

**Appendices to St. Matthew's Gospel
Matt. 1-14.**

Introduction.

Primary & Secondary Rules of Neo-Byzantine Textual Analysis.

Appendix 1: A Table of some instances where Scrivener's Text does not represent the properly composed Received Text.

Appendix 2: Minor variants between Scrivener's Text and the Majority Byzantine Text (MBT) (or another possible reading), including references to the neo-Alexandrian Text in those instances where the neo-Alexandrian Texts agree with the MBT in such an alternative reading to Scrivener's Text; where such alternative readings do not affect, or do not necessarily affect, the English translation, so we cannot be certain which reading the AV translators followed.

Appendix 3: Minor variants between the NU Text and Textus Receptus (or between Beza's Text of 1598 and the TR) not affecting, or not necessarily affecting, the English translation.

Introduction.

The Definite Article

a) *The Definite Article ("the") in
Matthew 4:21; 8:23; 9:1; 13:2; 14:22d.*

b) *The Definite Article and eleos.*

*The conjunctions, for instance, "de" (and) and "oti" (that).
Matthew 1-10 (in detail).*

End of Matt. 1-10 (in detail).

Matt. 11-14 (some more notable variants).

Appendix 4: Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E.

Appendix 5: Dedication Sermon for Revised Volume 1 (30 January 2010).

Appendix 6: Corrigenda to Former Volume.

Introduction.

In von Soden's K group upon which Robinson & Pierpont's Majority Text is based upon, there are 983 manuscripts, of which 949 or *c.* 96.5% are Byzantine and 914 or *c.* 93% are exclusively Byzantine. Thus only about 3.5% of these are of no interest for the purposes of composing the Received Text. Even if on a given reading the number were to go as low as *c.* 93%, this would only double the non-Byzantine text count to 7%, and more than a good *c.* 90% would still be Byzantine Text *i.e.*, all other text types would be below 7% of the total count. But

more generally, all other text types i.e., those with no Byzantine component at all, would be below 5% of the total. Thus *c.* 96.5% of the manuscripts in this K group are Byzantine (including the 3.5% that are Byzantine in part).

Since all other text types are well below five per cent of the total count, in practice the Majority Text equates the Byzantine Majority Text; and if the Byzantine Text is fairly evenly divided between two readings, it will likewise be fairly evenly divided in the Majority Text. Thus in practice, “Majority Text” and “Byzantine Text” are basically synonymous. References to the Majority Byzantine Text (MBT) are generally drawn from Robinson and Pierpont’s Majority Text based on von Soden’s K group of about 1,000 manuscripts which is more than 90% Byzantine text, although I also look at Hodges & Farstad’s majority text based on von Soden’s I and K groups of about 1,500 manuscripts which are more than 85% Byzantine text. In general terms these should yield the same textual result, other than where the text is fairly evenly divided between two readings, in which case these majority texts may or may not select the same reading. But in either instance they will select a reading that has significant support in the Byzantine textual tradition.

Thus while Robinson & Pierpont specifically refer to their majority text as “Byzantine Textform” whereas Hodges & Farstad do not, the reality is that both have in practice produced majority Byzantine Texts. Thus the distinction made between the Nestle-Aland 27th edition’s symbol of “R” for “Majority text, including the Byzantine Koine text” which is what one finds in Hodges & Farstad; and the UBS 4th revised edition symbol of “Byz” for “the majority of the Byzantine witnesses” which is what one finds in Robinson & Pierpont; though constituting an important point of ideological and theological demarcation (in which I concur with Robinson & Pierpont against Hodges & Farstad in favour of a Byzantine priority, albeit in my neo-Byzantine instance as a starting point, rather than like Robinson & Pierpont as a finishing point), is nevertheless *in practice* a distinction without merit in terms of what the majority text is. That is because the overwhelming majority of manuscripts are Byzantine text, and so whether they constitute over 85% of one’s manuscript count (Hodges & Farstad), or over 90% of one’s manuscript count (Robinson & Pierpont), the basic result will be the same; other than where the manuscripts are fairly evenly divided, in which instance the matter cannot be reasonably resolved on the basis of a text count. The two majority texts come close to constituting a standard (Matthew to Jude) von Soden based majority text in their main texts; but in addition to some minor stylistic differences, (e.g., a different usage of optional letters,) these two majority texts sometimes have a different view on whether minority splits within the manuscripts are more or less significant, and sometimes these two texts adopt different readings to each other when there is a major split in the manuscripts¹.

It should also be borne in mind that Scrivener’s Text contains punctuation, breathings, and capitalizations that are stylistic additions within the boundaries of legitimacy. Since the representative Byzantine Text passed through e.g., various uncial manuscripts in which the letters were all in capitals, and the words joined in continuous script, there is a sense in which *on this particular issue*, Robinson & Pierpont’s MBT (1991), which has no punctuations, no breathings,

¹ See my contrast and comparison of Robinson & Pierpont (2005) and Hodges & Farstad (1985) on Matt. 1-28 in Textual Commentary Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, “*Robinson & Pierpont’s (1991) new edition Byzantine Textform (2005).”

and is all in lower case Greek letters, is closer to the originals, such as we have them. However in Robinson & Pierpont's 2005 revised edition these have been added in. But Scrivener's punctuations, breathings, and capitalizations e.g., of proper nouns such as the first letter of "Jesus" at Matt. 4:12, "*Iesous* (Ἰησοῦς)," rather than the 1991 edition of Robinson and Pierpont's "*iēsous* (ἰησοῦς)," is certainly not wrong as such. Likewise, though Scrivener's capitalization of "Jesus" at Matt. 1:23, contrasts with the lower case "Jesus" of Robinson and Pierpont (1991), we can hardly argue the matter, since these are purely stylistic matters not affecting the text, and indeed it may be said that Scrivener's capitalization of "Jesus" at Matt. 1:23 is reminiscent of the old unicals that here read, "*IHCOYN*." Moreover, while I have selectively and occasionally included *some* such differences to highlight their presence (e.g., Matt. 2:17, *infra*), it should always be borne in mind that in either instance these are stylistic additions, and not part of the original text as reflected in Robinson and Pierpont's MBT (1991). Such stylistic additions now also form part of the revised Robinson & Pierpont MBT (2005), which in this sense now more resembles Hodges & Farstad's text (1985) which also has them.

Scrivener did not always properly construct the AV's Received Text or Textus Receptus (TR), although in general he did a very good and useful job for which we can be grateful. Where no difference exists, or no necessary difference exists in the English translation, between Scrivener's Text and a variant inside the closed class of three sources, the reading is placed in Appendix 1. However, this factor may potentially have consequence for Appendix 3 also, since what I call the "TR" in these appendices is usually Scrivener's Text; and possibly on some occasions may be wrong. If so I would not regard it as the true TR. I regard to the true TR to always be the representative Byzantine text, unless there is a clear and obvious textual problem with it that can be resolved by adopting another reading inside the closed class of sources. This generally equates Scrivener's Text.

With regard to optional letters, textual apparatuses I have used do not generally provide enough detail on such matters for me to pursue them further. The most fundamental textual apparatus used for majority Byzantine text work, that of von Soden, usually lacks such data. Or they may be like Tischendorf who at Matt. 5:47 combines such alternatives for "so" as "*out_o* (-*os*)," so one does not know which manuscripts use *out_o* and which use *out_{os}*. Though this defect cannot generally be remedied on presently available data, it is of no consequence to English translation.

