the fact that the Latin text reads, “O Son of (*fili*) David (*David*),” means the Latin supports the TR or *Variant 1* in not adding either “Lord” (*Variant 2*) or “Jesus” (*Variant 3*). *Variant 2* appears to be an assimilation with Matt. 15:22, 20:30,31, and *Variant 3* with Mark 10:47. However, unlike Mark 10:47 where “*Iesou*” (Jesus) comes after “*O (-) Yios (Son) Dabid (of David)*,” in the Matt. 9:27b *Variant 3*, “*Iesou* (Jesus),” comes before “*Yie (Son) Dad (David)*.” This indicates to me that the assimilation of *Variant 3* was quite probably, though not definitely, part of a “repair” work “reconstruction,” rather than a wilful changing of the text. There was possibly a space near the end of one line, followed by “*Yie (Son)*” at the beginning of the next line, and a scribe thought that a word had been lost due to a paper fade, when in fact this was not the case.

With regard to *Variants 2 and 3*, the fact that these assimilation both use the vocative for “Son (*Yie*),” means in a qualified way, they support the TR over *Variant 1* here. I.e., they both clearly support a vocative reading of “Son (*Yie*)” at Matt. 9:27b.

Whether *Variants 1, 2, and 3* were deliberate or accidental alterations is uncertain, though I think the latter more probable than the former. While we cannot be certain as to their origins, we can be certain that they are changes to the original text which is preserved for us in the Received Text. With the Latin not being relevant to the primary textual issue; and the *Textus Receptus* supported on the key issue of the vocative “Son (*Yie*)” by *Variants 2 & 3*; and supported outright by the ancient church doctor, St. John Chrysostom, as well as being supported by textual analysis of a Byzantine text fairly evenly divided between the TR’s reading and *Variant 1*; the TR’s reading is clearly on rock solid ground.

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 9:27b an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 9:27b, “*Yie (Son)*,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); and a later corrector of (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0250 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 157 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text type); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine

elsewhere), *et al.*

*Variant 1*, “*Yios* (Son),” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), and 1071 (12th century, independent).

*Variant 2*, “*Kurie* (O Lord) *Yie* (Son),” is followed by a later “corrector” of Minuscule 892; and the Family 13 Manuscripts, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.*

*Variant 3*, “*Iesou* (Jesus) *Yie* (Son),” is followed in the original reading of (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century)<sup>98</sup>.

*Variants 2* and *3* are not seriously entertained by neo-Byzantine supporters of the Received Text, nor Byzantine supporters of the Majority Text, nor neo-Alexandrian supporters of the NU Text. Thus e.g., neither of these variants are mentioned in either Robinson and Pierpont’s *Byzantine / Majority Textform* Greek NT (1991), nor the textual apparatus of Tischendorf’s 8th edition. For the neo-Alexandrians, the focus is on the split between the two major Alexandrian texts, one of which follows the TR, the other of which follows *Variant 1*. Westcott-Hort (1881) placed the correct reading of the TR, “*Yie*,” which is followed by London Sinaiticus, in their main text; and the incorrect reading of *Variant 1*, “*Yios*,” which is followed by Rome Vaticanus as a footnote.

Like Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle’s 21st edition (1952), the NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993), adopted the *Variant 1* of *Rome Vaticanus*. The erroneous *Variant 1* is found at Matt. 9:27 in the ASV as, “Have mercy on us, thou son of David.” It is likewise found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. Nevertheless, the combination of one Alexandrian text, London Sinaiticus, coupled with the leading Alexandrian Text, D 05, appears to have been too strong an inducement for Moffatt to ignore, who on this occasion, for the wrong reasons, adopted the right reading, “Son of David, have pity on us!” (Moffatt Bible).

However, Moffatt’s unfortunate usage of “pity” rather than “mercy (*eleeson*)” indicates his failure to understand in this cry, an object lesson for Christ’s spiritual healing that comes from his mercy, sometimes remembered in a hymn sung in Anglican Churches, “Kyrie eleison.” This is a middle ages Latinized form of the Greek “*Kurie eleeson*,” meaning, “Lord, have mercy.” This threefold petition is found in an English form in the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), as “Lord, have mercy upon us” (addressing God the Father), “Christ, have mercy upon us” (addressing God the Son), “Lord have mercy upon us” (addressing God the Holy Ghost). Alas, Moffatt’s lack of spiritual insight has crippled his translation at Matt. 9:27, even though he selected the right Greek reading. Let us than God for our Authorized Versions, which not only

---

<sup>98</sup> Swanson distinguishes between this original reading of C 04, and its later change by a corrector to the TR’s reading; Tischendorf refers to the change of C 04, though not its original reading; Nestle-Aland says C 04 has “*Yie*,” without mentioning the original addition of “*Iesou*.”

use the correct NT Greek Text, but which in both OT and NT were translated by godly men of spiritual insight and understanding.