Some may consider such minor changes, especially when not affecting, or not necessarily affecting, the English translation of the text, ought to be omitted in a textual commentary. Others may think they deserve greater treatment than I have here given them. It should be borne in mind, that even where the English translation of a Greek variant is the same, there may be differences in the shade of meaning of different Greek readings (see Matt. 1:18); and very occasionally I may refer to finer elements of the Greek (see Matt. 9:2a), though generally I leave these to a person's private study and commentaries. It should be understood that in such instances I support the Greek reading of the Received Text i.e., the von Soden based majority Byzantine text (Robinson & Pierpont whose basic text should equate that of Hodges & Farstad other than in such instances of a split text, in which instance they may or may not agree with each other), unless there is a clear and obvious textual problem with it, or a major split in the manuscripts requiring textual analysis to resolve. Those wishing to analyze these further, may be something less than fully satisfied with the relatively brief, and admittedly inadequate treatment, given to them in this Appendix; which only covers the first ten chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel

as a broad guide to these. For such persons, this Appendix is at best, a starting point. Like other textual commentaries, this one is a selection of different variants, albeit a more comprehensive selection than most, in which *I have sought to focus on those readings that affect English translation between the AV based on the TR, and NU Text translations*. Those who do not share this goal may in varying degrees be something less than fully satisfied with the fruits of my methodology. But I am also limited by constraints of time and space, and must taxonomically determine the *more important* matters. Even as they stand in these reduced terms, my textual commentaries are projected to be encyclopaedic in size, and I cannot reasonably extend them still further. As King Solomon said, “of making many books there is no end” (Eccl. 12:12).

It is also important to remember that in Matt. 5:18, Jesus looked to the smallest Greek letter, “iota (ι)” (in English, “i”) to symbolize the Hebrew “jod / yod (י)” (“y” sometimes transliterated from Hebrew into Greek as an “i” as in “*Iesous* / Jesus;” sometimes transliterated into English as an “i” as in “Isaiah” or a “j” as in “Jeremiah”) i.e., a “jot” (AV); and the smallest part of a single letter in any word i.e., “one tittle,” an example of which in English would e.g., be the cross on the letter “t,” so likewise for Greek the bar on the top of this same letter “τ,” so likewise for Hebrew the bar on the top left of teth (one of two Hebraic “t” letters) “ט.” Concerning these he said with respect to the Divine Preservation of Scripture, “Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law.” I.e., Jesus does not here teach that the Word of God cannot be corrupted, something he derivatively referred to with respect to the Samaritans and their corrupted Samaritan Pentateuch (John 4:21,22), for there are “many which corrupt the Word of God” (II Cor. 2:17). Rather, our Lord here teaches that the Received Text of Scripture cannot be lost.

E.g., at Matt. 7:5 the representative Byzantine Text’s word order was changed as a “stylistic improvement” in the two leading representatives of the Alexandrian Text (*infra*). While this does not affect the meaning or translation of the text; it nevertheless may manifest an attitude that a copyist has “the right” to make such “stylistic improvements,” and if so, this attitude, once established, can then be the thin edge of the wedge that leads to more and more “stylistic improvements” of the text, some of which do then change the meaning of the text. (This however is not always or necessarily the case, since e.g. a copyist might inadvertently miss a word, and then realizing his mistake decide he can insert it after the word he just wrote, without affecting the meaning, and so put it back in a different word order. In days when parchments were expensive, and ink rubbers did not exist, this may have seemed the best thing to do E.g., Matt. 12:44 shows both Alexandrian and Western scribes doing this as they first fumbled over the TR’s “*epistrepso*” / “I will return,” which they missed, and then added it back in later.) Jesus cautions us in Matt. 5:18 not to go down the track of deliberately and wilfully changing the text of Scripture, which is clearly what e.g., those Alexandrian scribes making “stylistic improvements” did on a number of occasions. If Eve did not first “touch” the apple, she would not have gone on to “eat of it” (Gen. 3:3). We must be careful not to condone so much as a deliberate and wilful “touch-up” of the text of Holy Scripture in the name of a “stylistic improvement,” but only ever seek, by the grace of God, to recognize what the original text of Scripture says.

On some occasions there is clear a discrepancy between the TR and Scrivener’s Text. Though Scrivener’s Text is the closest published Greek text I know of that we have to the Received Text, it may be fairly characterized as a Received Text with a relatively small number of modifications. Such discrepancies seem to indicate a lack of due care and diligence by

Scrivener in composing the “Received Text.” But as a package deal Scrivener’s Text is still a very useful, and we are fortunate that the Trinitarian Bible Society have in print.

Primary & Secondary Rules of Neo-Byzantine Textual Analysis.

The primary rules defining neo-Byzantine textual analysis and the Received Text, have been previously discussed at 1) *Textual Commentary Principles* b) *The Received Text (Latin, Textus Receptus)*, and 4) *Textual analysis only within the closed class of Providentially preserved sources; and only moving away from the representative Byzantine Text when required to do so for some good textual reason.* These are the defining qualities of neo-Byzantine textual analysis, as endorsed and supported by myself in this commentary.

However, there are also some secondary rules of neo-Byzantine textual analysis. *These apply only where there is no difference in the basic meaning of the text between two readings inside the closed class of sources.* In specific terms, this includes optional letters i.e., letters which may be added or left off; or diverse spellings where the MBT is not known.

The first matter is further discussed in Appendix 2, *infra*. There may be an optional nu (“n”) at the end of a word; or an optional sigma (“s”) at the end of a word, or an optional epsilon (“e”) at the beginning of a word. In general, neo-Byzantines do not appear to have formulated any hard and fast rules on optional letters, and so while my rule on this, *infra*, is within neo-Byzantine parameters, it is not the only possible position a neo-Byzantine may hold to. Thus while a given edition of a Greek text, such as that of Beza or Scrivener, must go one way or the other on this in their printing of the text, I think it would be too much to say that the spellings selected in this or that printing constitutes *the* definitive “Received Text.” Rather, I think one would have to say that on such matters, neo-Byzantine analysts of the Received Text allow diversity of opinion, there being no impact on the basic meaning of the text either way.

The second matter of diverse spellings is further discussed in Appendix 2, *infra*, with respect to a common example, namely, diverse spellings that appear to have arisen from abbreviations in certain manuscripts. E.g., in *Codex Freerianus* (Manuscript Washington, W 032), David is abbreviated to “*Dad*” (with a line across the top of these letters) at Matt. 12:23. A scribe working from such a manuscript when later seeking to spell this name out in greater detail, might spell it as, “*Dabid*” or “*Daueid*” or “*Dauid*.” In general, neo-Byzantines do not appear to have formulated any hard and fast rules on such diverse spellings, and so while my rule on this, *infra*, is within neo-Byzantine parameters, it is not the only possible position a neo-Byzantine may hold to. Thus once again, while a given edition of a neo-Byzantine Greek text must go one way or the other on this in their printing of the text, I think it would be too much to say that the spellings selected in this or that printing constitutes *the* definitive “Received Text.” Rather, once again, I think one would have to say that on such matters, neo-Byzantine analysts of the Received Text allow diversity of opinion, there being no impact on the basic meaning of the text either way.

The third matter involves the adoption of minority Byzantine readings that have the same meaning as the MBT as textual “trademarks.” I include under this the addition or subtraction of the definite article in some instances. A connected fourth matter (that I do not generally refer to in my textual analysis, and I shall not know discuss in detail,) revolves around altered word orders. I.e., where words come close together, and a deliberate or accidental scribal changed

word order does not affect meaning. Might a selection of a minority reading here be used as a textual “trademark”?

While recognizing that neo-Byzantines have historically allowed diversity of opinion on these matters, my own view, which 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantines clearly disagree with me on, is that the general primary rule should be applied i.e., the MBT is to be preferred unless there is *a good textual argument against it*. The practical effect of this, is that whether or not I specifically say so in a given instance in this commentary, I think the representative Byzantine text should apply in all such instances. With regard to the first two issues (optional letters and spelling of abbreviate proper nouns), it must be said that we do not generally know that the MBT is. Hence diversity must be tolerated. The resulting differences that occur between myself and some other neo-Byzantines are in my opinion thus of more consequence with respect to this third issue, than with respect to the first two issues.

Indeed, with respect to the first two issues I make one overriding qualification. That qualification is that the general rule which works so effectively for matters concerning the primary rules of textual analysis, and also with respect to the third matter in the secondary rules, namely that a fair sample of Byzantine texts (such as Stephanus’s) produces the same result as a majority text count in determining the representative Byzantine text, may not always work as effectively with these first two matters in the secondary rules. Thus it may not always be as easy to determine a representative Byzantine reading on these first two matters of optional letters and diverse spellings, generally, although not exclusively, of proper names. E.g., at Matt. 15:35,36, the majority Byzantine text of Robinson & Pierpont has the optional “n” at the end of three words, that the majority text of Hodges & Farstad does not. Neither have footnotes indicating any diversity in the text. Who is correct? We do not know since the common von Soden based text that both are using does not generally have this information. Thus they are making selections based on their own stylistic preferences, and these may be seen as something akin to modern day “textual trademarks” that help differentiate these two fairly similar majority texts. (And in this instance I do not object to such “textual trademarks” since we do not know what the MBT is here, and it does not affect translation.) Since the matter has no impact on meaning or translation, it is a diversity we can live with.

Hence e.g., at Matt. 14:25a in the main commentary, I simply follow Scrivener’s text in referring to the “TR’s, Greek, *‘apelthe ...’*.” While the optional “n” (nu) is absent in Scrivener and Hodges & Farstad, it is present in Robinson & Pierpont and W 032. In fact, we do not know what the MBT is here. But for these purposes of textual analysis, the issue simply does not matter. Thus I just follow Scrivener. Hence my general rule is that where the MBT is unknown on these first two issues, I simply follow Scrivener as the TR. Or if I am quoting the MBT, whatever Pierpont & Robinson, or Hodges & Farstad do is followed if (as usual) it is the same.

There is also one overriding qualification applying to all several matters. That is this, the internal selections from the selected Byzantine texts may reflect the usage of a textual “trademark” by a particular neo-Byzantine. I.e., “You know my text because at chapters so and so, and verses so and so, of this or that Book of the New Testament, the optional ‘n’ is used at the end of words, but the optional ‘s’ is not, and *vice versa* at such and such references. And I am the one who selected the one off minority Byzantine manuscript spelling of *autois* (then) rather than *autous* (them) at Matt. 14:14b, so if you see a text with that spelling you know that the guy got it from me, because it’s part of my trademark,” *infra*.

Whatever one may think of such back-room esoteric debates among neo-Byzantines and possible creation of rival trademarks among neo-Byzantines, *these are not the type of thing that we have generally troubled the minds of the people over*. But then again, putting a textual commentary like this into the public domain is not the type of thing that has been formerly done either. E.g., in the main commentary at Matt. 14:25b, I simply state in a bracketed comment, that Minuscule 28 has “*o Iēsous* [Jesus] placed slightly earlier in the sentence.” I do not stop to consider whether this different word order at Matt. 14:25 is e.g., due to an accidental scribal slip in which the scribe first jumped a couple of words, perhaps due to fatigue, wrote *o Iēsous*, and then realizing his mistake, put back in the missing words, “*pros (unto) autous (them)*.” Nor do I consider if this was a deliberate “stylistic improvement.” *I certainly do not generally raise the question, “Was this a deliberate alteration of word order as a scribal ‘trademark’?”* (Nor do I generally raise this difficult question in Alexandrian texts such as *Variant 3* of Matt. 14:27.) Of course, we do not know the answer to such questions anyway, and at best can only raise them as possibilities. The important thing for the point of textual analysis at Matt. 14:25, is that even though Minuscule 28 has the words “*o Iēsous* (Jesus)” placed two words earlier than the representative Byzantine text, it nevertheless still has them there.

Importantly, *these matters have no impact on the meaning of the text or translation*. But it also means that if I wish to stipulate that the representative Byzantine text spelling or word order is to always apply on the same principles it does in the primary rules, or if we do not usually have the MBT detail to know optional letters or spellings of proper nouns, so we simply follow Scrivener here; then fellow neo-Byzantines who do not agree with me can simply put this down as “Gavin McGrath’s trademark,” even though I think so following the MBT wherever one can on suchlike is far more than this.

My views here, which exercise an internal neo-Byzantine option in the secondary rules, to favour the usage of a Byzantine primary rule of textual analysis not always so applied in the secondary rules by other neo-Byzantines, may lead some to say, *The neo-Byzantine textual analyst, Gavin McGrath, is more Byzantine than the neo-Byzantines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries!* If necessary, that is a badge I am prepared to wear. As I have stated before, so I state again, that if a neo-Byzantine textual analyst does not agree with me on this matter, he is entitled to simply view this as “Gavin McGrath’s trademark,” even though I look upon it as much more than that. Moreover, I would question whether in fact one can say *all*, or simply *some* neo-Byzantines of the 16th and 17th centuries would disagree with me on such an esoteric matter.

Whatever one thinks of my views on these secondary rules, in the first instance, I am and I remain, by the grace of God, a neo-Byzantine. I adhere to all the primary rules of neo-Byzantine textual analysis, and I also accept that differences of opinion over what reading to follow under these secondary rules are *bona fide* scholastic differences amongst we neo-Byzantines. I thus still use and cite neo-Byzantine NT texts that have a different position on the application of these secondary rules than do I. (As those who disagree with me would say, “texts with a different trademark.”)

In the second instance, I reply that since there is no impact on translation, when 16th and 17th century Bible Protestant translators, whether those of the King James Version or another translation, looked at the reading of a representative Byzantine text, or a printed NT Text which

took a different view, we do not actually know which of the two readings they followed. In my opinion, it is likely that if asked, different translators of e.g., the Authorized (King James) Versions would probably have taken different positions on the resolution of such matters under these secondary rules, and some would probably have been non-committal. On the one hand, they might have regarded these matter as not being one of primary importance, and so not of principal concern to them; or on the other hand, they may have regarded these as simply matters of “different trademarks.” Once again, the fact that this type of neo-Byzantine textual commentary has not previously been put into the public domain for interested church ministers, interested college teachers or students, interested laymen, or others, acts to create a situation where matters are raised that historically were determined by small numbers of academically minded persons in general seclusion behind closed doors.

Nevertheless, such qualifications as tolerance to fellow neo-Byzantines who disagree with me aside, I resolve all such textual matters on the basis that the reading of representative Byzantine text is preferable and should be followed. Unless, that is, one can show a textual problem with the representative Byzantine reading e.g., a certain Greek word is always spelt a particular way by a particular writer, as it is in a given minority Byzantine reading, but this is different to the representative Byzantine reading whose spelling is uncharacteristic of this writer. Therefore it follows that if I were composing a NT Greek text, it would in some small matters *with no impact on basic meaning or translation*, be different to some other neo-Byzantine NT Greek texts. But this does not put me outside the neo-Byzantine fold, since those who disagree with me would see this as my application of the secondary rules, i.e., as “Gavin Basil McGrath’s trademark.” (Indeed, 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantines were known to sometimes disagree on such matters.) Such are the minor differences of perception among we neo-Byzantines who adhere to the same major textual perceptions. Such are realities of life! And if I be wrong on this or any other matter, I humbly beg God’s pardon through Christ my Lord.

Appendix 1

A Table of some instances where Scrivener’s Text does not represent the properly composed Received Text.

As seen by the following itemized instances, Scrivener’s Text is not, as it claims, the TR, although in general it is very close to the TR.

- Title: Scrivener reads “*Euaggelion* (The Gospel) *to* (-)
kata (according to) *Mathaion* (Matthew),” rather than
“*Euaggelion* (The Gospel) *kata* (according to)
Mathaion (Matthew)”.
- Matt. 1:6, Scrivener reads “*Solomontos* (Solomon),” not “*Solomona* (Solomon).”
- Matt. 2:23, 4:13, & 21:11, Scrivener reads “*Nazareth* (Nazareth),” not “*Nazaret* (Nazareth).”
- Matt. 5:11, Scrivener adds “*rema* (word)” to TR.
- Matt. 5:28, Scrivener reads “*autes* (of her)” not “*auten* (her).”
- Matt. 5:39a, Does Scrivener add “*de*” to TR (and *de* is then untranslated in AV)?