**Matt. 9:34** “But the Pharisees said,  
He casteth out devils through the prince of devils” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s entire verse 34, Greek, “*oi* (the) *de* (But) *Pharisaioi* (Pharisees) *elegon* (‘said,’ literally, ‘they said’), *En* (through / by) *to* (the) *archonti* (prince) *ton* (of the) *daimonion* (devils) *ekballei* (he casteth out) *ta* (the) *daimonia* (devils)” (AV), i.e., “But the Pharisees said, He casteth out devils through the prince of devils,” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, “*Pharisaei* (the Pharisees) *autem* (but) *dicebant* (‘said,’ literally, ‘they said’): *In* (By) *principe* (the prince) *daemoniorum* (of devils) *eicit* (he casteth out) *daemones* (devils),” i.e., “But the Pharisees said, He casteth out devils by the prince of devils,” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century); and with some minor variations among the manuscripts by old Latin Versions f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, the Vulgate’s reading is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); and the ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430).

Moreover, (as an assimilation to Matt. 12:24; Luke 11:15,) with the addition of “Beelzebub” before “the prince of the devils,” it is also found in old Latin Versions b (5th century, Latin “*Belzebul*”), h (5th century, Latin “*Belzebul*”), g1 (8th / 9th century, Latin “*Beelzebub*”), g2 (10th century, Latin “*Beelzebub*”); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). As a Latin Vulgate codex, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron here shows an interesting variant that *might* reflect an earlier form in an old Latin Version which this Diatessaron has assimilated to its more general Latin Vulgate readings; although it is also possible that this is a direct assimilation from Matt. 12:24; Luke 11:15 as a consequence of Diatessaron formatting

However, the word “*En* (through)” is omitted in a minority Byzantine reading (*Variant 1*), found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53). Moreover, the entire verse is omitted (*Variant 2*) in old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), and d (5th century). The *Variant 2* omission is also followed by the ancient church Latin writers, Juvencus (d. 4th century) and Hilary (d. 367).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore correct. Were it absent, as in *Variant 2*, this would present a contextual problem, since the words of the next chapter would then seem to be said in a void, “If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?” (Matt. 10:25).

The origins of *Variants 1 & 2* are in the realm of conjecture. *Variant 1* which omits “through (*en*),” appears to have been an accidental omission, possibly brought about by ellipsis between the “n” (nu) endings of “*elagon* (they said)” and “*en* (through);” or possibly the result of a typical paper fade.

Manuscript Washington (W 032) helps us to better understand how *Variant 2* might have been omitted by accident. In W 032, Matt. 9:33 ends the line with *ICPAHL* (Israel). The second last letter, “H” (Ϸ), eta, has two dark lines on each side, but the connecting line in the middle is quite light. This is then followed by the “L,” lambda, which in Greek looks like a triangle, with no bottom bar on the triangle, with a slight protrusion from the right bar of the triangle at the top i.e., “Λ”. Then two lines down, we find Matt. 9:34 ends the line with *DAIMONIA* (devils). Here, the final “A” looks like a lambda (Λ), i.e., like the English “A” but with a slight protrusion from the right bar of the “A” at the top (something like, but not as extended as the modern lower case lambda i.e., λ); but the cross-bar in the “A” is poorly formed, joining with the bottom left of the A, with only a small space gap above it. From this, it is not difficult to see how a scribe who made either the same type of poorly formed “A,” or possibly an even more poorly formed “A,” could write a letter that at a quick glance looked like a lambda (Λ). In W 032, the end of the line for Matt. 9:34 is about 2-3 letters to the left of the end of the line ending Matt. 9:33; however, if one adds in the missing two letters of “en” that are absent from W 032, then in such a continuous script, the end of these two lines ending Matt. 9:33 and Matt. 9:34, would be about parallel where they terminated. Therefore, a scribe copying out a similar manuscript, may have first written down the “HA” (i.e., “el”) ending of “*ICPAHL* (Israel)” in Matt. 8:33, and then had a break, either leaving a marker at the place he was up to, or just remembering the approximate place he was up to. If upon returning, e.g., the marker had slidden down slightly, or he was slightly out in his recollection of where the end of the line was that he was up to; then on a quick glance at the line ending with a heavy right-hand side line of the “H” and the “Λ” of “*ICPAHL* (Israel),” and a quick glance at the “T” of “*DAIMONIA*” followed by a poorly formed “A” of “*DAIMONIA*” that might *prima facie* look like a lambda (Λ) i.e., something like “*DAIMONIA*”; he may have thought he had written the “IA” of “*DAIMONIA*,” and then rapidly proceeded to write down “KAI (And)” etc. of Matt. 10:35.

In the final analysis, we cannot be sure as to the origins of these variants. We only know for sure that the original reading of the TR was evidently changed in *Variants 1* and *2*. The TR’s text has good support from the Greek and Latin, including the support of three notable church doctors, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine. There is no good textual argument against it, and indeed, were Matt. 9:34 omitted, it would create a tension with Matt. 10:25. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 9:34 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 9:34, “But the Pharisees said, He casteth out devils through the prince of devils,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century), (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (*c.* 6th century), and

Harclean h (616) Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; the Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century), Georgian Version (5th century), Ethiopic Version (c. 500), and Slavic Version (9th century).

*Variant 1*, which omits “*En* (through),” is also found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century)<sup>99</sup>.

*Variant 2*, which omits this entire verse, is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also not found in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); although since the Arabic Diatessaron does not include all verses from the Gospels in its “harmony” of the Gospels, we cannot be sure what to make of this.

The NU Text Committee considered, “It is difficult to decide whether this verse should be included in the text or placed in the apparatus” as a footnote. They thought it might be “an intrusion here from [Matt.] 12:24 or from Lk 11:15;” even though they finally decided to include it, in part because “it seems to be needed to prepare the reader for [Matt.] 10:25;” and in part because of “the preponderant weight of witnesses which include the verse” (Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1971, pp. 25-6). The fact that the NU Text Committee found it so “difficult,” is a sad commentary on how strongly they follow their invalid presupposition that the shorter reading is to be preferred over the longer reading, *on the basis of the circular reasoning* that scribes are more likely to add (conflate) a reading, than prune (omit) a reading. Of course, this also posits a much higher level of wilful change than is always warranted, since deletions can also occur more frequently due to inadvertence, in a way that additions generally cannot.

The fact that the NU Text Committee found it “difficult to decide” which reading to follow here, i.e., whether to include verse 34 (TR) or to omit it (*Variant 2*), means that we cannot be confident as to whether or not future editions of the NU Text will, or will not, include this verse. But at least for the moment, Matt. 9:34 is in the NU Text. However, if the NU Text does omit this verse in the future, then future NU Text editions may also do likewise. Notably, Matt. 9:34 was placed in square brackets as optional by Westcott-Hort (1881).

This verse was nevertheless included by the ASV translators, as, “But the Pharisees said, By the prince of the demons casteth he out demons” (ASV). Matt. 9:34 was also included in the NASB, RSV, ESV and NIV, without qualification. It is included in the NRSV, which nevertheless casts unwarranted doubt over this verse, saying in a Matt. 9:34, footnote, “Other ancient authorities lack this verse” (NRSV ftn). Both the NEB and its revision, the REB, remove this verse from the main text, but refer to it in a footnote reading. On this occasion, seemingly swayed in his views by the Western Text, Moffatt’s Bible lacks this verse, claiming in

---

<sup>99</sup> Swanson and Tischendorf mention this, but Nestle-Aland and UBS simply include London Sinaiticus in the list of those supporting the inclusion of verse 34.

a footnote it “is to be omitted, as a later insertion from 12:24 or Mark 3:2.”

**Matt. 9:35** “among the people” (TR & AV) {B}

The TR’s Greek reading, “*en* (among) *to* (the) *la* (people),” is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Codices E 07 (*Codex Basilensis*, 8th century), F 09 (*Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae*, 9th century), X 033 (*Codex Monacensis*, 10th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). It is further supported as Latin, “*in* (among) *populo* (the people),” in old Latin Version c (12th / 13th century); and also found in some Latin Vulgate Manuscripts with independent readings. These key words are also supported by old Latin Version g1 (8th / 9th century) (see *Variant 3, infra*). From the Greek and Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Greek *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of e.g., Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633).

However, these words are omitted in a minority Byzantine reading (*Variant 1*) e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). They are further omitted in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), d (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, this omission is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). They are also not present in a quote by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); although arguably he was simply selecting only a part of this verse to quote<sup>100</sup>.