- Matt. 5:44, Scrivener reads “*tous misountas* (to them that hate)” not “*tois misousin* (to them which hate).”
- Matt. 7:4, Scrivener reads “*apo* (from)” for the TR’s “*ek* (‘out,’ in ‘the mote out of thine eye’).”
- Matt. 7:15, Does Scrivener add “*de*” to TR (and *de* is then untranslated in AV)?
- Matt. 9:4a, Scrivener reads “*idon* (seeing),” not “*eidōs* (knowing).”
- Matt. 9:17c, Scrivener reads, “*amphotera* (both),” not “*amphoterōi* (both).”
- Matt. 10:25c, Scrivener reads “*tous oikiakous* (they / them of household),” not “*tous oikeiakous* (they / them of household).”
- Matt. 10:28b, Scrivener reads “*apokteinontōn* (‘killing’ = ‘which kill’),” not “*apoktenontōn* (‘killing’ = ‘which kill’).”
- Matt. 10:36, Scrivener reads “*oi oikiakoi* (they / them of household),” not “*oi oikeiakoi* (they / them of household).”
- Matt. 11:8, Scrivener reads, “*basileon* (kings)” not “*basileion* (kings’).”
- Matt. 11:16a, Scrivener reads “*paidariois* (‘unto little children’ or ‘unto children’),” not “*paidiois* (‘unto children’).”
- Matt. 12:21, Scrivener reads, “*en* (in) *tō* (-) *onomati* (name),” not “*tō onomati* (in name).”
- Matt. 12:32a, Scrivener reads, “*os an* (whosoever),” not “*os ean* (whosoever).”
- Matt. 12:32b, Scrivener reads, “*en toutō tō aionī*” i.e., “in this world,” not “*en tō nun aionī*” i.e., “in this world.”
- Matt. 12:35b, Scrivener reads, “*ta* (-) *agatha* (good things),” not “*agatha* (good things).”
- Matt. 12:42 (twice), Scrivener reads “*Solomōntos* (Solomon),” not “*Solomōnos* (Solomon).”
- Matt. 13:27, Scrivener reads, “*ta* (-) *zizania* (tares),” not “*zizania* (tares).”
- Matt. 13:30, Scrivener reads, “*tō* (the) *kairō* (time),” not “*kairō* ([the] time).”
- Matt. 13:33, Scrivener reads, “*enekrupsen* (‘she hid’ = ‘hid’),” not “*ekrupsen* (‘she hid’ = ‘hid’).”
- Matt. 13:40, Scrivener reads, “*katakaietai* (burned),” not “*kaietai* (burned).”
- Matt. 14:14b, Scrivener reads, “*ep*’ (toward) *autous* (them),” not “*ep*’ (toward) *autois* (them).”

My own views on these matters are stated in the discussion at *Primary & Secondary Rules of Neo-Byzantine Textual Analysis, supra*. But conscious of the fact that this area of secondary rules on readings has no impact on English translation and is a matter of neo-Byzantine scholastic differences, I leave some of these matters where English translation is not affected for the reader to think through for himself, *infra* (e.g., optional letters, *infra*²). Recognizing that these matters of “back-room debates” and / or “tricks of the trade” with “rival trademarks” among we neo-Byzantine textual analysts, I do not wish to focus too much on them in this commentary. But I note that the day of textual “trademarks” is clearly not over, for we see some Hodges & Farstad “trademarks” at Matt. 10:25c,26,28, which were then followed by Robinson & Pierpont, *infra*.

² As a feature of this Revised Volume 1 (2010), I have decreased the scope and number of these relative to the original Volume 1 (2008).

On the one hand, I can accept that the first two types of secondary rule matters discussed above, i.e., optional letters and variant spellings after abbreviations have been used in texts, are matters where in general it may be impossible to presently determine the representative Byzantine text, and so some diversity may occur. Hence I would not object to some usage of various combinations of these as an overall “textual trademark.” Nevertheless, I think the type of system used by Scrivener, in which the optional letter is added before a vowel is a good stylistic way to deal with this problem, even if less occasionally, with a relatively low frequency (under 1%), in various places this was not done as part of a “textual trademark.” Likewise if e.g., “Dabid” is normatively used, if in a similar very low frequency of instances, probably best stylistically isolated e.g., to a book that only uses “David” once like II Tim. 2:8, “Dauid” was used.

But on the other hand, were I to deliberately select the third (e.g., see *autous / autois* at Matt. 14:14b), *supra* and *infra*, fourth (altered word order), *supra* and *infra*, *infra*, type of variants discussed above with regard to the secondary rule, i.e., concerning the third type of minor spelling differences in a minority reading (e.g., the minority Byzantine spelling using an eta / *ē* rather than an epsilon / *e* discussed at Matt. 14:19d in Appendix 3, *infra*); or the fourth type of variant (e.g., the minority Byzantine word order of Matt. 2:8 or Matt. 2:19 discussed in Appendix 3, *infra*,³); or the fifth type which is use of a definite article (Matt. 5:45 in Appendix 3, *infra*) in order to deliberately create “trademarks” in a NT Greek text, then my conscious would be troubled over the matter. I would think that I was deliberately sullyng the pure text of Holy Scripture. I simply could not do it.

But on the other hand, those great textual analysts of the 16th and 17th centuries would probably reply that I have a “weak” “conscience” (I Cor. 8:7). Though I do not think of myself in this way, I must nevertheless acknowledge that as regards textual analysis, the great textual analysts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are *very much* my betters. And so *perhaps* they are right and I am wrong? For I am like unto a chef, and they are like unto a Sydney University College Warden, Fellows (if present), and Tutors, who all sit at the High Table of St. Paul’s College Dining Hall, upon whom I as the chef gladly wait upon, and thank God for the privilege of doing so.

Nevertheless, under God, I must follow the dictates of my conscience, and I could not “stand before the judgement seat of Christ” (Rom. 14:10) with good conscience, if I had deliberately made such a “trademark” choice where I knew what the MBT was, and there was no clear and obvious textual problem with it. I also think it reasonable and fair to spend a little amount of time on this issue for the sake of interested readers, and also for transparency of my views. But I do so with admitted reluctance, and generally prefer to cast a veil over these matters of difference between we neo-Byzantine textual analysts, since these secondary rules *have no impact on basic meaning or translation*, and I do not want people to lose sight of the fact that it is our unity on the application of the primary rules that defines us, and on this more public and important side of neo-Byzantine textual analysis, it is a case of *united we stand*. I am also

³ I have highlighted the fact that some of these variant word orders can be found in either a minority Byzantine text or Latin text (though this changed Latin word order may be due to the act of translation, rather than replication of the changed word order in a Greek text), in, for instance, Matthew 3 to 4 of Appendix 2, *infra*, for the reader wishing to consider this further.

conscious of the fact that these type of things were not historically discussed in the public domain.

Thus though I would not do this type of thing very often, on this occasion I invite the interested reader to come with me in this latter section of Appendix 1, for a “special treat,” as we go from the “front room” beauties of the Received Text which is magnificent and public like the beautiful sandstone edifices of the Great Hall and other parts of the main quadrangle of Sydney University that people like to wander around and look at on e.g., a *Sydney University Open Day*, to a secluded university “back-room” that the general public does not usually visit. This is a “Cook’s tour.” If it does not appeal to a reader, he may wish to decline the invitation at this point, and simply look at other parts of this commentary. Either way, the humble servant says, “ENJOY yourself.”