Another reading, Greek, “*kai* (and) *polloi* (many) *ekolouthesan* (followed) *auto* (him)” (*Variant 2*), is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 262 (10th century). This reading is further followed as Latin, “*et* (and) *multi* (many) *secuti sunt* (they followed) *eum* (him),” in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), and h (5th century).

Another Latin reading (*Variant 3*), conflates the TR’s reading with *Variant 2* (and so gives some testimony to the presence of the words, “*in populo*”) i.e., Latin, “*in* (among) *populo* (the people) *et* (and) *multi* (many) *secuti sunt* (they followed) *eum* (him).” It is found in old Latin g1 (8th / 9th century).

The Greek terminology, “*en* (among) *to* (the) *la* (people),” undoubtedly accords with Matthean Greek (Matt. 4:23; 26:5). There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is thus correct.

The origins of these variants are speculative. Including the word before and after “among the people,” the reading of the *Textus Receptus* (TR) is Greek, “*malakian* (disease) *en* (among) *to* (the) *la* (people) *idon* (seeing, verse 36).” A scribe may have written “*malakian* (disease),” and remembering in his head, “I’m up to the “*ian*” (of *malakian*) and *ao* (of *la*).”

---

<sup>100</sup> This point is lost on the neo-Alexandrian commentary of Chrysostom’s Homily 32:3 on Matthew, in Schaff, P., (Editor), *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, [first series,] *op. cit.*, Vol. 10, p. 212 (English translation).

Returning later, and working back, looking for “*ian*” and “*ao*” as he moved from the right hand side of the line backwards he saw “*idon*.” The delta of *idon* (which looks like a triangle, “Δ”) is similar to a poorly formed alpha (“Α”). Thinking with great rapidity, his mind may have become befuddled between the alpha and delta, and taking the *idon* to be the letters he had remembered, he may then have written down “ΙΔΩΝ (*idon*)” and kept going. Thus may have arisen *Variant 1*.

Alternatively, *Variant 1* may have been a paper fade. Whether *Variant 1* arose from one of these two possibilities, or for another reason, God has protected the correct reading for us in the representative Byzantine Text.

*Variant 2* appears to have been an assimilation from the type of wording found at Matt. 12:15; 19:2.

Any reading from any time up to the 16th century in either the Greek Byzantine tradition or Western Latin tradition, or ancient church writer from before *c.* 500 A.D., or mediaeval church writers after *c.* 500 A.D and if so, with an emphasis on early medieval church writers till about the mid 8th century, is inside the closed class of sources. Therefore, one may follow a Greek or Latin reading that only has known textual support from a later period e.g., the 8th or 9th century. However, as a general, though not absolute rule, one seeks to show support for a reading from ancient times, and accessibility over the centuries between *c.* 500 and 1599 A.D. . If a reading is the representative Byzantine Text, it necessarily had accessibility over the ages in this second category i.e., between *c.* 500 and 1599 A.D; though one still looks for any support it had in ancient times. Generally, this is possible. But the ideal is not always attainable, since not all readings were sufficiently well quoted in ancient times to achieve this desired object. If a reading is the representative Byzantine reading, and there is no good textual argument against it, then it is still to be taken as the text preserved by God over the ages, notwithstanding the lack of any specific citation of it inside the closed class of sources during ancient times. Likewise, one can cite any Latin reading, either as support for the Byzantine Text, or if there is a textual problem in the representative Byzantine text, in order to alleviate this textual problem.

The text here is such a case in point. The earliest Greek texts come from the 8th and 9th centuries on, and the earliest Latin texts come from the 8th or 9th century on. Though the lateness of these Greek and Latin manuscripts does not affect our adoption of the reading, it does affect the rating we must give it i.e., the rating must be lower than it otherwise would be. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 9:35, a low level “B” (in the range of 66% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

#### *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 9:35, “among the people,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); together with Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text type). It is also found in the Armenian Version (5th century).

*Variant 1*, which omits the words, “among the people,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); and (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century). It is also omitted

in Minuscles 33 (9th century, mixed text in the Gospels), 565 (9th century, independent), 788 (11th century, independent text), 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels), 157 (12th century, independent), and 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere). It is also omitted in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Gothic Version (4th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

*Variant 2*, “and many followed him,” is basically followed in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century). However, in Ciasca’s Latin this changes “*secuti sunt*” (“they followed,” 3rd person plural indicative active perfect), *supra*, to “*sequebantur*” (“they were following,” 3rd person plural indicative active imperfect), although in English the translation would still be, “And (*et*) many (*multi*) followed (*sequebantur*) him (*eum*),” as in *Variant 2, supra* (not the more literal, “and many were following him”).

*Variant 3*, which conflates the TR’s reading with *Variant 2*, i.e., “among (*en*) the (*to*) people (*laō*) and (*kai*) many (*polloi*) followed (*ekolouthesan*) him (*auto*),” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); and the Family 13 Manuscripts, which contain Minuscles 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.*

*Variant 4*, is similar to *Variant 3*, but lacks the “many (*polloi*)” of *Variant 3*, and so reads, “among (*en*) the (*to*) people (*laō*) and (*kai*) they followed (*ekolouthesan*) him (*auto*).” It is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century)<sup>101</sup>.

With one of the main Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus, lacking further support for *Variant 4*, not even Tischendorf who often had a penchant for this text when it disagreed with Rome Vaticanus, was prepared to follow it in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72). Thus, with the other major Alexandrian text, Rome Vaticanus, having a wider support for *Variant 1*, the NU Text *et al* adopted *Variant 1* which omits the words, “among the people.” Hence this incorrect omission is found at Matt. 9:35 in the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

**Matt. 9:36** “fainted” (TR & AV) {C}

*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

---

<sup>101</sup> Swanson and Nestle-Aland mention this, but Tischendorf simply lists it as supporting *Variant 3*.

Old Latin Version d reads “*quia* (because) *erant* (they were) *fatigati* (‘weary,’ perfect passive participle, nominative plural, from *fatigo*).” The Latin word, “*fatigati*,” may mean “weary” or “fatigued.” This is like the minority Byzantine reading Greek word in the TR, “*eklelumenoi* (present passive participle, nominative plural, from *ekluo*),” which may mean “fainted” or “weary.” This is quite different to the Latin word “*vexati* (perfect passive participle, nominative plural, from *vexo*)” found in e.g., the Vulgate at Matt. 9:36, which may mean “troubled,” “disturb,” “distressed,” or “vexed.” This is like the representative Byzantine text Greek word, “*eskulmenoi* (perfect passive participle, nominative plural),” from *skullo*, meaning to “flay” or “skin,” and hence may mean “harassed,” or “troubled,” or “distressed.”

Therefore it seems reasonable to conclude that old Latin Version d is supporting the reading of the Received Text, albeit giving the Greek “*eklelumenoi*” from *ekluo*, the meaning of “weary,” rather than the meaning of “fainted,” with Latin “*fatigati*.” The AV’s “fainted” at Matt. 9:36; Gal. 6:9, captures one element of *ekluo*; and the NKJV’s “were weary” at Matt. 9:36, or the NASB’s “grow weary” at Gal. 6:9, captures another element of *ekluo*. None of these translations are wrong, because there are different shades of meaning in certain Greek words such as *ekluo*, and they cannot always be perfectly captured in one English translation. It is clear that old Latin d takes the same element of *ekluo* at Matt. 9:36, that the NKJV does at Matt. 9:36 or the NASB does at Gal. 6:9.

Hence it is clear that old Latin d supports the reading of the *Textus Receptus*. I thus disagree with the textual apparatuses of Tischendorf *et al*, which fail to show old Latin d supporting the TR’s reading.

#### *Principal Textual Discussion.*

At Matt. 9:36, the TR’s Greek reading, “*eklelumenoi* (‘fainted’ or ‘were weary’),” in the words, “because they fainted” (AV), is a minority Byzantine reading. It is supported by *Codex Mosquensis* (V 031, 9th century, Moscow, Russia) and Minuscule 1188 (11th / 12th century, St. Catherine’s Monastery, Sinai, Arabia). It is further supported as Latin, “*fatigati* (weary),” in *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis* (old Latin Version d, 5th century, Cambridge University, England, UK). It is manifested in the Greek New Testaments of e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633).

However an alternative, reading (*Variant 1*), Greek, “*eskulmenoi* (‘distressed’ or ‘harassed’),” thus making the reading, “they were distressed” or “they were harassed,” is followed in the majority Byzantine Text reading e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is also followed as Latin, “*vexati* (distressed),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century) k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Basil the Great (d. 379) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367) and Jerome (d. 420).

Another reading (*Variant 2*), omits the Greek words, “*eklelumenoi* (fainted) *kai* (and) *errimmenoi* (were scattered abroad),” i.e., reading simply, “because they were as sheep having no

shepherd.” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in N 022 (6th century).