AT MATT. 1:6 (once) and MATT. 12:42 (twice), the spelling, “*Solomontos* (Solomon)” found in Scrivener’s Text, is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., at Matt 1:6, W 032, Sigma 042, & Minuscule 1223, 10th century; & at Matt. 12:42, Minuscule 21, 12th century). It is earlier found at Matt. 1:6 in Stephanus (1550); and at Matt. 12:42 in Erasmus (1522) and Stephanus (1550). Another minority Byzantine spelling at Matt. 1:6 is, “*Solomona* (Lectionary 2378). But the MBT spelling at Matt. 1:6 (e.g., Lectionary 1968) is, “*Solomona* (Solomon);” and the MBT spelling at Matt. 12:42 (twice) (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042) is “*Solomonos* (Solomon).” Both of these MBT spelling enjoy the residual support of von Soden’s K group at Matt. 1:6 (‘*Solomona*,’ once) and Matt. 12:42 (‘*Solomonos*,’ twice), and must therefore be supported by at least c. 90% of Byzantine Text manuscripts; and Green’s Textual Apparatus (based on this data) says at least 95% of manuscripts (although as elsewhere, Pierpont here fails to factor in a sufficiently high error bar for von Soden’s generalist groups). The MBT spellings are found at Matt. 1:6 in Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and at Matt. 12:42 in Erasmus (1516).

The MBT readings have no good textual argument against them and are thus correct. The minority Byzantine reading at Matt. 12:42 is found in four out of five references by Origen, and the MBT reading is found in the remaining one Matt. 12:42 reference. Thus Origen was probably the originator of this spelling variant at Matt. 12:42.

The MBT spelling at Matt. 1:6 is found in six of the eight selections of Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum; P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ’s College, Cambridge, F. i. 8); although Elzevir (1633) follows the minority Byzantine spelling, “*Solomontos* (Solomon),” at Matt. 1:6. The MBT at Matt. 12:42 is found in four of the eight selections of Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) (Gospel manuscripts v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ’s College, Cambridge, F. i. 8), whereas the minority reading is found in only one of them (Gospel manuscript: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17).

Erasmus appears to have developed “*Solomontos* (Solomon),” as a textual “trademark” for Matt. 12:42 between the time of his 1516 and 1522 edition. Later this “bright idea” was “further developed” as “*Solomontos* (Solomon)” was adopted as a textual “trademark” for Matt. 1:6, evident in e.g., Stephanus (1550) and Elzevir (1633). The MBT spellings are found (thrice) at Matt. 1:6 (*Solomona*); 12:42 (*Solomonos*) in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899),

Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). At Matt. 1:6; 12:42, the Burgonites' Hodges & Farstad, consider these majority text spellings should replace the spellings found in e.g., Scrivener's Text, which they claim are the spellings of the "TR" or "Textus Receptus"⁴. But because there is no difference in English translation, in fact we cannot say for sure what the TR used by the AV translators was in these three instances. Thus Burgon & Miller were wiser at both Matt. 1:6 and Matt. 12:42 where they simply state their preference for the MBT reading, but do not state what they think the TR reads here⁵. But whatever it was, these majority texts have here discovered the true TR, found at Matt. 1:6 (once); 12:42 (twice) in the earlier Greek NT Text of Erasmus (1516). Let the text of Scrivener be amended accordingly!

AT MATT. 4:13, Scrivener's Text reads, "*Nazareth*." Robinson & Pierpont (2005) show "*Nazaret*" as the majority Byzantine text reading and give no alternative reading of "*Nazareth*;" whereas Hodges & Farstad's majority text gives "*Nazaret*" in the main text, but says part of the majority text follows this reading, and part of the majority text follows "*Nazareth*." Green's Textual Apparatus, which like both Robinson & Pierpont's and Hodges & Farstad's texts is (other than in Revelation,) based on von Soden (though deficient in that it fails to recognize an error bar of c. 10% must be factored in for von Soden's system which takes the general c. 90% plus manuscript readings, but which is nevertheless not a matter that affects the fundamental integrity of Green's Textual Apparatus as a *general* guide,) does not refer to this reading. Thus I must go to von Soden direct.

In his K group, Von Soden says at Matt. 4:13, that "*Nazaret*" is followed by all manuscripts other than those following the "*Nazareth*" reading, namely, those in his K1 group other than 661 (11th century, unclassified outside of von Soden's system), and one manuscript from his Ki group, E 07 (8th century, Byzantine). Von Soden's K1 group contains 37 known Byzantine manuscripts⁶, of which 2 are Byzantine only in part⁷, and 15 manuscripts unclassified

⁴ Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xviii, 1, & 39.

⁵ Burgon & Miller (1899), pp. 2 (Matt. 1:6) & 97 (Matt. 12:42).

⁶ Codices 0211 (7th century, von Soden's ε 49), V 031 (9th century, von Soden's ε 75), Omega 45 (9th century, von Soden's ε 61), S 028 (10th century, von Soden's ε 1027); Minuscules 461 (9th century, von Soden's ε 92), 399 (10th century von Soden's ε 94 other than Matthew which is Ia), 1077 (10th century, von Soden's ε 1139), 1172 (10th century, von Soden's ε 1036), 272 (11th century, von Soden's ε 1182), 277 (11th century, von Soden's ε 166), 476 (11th century, von Soden's ε 1126), 655 (11th / 12th century, von Soden's ε 177), 699 (11th century, von Soden's δ 104, K1 in the Gospels; K in Acts, Pauline Epistles, & Revelation), 711 (11th century, von Soden's ε 1179), 1006 (11th century, von Soden's ε 1156, Byzantine outside Revelation), 1045 (11th century, von Soden's ε 1151), 1470 (11th century, von Soden's ε 2014), 57 (12th century, von Soden's δ 255, K1 group in Gospels; Kc group in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 1123 (11th century, von Soden's ε 1152), 1514 (11th century, von Soden's ε 2026), 1556 (11th century, von Soden's ε 1134), 1672 (11th century, von Soden's ε 1149), 2172 (11th century, von Soden's ε 191), 2281 (11th century, von Soden's ε 158), 1191 (11th / 12th century, von Soden's ε 1099), 261 (12th century, von Soden's ε 282), 355 (12th century, von Soden's ε 235), 408 (12th century, von Soden's ε 231), 419 (12th century, von Soden's ε 232), 438 (12th century, von Soden's ε 241), 509 (12th century, von Soden's ε 258), 524 (12th century, von Soden's ε 265), 688 (12th century, von Soden's ε 246), 975 (12th century, von Soden's ε 3024), 2177 (12th

outside of von Soden's system⁸. (Due to some vagaries in von Soden's system, we are uncertain if 3 manuscripts are or are not in his K1 group⁹.) Of the 14 manuscripts unclassified outside of von Soden's system, we know from more general statistical analysis of von Soden's K group, (that as a broad-brush, though not a precise guide,) *c.* 96.5 % are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, *c.* 3.5% are Byzantine only in specific parts, and *c.* 3.5% are non-Byzantine. Applying these as projections to these 14 manuscripts, 13 of them are probably Byzantine, of which 1 may be Byzantine only in part. Though such statistical projections are at their most hazardous with small numbers like this, at this point in time, this is all we have to go on. Adding together the 37 known and 13 projected Byzantine manuscripts, means *c.* 50 manuscripts in the K1 group and 1 manuscript in the Ki group, i.e., *c.* 51 Byzantine manuscripts (of which *c.* 2 are Byzantine only in part) support the minority Byzantine reading, "Nazareth".

As discussed in the Preface of Commentary Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), in von Soden's K (Koine) group, there are 983 manuscripts, of which 949 are Byzantine i.e., 914 are exclusively Byzantine, 35 are Byzantine only in specific parts, and 34 are non-Byzantine. These *c.* 51 manuscripts in the wider 949 of K group, constitute *c.* 5.4%; or the *c.* 49 exclusively Byzantine manuscripts in the wider 914 exclusively Byzantine of the K group constitutes *c.* 5.4%. Thus in rounded numbers (and allowing an error margin of up to *c.* 10% within these figure because von Soden looks at general groups), we can say a number between just under 5% and just under 6% of Byzantine manuscripts follow the "Nazareth" reading, which for our generalist purposes we shall state as *c.* 5%; and thus *c.* 94-95% of Byzantine manuscripts, which for our generalist purposes we shall state as *c.* 95%, follow the "Nazaret" reading. (Though these type of figures partly based on projections are "rubbery," they are a useful *general* guide for our purposes.)