However, the representative Byzantine reading, “*eskulmenoi* (distressed / harassed),” poses a serious textual problem. The Greek “*eskulmenoi*” is from *skullo*, meaning to “flay” or “skin.” In NT Greek, it is thus used *of man* with the sense of being “troubled.” E.g., “Why troublest (*skulleis*) thou the Master?” (Mark 5:35); “Lord, trouble (*skullou*) not thyself” (Luke 7:6); and “Trouble (*skulle*) not the Master” (Luke 8:49). Highlighting the meaning of *skullo* as “flay” or “skin,” the Greek *skulon* comes from *skullo*, and *skulon* means “stripped” i.e., as an animal hide, and so in a derivative sense refers to “booty” or “spoil.” Hence we read in Luke 11:22 of how a “stronger” man can “overcome” another, “and divideth his spoils (*skula*).”

The Greek *skulon* is used in the OT Greek Septuagint. E.g., in II Chron. 14:9-15 (LXX), we read, “And Asa cried unto the Lord” (vs. 11, LXX), “So the Lord smote the Ethiopians” (vs. 12, LXX). “And Asa and his people,” “took many spoils (*eskuleusan skula*, ‘they spoiled spoils’),” (vs. 13, LXX); “and they spoiled (*eskuleusan*) all their cities, for they had much spoil (*skula*)” (vs. 14, LXX). “And” “they took many sheep (*probata*) and camels (*kamelous*), and returned to Jerusalem” (cs. 15, LXX). Thus the “sheep” (*probata*) were “stripped” i.e., taken as “spoils” (*skula*); and there was clearly nothing wrong with this. So too, the children of Israel were told in Num. 31:27,28 (LXX), to “divide the spoils (*skula*),” e.g., “the sheep (*probaton*).” I.e., whereas there is an intrinsic problem with a good man being “troubled” (*skullo*, Mark 5:35; Luke 7:6; 8:49); there is no intrinsic tension in the proposition that a “sheep” be “stripped” or taken as “spoils” (*skula*, Num. 31:27,28, LXX; II Chron. 14:13-15, LXX).

That there is nothing intrinsically problematic about such animals being “stripped” or “skinned,” is also clear from the NT usage of “sheepskins (*melote*).” Hence in Heb. 11:37, we read of how OT saints (II Kgs 1:8 cf. Matt. 3:4) “wandered about in sheepskins (*melotais*) and goatskins (*aigeiois dermasin*).” Cf. “*endumasi* (clothing) *probaton* (of sheep)” i.e., “sheep’s clothing” in Matt. 7:15. That there is nothing intrinsically wrong with “sheep (*probata*)” being “distressed (*eskulmenoi*),” is also clear from e.g., the OT animal sacrifices e.g., the Passover Lamb (Exod. 12; Matt. 26:1,19). Hence saying that “sheep having no shepherd” will get “distressed” (*eskulmenoi*); is about as incongruous as saying, “sheep having no shepherd” will get “fleeced,” or get “butchered” for meat. The reality is, that “sheep having a shepherd” may by virtue of that very fact, get fleeced or butchered or “skinned” or “distressed” (*eskulmenoi*).

Therefore, when we read at Matt. 9:36, in the representative Byzantine Text, that Jesus “was moved with compassion, on them, because they were distressed (*eskulmenoi*),” being “as sheep (*probata*) having no shepherd,” the mixture of “distressed (*eskulmenoi*),” with a negative connotation when applied to “sheep (*probata*),” is a *non sequitur*. I.e., the proposition that one would be concerned that “sheep” are “skinned” or “flayed” or in some derivative sense, so “distressed (*eskulmenoi*),” or the notion that sheep so “distressed (*eskulmenoi*)” lacked a shepherd; when it would be their shepherd who would take them to the place where they were sold and “skinned” and so “distressed,” is a conclusion that does not sensibly follow from the fact that they are “sheep.” While it must be said that there would be contexts where a shepherd would be concerned that his sheep were distressed e.g., if a wolf was in the area and the sheep were agitated because they knew of the wolf’s presence, one would not describe their “distress” through *eskulmenoi* from *skullo*, but some other Greek word would be used e.g., *stenochoreo* which carries the idea of being *hemmed in* too closely e.g., St. Paul says, he was “not (*ou*) distressed (*stenochoroumenoi*)” (II Cor. 4:8).

Thus the representative Byzantine Text usage of “distressed (*eskulmenoi*)” with “sheep (*probata*)” at Matt. 9:36, creates a textual incongruity that clangs on the ears as bad NT Greek (and bad LXX Greek). The only way to remedy this textual stylistic turbulence, is to adopt the minority Byzantine reading, “*eklelumenoi* (fainted / were weary),” thus restoring textual stylistic tranquillity to the verse. Therefore, we cannot doubt that the TR’s reading is the correct one (since there is no good textual argument against the words found in both the TR’s reading and *Variant 1*, all of which are omitted in *Variant 2*).

The Greek “*eklelumenoi* (fainted / were weary)” is from *ekluo*. It is found in Mark 8:3; Gal. 5:9; Heb. 12:5. A contextual nexus between “wearied and faint (*ekluomenoi*)” is found in Heb. 12:3. It forms part of Matthean Greek, for we read in Matt. 15:32, that Christ had “compassion on the multitude,” because they had “nothing to eat,” “lest they faint (*ekluthosin*).” This is strikingly similar to the usage in Matt. 9:36 when Christ had “compassion” on “the multitudes,” “because they fainted (*eklelumenoi*);” since *ekluo* can be used for man or beast. This comparison with Matt. 15:32 thus shows the stylistic congruity of using “*eklelumenoi* (fainted)” at Matt. 9:36 in Matthean Greek. In John 6:21 Christ says, “Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you: for him hath God the Father sealed.” Thus the spiritual image in Matt. 9:36 may be men who have “fainted,” as in Matt. 15:32 for lack of food, but unlike Matt. 15:32 the food in Matt. 9:36 is spiritual food. But at the same time, the imagery is consistent with “sheep” who may also “faint” for lack of food, or other reasons, if they lack a shepherd e.g., their feet may get locked in a bog in softer ground near a watering hole or after rain.

The origins of *Variant 1* are conjectural. But if on a given line, the TR’s reading “...EKLELYMENOI...” (*eklelumenoi*, fainted) underwent a paper fade or loss of the second, third, and fourth letters (*KLE*), it would have looked to a scribe as “...E:::LUMENOI...”. Recognizing the loss of three letters, a scribe may have “reconstructed” these as the letters “CKY” to form “...ECKYLUMENOI...” (*eskulmenoi*, distressed); possibly with some reference to *skullo* at Mark 5:35; Luke 7:6; 8:49. Superficially, this may have seemed to the well intentioned scribe to have made sense of the passage. But he who said, “Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away” (Matt. 24:35), preserved the original reading in a slim line of manuscripts. Then when the great and godly textual scholars of the 16th and 17th centuries looked into the matter, humbly relying upon Almighty God they realized what had happened, and by the grace of God, they placed the correct reading into their formally compiled Received Text.

With respect to *Variant 2*, it is possible that a scribe was looking at a manuscript with the *Variant 1* error, that looked something like the following on the text of “... OTI (because) ESAN (they were) ECKYLUMENOI (distressed) KAI (and) EPPIMMENOI (scattered abroad) OCEI (as) ....”

.....OTIESANEC  
 KYELUMENOIKAIEPPIMMENOIQCE  
 I.....

The capital omega (O) of OCEI in the Greek found in e.g., Codex W 032, looks something like the English “W” (i.e., a larger form of the modern lower case omega, “ω” not to be confused with the modern upper case omega, “Ω”). Thus the end of the two lines would have looked

something like:

.....*ANEC*

.....*IWCE*

If the distance between the left hand side of the let bar on the omega and the middle bar, was smaller than usual, especially when compared to the distance from the middle bar to the right hand side, the omega would have looked more like an “N,” although it would still be clearly a “W” (ω / omega). It is possible that having written, “*OTI* (because) *ESAN* (they were),” the scribe, perhaps suffering from fatigue, momentarily got distracted, and in his mind befuddled the “*NEC*” ending of one line, with the “*WCE*” ending of the other, and started writing down, “*WCEP*” (as) etc. . Of course, we cannot be certain of the origins of *Variants 1* and *2*, we only know that these changes were evidently made.

On the one hand, the textual argument strongly favours the TR’s reading which is found in both the Greek and Latin textual traditions, and enjoys ancient support in the Latin textual tradition. But on the other hand, the TR’s reading is both a slim minority Greek reading and a slim minority Latin reading. Taking into account all these factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 9:36, a solid “C” (in the range of 60% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading, but has a lower level of certainty.

*Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.*

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 9:36, “fainted” or “were weary” (*eklelumenoi*) is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and Minuscule 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere).