In more precise, though still "rubbery" terms, about 860 or *c.* 88% of these K group manuscripts cover the Gospels (see commentary at Matt. 9:5b). Therefore these 51 manuscripts constitute 5.9% of the Gospel manuscripts in K group. Thus in rounded numbers (and allowing

century, von Soden's ε 1296), 263 (13th century, von Soden's δ 372, Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles, K1 group in Byzantine Gospels, Ia3 group in Byzantine Acts & non-Byzantine Pauline Epistles), 1087 (13th century, von Soden's ε 2035), & 656 (13th / 14th century, von Soden's δ 463, K1 in the Gospels, Kr in the General Epistles).

⁷ Minuscules 1006 & 263.

⁸ Minuscules 163 (11th century, von Soden's ε 114, in both K1 group & I group), 345 (11th century, von Soden's ε 119, K1 group & I group), 661 (11th century, von Soden's ε 179), 933 (12th century, von Soden's ε 2004), 974 (12th century, von Soden's ε 2043), 1257 (12th century, von Soden's ε 1104), 1511 (12th century, von Soden's ε 2025), 1575 (12th century, von Soden's ε 1273), 382 (13th century, von Soden's ε 300) 972 (13th century, von Soden's ε 3022), 1372 (14th century, von Soden's ε 4004), 1410 (14th century, von Soden's ε 468, K1 od. Kak), 1440 (14th century, von Soden's ε 1456), 1580 (14th century, von Soden's ε 1432), 1587 (14th century, von Soden's ε 1434).

⁹ Is Byzantine Minuscule 690 (14th century, von Soden's ε 435) included in K1? What about two other minuscules, otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden's system, 927 (12th century, von Soden's δ 251; Is it K1 in the Gospels?, Is it Kak in the Gospels?; It is Ia2 in Acts & Pauline Epistles); & 1646 (12th century, von Soden's δ 267)?

an error margin of up to *c.* 10% within these figure because von Soden looks at general groups), we would say a number between just over 5% (*c.* 5.3%) and just under 6% of Byzantine manuscripts follow the “*Nazareth*” reading, which for our generalist purposes we shall state as *c.* 5.5%; and thus *c.* 94-95% of Byzantine manuscripts, which for our generalist purposes we shall state as *c.* 94%, follow the “*Nazaret*” reading. There is no great difference between these more general and more precise figures, and for our purposes the broad-brush picture is the same either way.

Thus at Matt. 4:13, (like e.g., Erasmus 1517 & 1522) Scrivener adopts a minority Byzantine reading followed by *c.* 5-6% of Byzantine manuscripts, “*Nazareth*,” whereas the MBT reading is “*Nazaret*.” More generally in St. Matthew’s Gospel, we find “*Nazaret*” is the MBT reading at Matt. 2:23 and 21:11, and there being no good textual argument against these, they are thus correct. “*Nazareth*” thus looks like an early “trademark” from the hand of Erasmus, adopted by later neo-Byzantine texts of the 16th and 17th centuries, e.g., Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) shows this reading in only one of his selected 8 manuscripts (Gospel manuscript: H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum). While as a 21st century neo-Byzantine textual analyst I share the later 16th and 17th centuries neo-Byzantine textual analysts great respect for Erasmus of Rotterdam, and I say of such men that as a package deal, “they are greater than I,” I nevertheless distance myself from the idea of textual “trademarks.” I want nothing to do with them when the MBT is clearly ascertainable (*i.e.*, other than for optional letters and spellings of some proper nouns).

Therefore I maintain that Scrivener’s text should be altered at Matt. 2:23; 4:13; 21:11, to read, “*Nazaret*” not “*Nazareth*.” The *Geneva Bible* of 1557 reads “*Nazaret*” at Matt. 2:23; 21:11; and “*Nazareth*” at Matt. 4:13. Then the revised *Geneva Bible* of 1560 which is Dedicated to “The Most Virtuous and Noble Queen Elizabeth, Queen of England, France, and Ireland,” (although it is not as a consequence of this known as “The Queen Elizabeth Version”), standardized these to read, “*Nazaret*” at Matt. 2:23; 4:13; 21:11. I regard the *Geneva Bible*’s “*Nazaret*” as essentially untranslated Greek; and in this sense I disagree with it for the same type of reason that I disagree with leaving Hebrew *sheol* untranslated in parts of the NKJV’s OT (e.g., II Sam. 22:6; Ps. 16:10; Isa. 5:14, NKJV), or I disagree with the fetish of those half-wits who get rid of the AV’s usage of “Jehovah” and love to say how “smart” they think they are because “the Hebrew is ‘YaHWeH’ not ‘Jehovah’.” After all, do we commonly speak Hebrew (NKJV’s Ps. 16:10), Greek (Geneva Bible’s Matt. 2:23; 4:13; 21:11), or English?

This type of thing reminds me of the old Choir Master at St. Philip’s Church Hill (Sydney) where I used to attend Matins (2nd & 4th Sundays of the month) and Choral Communion (1st, 3rd, & 5th Sundays). Services were always from the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) and Authorized Version (and the *Athanasian Creed* was sometimes said); and in the singing of the *Te Deum* at Matins, he forced all choristers to sing, “*Sabaot*,” not “*Sabaoth*,” at “*Holy, Holy, Holy: Lord God of Sabaoth*,” on the basis it was “the correct Hebrew” pronunciation. Personally, I prefer the Anglicized form “*Sabaoth*” on the basis that we speak English, not Hebrew (and the Greek agrees with me as “*sabaōth*” in Rom. 9:29 and Jas. 5:4). But such a peccadillo against the English language is something we may sometimes have to tolerate.

Thus while one may leave the Greek, “*Nazaret*” untranslated as “*Nazaret*” (Geneva Bible, 1560), in an English translation; the better practice is to *translate it* into its Anglicized form as,

“Nazareth.” This is certainly the customary English name for Nazareth, a town I was privileged to inspect as part of a wider visit to Israel in Feb 2002. Hence because both the Greek, “Nazaret” and “Nazareth,” may be rendered into English as “Nazareth,” I maintain that such a change to Scrivener’s text ought not to lead to a change in the AV’s translation, “Nazareth,” and nor should it lead people to adopt something akin to the old St. Philip’s Choir Master’s queer quirk with regard to “Sabaoth,” by pronouncing this as “Nazaret.”

AT MATT. 5:28, Scrivener’s Text follows a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., Sigma 042, M 021; Justin Martyr & Origen), which reads, “*autēs* (‘of her,’ singular feminine genitive, from *autos-ē-o*.)” By contrast, the MBT (e.g., W 032; Origen, Eusebius, & Chrysostom) reads, “*autēn* (‘her,’ feminine singular accusative, pronoun from *autos-ē-o*);” and likewise the Latin Vulgate reads, “*eam* (‘her,’ feminine singular accusative, pronoun from *is-ea-id*.)”

The MBT at Matt. 5:28 thus reads, “*pros* (to) *to epithumesai* (‘lust,’ active aorist infinitive, from *epithumeō*) *autēn* (her).” It is clearly harmonious with Matthean Greek to use the accusative, *autēn* (her)” with an active aorist infinitive e.g., Matt. 1:19 we read, “*autēn* (her) *paradeigmatizai* (‘to expose publicly,’ active aorist infinitive, from *paradeigmatizō*),” i.e., “to make her a publick example” (AV). (Cf. Matt. 14:4, an active present infinitive, *echein* / ‘to have’ with *autēn* / ‘her.’) Since there is no good textual argument against the MBT, this is the correct reading.

Burgon & Miller (1899) give this as an example of where they consider their majority text should replace what they call the “Textus Receptus¹⁰.” In fact, with both readings being possibilities that underpin e.g., the AV, on this occasion they have simply discovered the true TR. This MBT reading is also followed in the later majority texts of Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005).