The correct reading is also found in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), which in Ciasca’s Latin is, “*defatigati* (fatigued / tired).” This may be directly translated from the Arabic as, “were wearied” (Hogg).

*Variant 1*, “distressed” (*eskulmenoi*), is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts* (Swanson), which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 1 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee*), Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), and 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude); and the *Family 13 Manuscripts* (Swanson), which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 1 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee*) Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 13 (13th century, independent). The erroneous *Variant 1* was adopted by the NU Text *et al.*

*Variant 1* is the neo-Alexandrian translation followed in the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. The ASV reads “distressed” (ASV); and this was the neo-Alexandrian translation also followed in the NASB.

*Variant 1* is found at Matt. 9:36 in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899) Hodges

& Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). The textual apparatus of the Burgonite *New King James Version* says the NU Text and Majority Text read “harassed.”

At Matt. 9:36, translating from the Latin, *Variant I* was followed by the Roman Catholic *Rheims-Douay Version* (NT 1582 & OT 1609/10, which reads, “because they were distressed.”

Unlike the Roman Catholic neo-Alexandrians of the *Jerusalem Bible* and *New Jerusalem Bible*, who use a neo-Alexandrian paradigm to attack the Greek Received Text; the Roman Catholic Latins maintain the wonderful truth that God providentially preserved the NT text through reference to the Latin Text, but they misuse this truth so as to attack the Greek Received Text. The Greek Majority Text Burgonites such as Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont, revise Burgon’s majority text ideas so as to create a Greek manuscript priority i.e., they only use Greek manuscripts in their majority text count, and Robinson & Pierpont go further with a specifically Byzantine Greek priority. Thus these revisionist Burgonites maintain the wonderful truth that God providentially preserved the NT text through reference to the Byzantine Greek Text (even though they erroneously include a smaller percentage of non-Byzantine texts in their majority text count that does not alter the fact that they have both produced what in overview are majority Byzantine texts<sup>102</sup>), but they misuse this truth so as to attack the Greek Received Text. The neo-Alexandrians, whether Roman Catholics such as those who translated the JB, or apostate “Protestants” such as e.g., those involved in translating the *Revised Standard Version* (1st ed. 1946-52; 2nd ed. 1971), both preserve the wonderful truth that one must “study to shew thyself approved unto God” (II Tim. 2:15); but by their religiously liberal textual “science falsely so called” (I Tim. 6:20) that denies the doctrine of the Divine preservation of Scripture, they too set about to attack the Greek Received Text.

Here at Matt. 9:36, the Latin Papists; together with the original Burgonites who use all manuscripts, not just the Greek ones (Burgon & Miller; although in practice this is a sample of always less than 200 manuscripts, and sometimes much less than this), the Greek Priority Majority Text Burgonites (Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont); and also the religiously liberal neo-Alexandrians, all consort and conspire together against the Received Text. Yet none of them can see that “*eskulmenoi* (distressed / harassed)” (*Variant I*) poses a serious textual problem, and so cannot be correct! “They be blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch” (Matt. 15:14). But “he that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision” (Ps. 2:4), for “his truth endureth to all generations” (Ps. 100:5).

“Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish in the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little” (Ps. 2:12). Let us humbly “come, let us worship and bow down: let us kneel before the Lord our maker” (Ps. 95:6). Let us pray: “O holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity, three Persons and one God: have mercy upon us miserable sinners . . . . Remember not, Lord, our offences, nor the offences of our forefathers; neither take thou vengeance of our sins: spare us, good Lord, spare thy people, whom thou hast redeemed with thy most precious blood, and be not angry with

---

<sup>102</sup> Of about 1,000 manuscripts from von Soden’s K group used for Robinson & Pierpont’s majority text, more than 90% are Byzantine text; and of about 1,500 manuscripts from von Soden’s I and K groups used for Hodges & Farstad majority text, more than 85% are Byzantine text.

us forever. *Spare us, good Lord.* From all evil and mischief; from sin, from the crafts and assaults of the Devil; from thy wrath and from everlasting damnation, *Good Lord, deliver us.* From all blindness of heart; from pride, vainglory, and hypocrisy; ... *Good Lord, deliver us.* ... From all ... false doctrine, heresy, and schism; from hardness of heart, and contempt of thy Word ..., *Good Lord, deliver us*" (*The Litany, Anglican Book of Common Prayer, 1662*). Let us thank God that we have his truth in the *Textus Receptus*, translated for us in our King James Bibles!