The MBT is also found in some Alexandrian texts (see Matt. 5:28 at Appendix 3, *infra*). In the minority Byzantine reading with the genitive, “*autēs* (‘of her,’ singular feminine genitive, from *autos-ē-o*),” the clause may be translated, “to lust for her” (NKJV) or “to (*pros*) lust (*to epithumesai*) after her (*autēs*)” (AV). Alternatively, in the MBT reading with the accusative, “*autēn* (‘her,’ singular feminine accusative, from *autos-ē-o*),” the clause may be translated “with (*pros*) lust for her” (NASB) or “to (*pros*) lust (*to epithumesai*) her (*autēn*)” i.e., “to lust after her” (ASV & W-H).

The minority reading of Scrivener’s Text at Matt. 5:28 is earlier found in Erasmus (1516) and is thus a “trademark” identifier of an Erasmus derived or copied text, in which the meaning is the same as the MBT. Comparative analysis with ASV which renders “*autēn* (her)” from W-H, shows that the AV’s translation may have been from “*autēn* (her)” in the MBT, although it may also have been from the minority Byzantine reading of Erasmus manifested in Scrivener. Either way, the AV remains correct as an English translation. Nevertheless, I maintain the “*autēs* (of her)” of Scrivener’s Text should be replaced with MBT reading, “*autēn* (her).”

AT MATT. 5:44, the reading of Scrivener’s Text, “*tous misountas* (‘to them that hate,’ masculine plural accusative, present active participle from *miseō*),” is a minority Byzantine

¹⁰ Burgon & Miller (1899), pp. vii & 30.

reading e.g., Minuscule 2 (12th century), found in the Greek NTs of e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633). It means the same as the MBT reading, “*tois misousin* (masculine plural dative, present active participle from *miseo*)” (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) (also found at Luke 6:27 as, “to them which hate”).

It is certainly within the parameters of Matthean Greek to use either an accusative form (cf. Matt. 4:18, “*ballontas*,” “casting,” AV, masculine plural accusative, present active participle from *ballō*), such as in the minority Byzantine reading at Matt. 5:44; or a dative form (Matt. 7:11 “*aitousin*,” “asking” = “ask,” AV, masculine plural dative, present active participle from *aiteo*), or such an accusative form (cf. Matt. 4:18, “*ballontas*,” “casting,” AV, masculine plural accusative, present active participle from *ballō*), such as in the majority Byzantine reading at Matt. 5:44. There being no good textual argument against the MBT reading it should stand.

Burgon & Miller (1899) give this as an example of where they consider their majority text should replace what they call the “Textus Receptus.” In fact, with both readings being possibilities that underpin e.g., the AV, on this occasion they have simply discovered the true TR. This MBT reading is also followed in the later majority texts of Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005).

What of the variant? It is found in e.g., Erasmus’s 1516 edition. I say, good Christian reader, can you see Erasmus smiling if he had known that one of his “trademarks” would have “stood the text of time” down to Scrivener’s Text of about 400 years later in 1902? Erasmus was a much greater neo-Byzantine textual analyst than am I, as indeed were the other luminaries who perpetuated this “trademark” such as Stephanus. But I do not share their views on textual “trademarks.” Hence I say, *Let the representative Byzantine Text stand!*

AT MATT 9:17c Scrivener’s Text reads, “*amphoterā* (‘both,’ neuter plural nominative adjective, from *amphoeroi*),” in the words, “and both are preserved.” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Phi 043 (Matthew & Mark, 6th century). Making no difference to the English translation, the MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & N 022) reads, “*amphoterōi* (‘both,’ masculine plural nominative adjective, from *amphoeroi*).”

The style of the MBT reading at Matt. 9:17c is strikingly similar to that at Matt. 15:14. Let the reader consider the following stylistic similarity. Matt. 9:17c reads, “*oinon* (‘wine,’ masculine singular accusative noun, from *oinos*) *neon* (‘new,’ masculine singular accusative adjective, from *neos*) *eis* (into) *askous* (‘bottles,’ masculine plural accusative noun, from *askos*) *kainous* (‘new,’ masculine plural accusative adjective, from *kainos*), *kai* (and) *amphoterōi* (‘both,’ masculine plural nominative adjective, from *amphoeroi*) *sunterountai* (are preserved).” Matt. 15:14 reads, “*Tuphlos* (‘the blind,’ masculine singular nominative adjective, from *tuphlos*) *de* (and) *tuphlon* (‘the blind,’ masculine singular accusative adjective, from *tuphlos*) *ean* (if), *amphoterōi* (‘both,’ masculine plural nominative adjective, from *amphoeroi*) *eis* (into) *bothunon* (the ditch) *pesountai* (shall fall).”

The MBT reading at Matt. 9:17c is clearly harmonious with that at Matt. 15:14, and there is certainly no good textual argument against it. In Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624), Elzevir lists five of his eight selected manuscripts in favour of the MBT reading (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; H, Harleian., 5598, British Museum; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ’s

College, Cambridge, F. i. 8).

Burgon & Miller (1899) give this as an example of where they consider their majority text should replace what they call the “Textus Receptus.” In fact, with both readings being possibilities that underpin e.g., the AV, on this occasion they have simply discovered the true TR. This MBT reading is also followed in the later majority texts of Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005).

The minority reading, “*amphotera* (both),” is found in Erasmus (1516 & 1522). Canst thou hear the great Erasmus laughing as he created this “trademark”? Canst thou hear Stephanus declare, “Good one, Erasmus, good one!,” as he uses it in his 1550 edition? Canst thou hear Beza declaring, “I like it, Erasmus and Stephanus, I like it!,” as it enters his 1598 edition? Canst thou hear the Elzevir saying, “Beautiful, beautiful, beautiful,” as he too makes his own in his 1633 edition? But now, good Christian reader, canst thou hear this royal guardian of the Holy Oracles declare in soft and reverential tone to Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, and Elzevir, “Not on my watch, O great ones, not on my watch.” *Let the text of Scrivener be amended accordingly!*

CONCERNING MATT. 10:25c AND MATT. 10:36. At Matt. 10:25c the reading of the MBT according to both Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont (e.g. W 032 & U 30) is “*tous oikeiakous autou* (accusative plural masculine, second declension noun, from *oikeiakos*);” whereas both Scrivener’s Text and the NU Text read, “*tous oikiakous* (accusative plural masculine, second declension noun, from *oikiakos*) *auto*” (e.g., Sigma 042 & N 022). Though employing different spellings, both mean the same thing, “them of his household.” So too at Matt. 10:36, the reading of the MBT according to both Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont (e.g., W 032 & U 30) is “*oikeiakoi* (nominative plural masculine, second declension noun, from *oikeiakos*);” whereas both Scrivener’s Text and the NU Text read, “*oikiakoi* (nominative plural masculine, second declension noun, from *oikiakos*)” (e.g., Sigma 042). Once again, while using different spellings, both refer to “they / them of household,” and so together with, “*autou* (of him),” mean the same thing, “they / them of his own household.”

Von Soden (1913) says that at Matt. 10:25c the “*ei*” spelling, that is subsequently followed in the von Soden based works of Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005), has the reading of von Soden’s K group other than about 10 K subgroup manuscripts, and so this is clearly the MBT reading. Likewise at Matt. 10:36, von Soden says the “*ei*” spelling has the same type of manuscript support one finds at Matthew chapter 10 verse “25”. Therefore Scrivener’s Text should be amended accordingly at Matt. 10:25c,36 to the “*ei*” spelling for “*oikeiakous*” and “*oikeiakoi*” respectively.

AT MATT. 10:28b, the spelling variants in the same root word of “*apokteino*” (Scrivener) “*apokteno*” (MBT) “*apoktenno*” (NU Text), act to produce the diversity of three different declensions. Scrivener’s Text reads, “*apokteinonton* (present active, genitive plural masculine participle, from *apokteino*);” the MBT according to both Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont (e.g., N 022), reads “*apoktenonton*,” and a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042), also found in the NU Text *et al* following the Alexandrian text’s London Sinaiticus, reads “*apoktennonton*” (NU Text). But at Matt. 10:28b all three spellings still mean “killing,” i.e., “which kill” (AV).

Von Soden (1913) says that at Matt. 10:28b, the “*e*” spelling, that is subsequently

followed in the von Soden based works of Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005), has the residual support of von Soden's K group i.e., at least *c.* 90% of it. Therefore Scrivener's Text should be amended accordingly at Matt. 10:28b to the "e" spelling for "*apoktenonton*."

Burgon & Miller (1899) give Matt. 10:28b as an example of where they consider their majority text should replace what they call the "Textus Receptus." In fact, with both readings being possibilities that underpin e.g., the AV, on this occasion they have simply discovered the true TR.

AT MATT. 11:8, Scrivener's text reads, "*basileon* (<kings'>, masculine plural genitive noun, from *basileus*)," and this is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., K 017, 9th century & 2, 12th century). But the spelling "*basileion* (<kings'>, masculine plural genitive noun, from *basileius*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, N 022, & Lectionary 2378); and yet another minority Byzantine variant spelling is "*basilion* (<kings'>)" (Sigma 042). The MBT is found as the majority text reading in Hodges & Farstad (1985), who nevertheless considers "*basileon*" to be a notable minority variant of the "TR." By contrast, while Robinson & Pierpont (2005) agree with Hodges & Farstad that the MBT spelling "*basileion* (kings')" is the majority text reading, unlike them, they consider the text is "significantly divided" with the spelling "*basileon* (kings')," which they give as a sidenote. In this, they agree with Burgon & Miller (1899) who refer to a split text at this point.

Going to the source for both Hodges & Farstad's and Robinson & Pierpont's majority texts, von Soden (1913) says that inside the K group, the minority Byzantine spelling, *basileon* (kings'), has the support of one manuscript, and the MBT spelling, "*basileion* (kings')" has the support of the rest of K group. Recognizing the generalist nature of von Soden's groups, this means that the MBT spelling has the support of at least *c.* 90% of K group, and quite possible far more than this. Under these circumstances, the claim of Burgon & Miller (1899) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005) that the Byzantine Text is "significantly divided" (Robinson & Pierpont's terminology) here at Matt. 11:8 is unsustainable; and so on this occasion Hodges & Farstad are quite right to show the text is NOT seriously divided at all.

But what of the claim made by both Burgon & Miller (1899) and Hodges & Farstad (1985), that "*basileon*" is the reading of the "TR"? On the one hand, this reading is found in Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633). But on the other hand, in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624), Elzevir lists the spelling of a majority of five of his eight selected manuscripts in favour of the MBT reading (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; H, Harleian.; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8).

Though Elzevir was aware of the majority attestation of the MBT reading he selected the minority reading. Why? The answer appears to lie in his continuation of what by that time, had been a well established textual "trademark" that had originated with Erasmus more than a hundred year afore, and was thereafter continued by, for instance, Stephanus and Beza. In such an instance, the true TR is clearly the MBT reading. *Let Scrivener's Text be amended accordingly!*

AT MATT. 11:16a, Scrivener's text, like that of Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus

(1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633), reads “*paidariois* (neuter plural dative noun, from *paidarion*),” meaning either, “unto little children,” or “unto children.” In broad general terms it is found in less than about 5% of all manuscripts (Green’s textual apparatus), or in more precise terms less than *c.* 10% of all manuscripts (von Soden)¹¹. It is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 2 (12th century). By contrast, the MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & N 022) reads “*paidiois* (neuter plural dative noun, from *paidion*),” meaning “unto children.”

There is no good textual argument against the MBT here at Matt. 11:16a. The Greek *paidion* clearly forms part of Matthean Greek (Matt. 2:8,9,11,13,14,20,21; 14:21; 15:38; 18:2,4,5; 19:13,14); whereas *paidarion* is not used elsewhere; and given its status as a slim minority Byzantine reading, while its origins are uncertain, it was possibly brought in from Johannine Greek (John 6:9, “lad” = “*paidarion*”¹²). Certainly it could not be said that the usage of *paidion* at Matt. 11:16a is contextually inappropriate, since we also find it used in a similar way in Luke 7:32. More generally, this area of Matt. 11:16,17 appears to have suffered at the hands of numerous corrupters of the text (see main commentary at Matt. 11:16b; 11:16c,17; 11:17b). Therefore at Matt. 11:16a the MBT should stand and Scrivener’s Text amended accordingly.

Since the AV translation is “unto children,” *not* “unto little children,” it is *prima facie* possible that the King James translators followed either reading at Matt. 11:16a. Notably, while this was translated as “children” by Tyndale (1526 & 1534), Cranmer (1539)¹³, and the Geneva Bible (1557), the Geneva Bible (1560) made this “little children.” The fact that the AV translated this as “children,” therefore meant it was specifically following the tradition of “children” as opposed to “little children.” Thus given the known textual discrepancy, one may argue that had the AV translators agreed with e.g., the Geneva Bible (1560), then they would have here translated this as “little children” (Geneva Bible) not “children” (AV). However, by itself, this argument is not conclusive since “*paidariois*” can be rendered either way. But what is conclusive is that the reading, “*paidiois*” is MBT and has no good textual argument against it. It is thus the TR here at Matt. 11:16a.

In Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624), Elzevir lists a majority of five out of his eight selected manuscripts in favour of the MBT reading (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x.

¹¹ Von Soden makes no reference to this variant. Therefore, it is residually supported by his K group. This means on his generalist group figures, 90% plus of the K group supports the reading, “*paidiois*.” Based purely on von Soden’s generalist data, this could be anything between *c.* 90% and 100%. While I generally just cite Green’s textual Apparatus, it should be understood that it is only a broad-brush guide, and in compiling it Pierpont did not always adequately recognize this error bar of up to *c.* 10% (although in some instances his percentage groups are broad enough to cover this error bar on some specific reading, though this is not always so.)

¹² Neuter singular nominative noun, from *paidarion*.

¹³ The *Great Bible* of 1539 is also known as *Cranmer’s Bible* because of Cranmer’s Preface to it.

16; H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8). The reading "*paidiois* (unto children)," is found in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). While both Burgon & Miller and Hodges & Farstad claim that the "TR" here reads "*paidariois* (unto children)," I would disagree and say that both have simply discovered the true TR, known, for instance, to Elzevir as the MBT reading, but not followed for the reason mentioned in the next paragraph.

As to the issue of why the neo-Byzantine texts of Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, and Elzevir, *supra*, used "*paidariois* (unto children)" it can only be reasonably concluded that this was one of Erasmus's textual "trademarks," whose continued usage by later 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantines was thought of as their "in-house" way of honouring Erasmus. But on this occasion the great and learned Erasmus, for whom like all neo-Byzantines I have great respect, was with all due respect to him, "too smart by half." The fact that the Geneva Bible (1560) exploited an ambiguity in this word to make it read, "little children," shows that Erasmus *et al* were here "skating on thin ice" with this particular textual "trademark." As I have said before, so I say now again, that this issue of textual "trademarks" (other than for optional letters or proper nouns where we do not know what the MBT reading is,) is an area of disagreement between myself as a 21st century neo-Byzantine, and the great 16th and 17th centuries neo-Byzantines.

AT MATT. 12:21 Scrivener's text, like that of Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633), reads "*en* (in)" before the dative "*to* (-) *onomati* (name)." In broad general terms this reading is found in less than about 5% of all manuscripts (Green's textual apparatus), or bearing in mind the generalist nature of von Soden's groups we might more safely say less than *c.* 10% of all manuscripts (von Soden). Both Tischendorf (1869-72) and von Soden (1913) claim it is the reading of the Vulgate *et al.* While it may be argued that it can be reconstructed in the Greek from the Latin of e.g., the Vulgate which reads, "*in* (in) *nomine* (name);" I would regard this as an unconvincing argument since the Greek dative "*to* *onomati*" can also be rendered, "in name;" and given that the MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) lacks the "*en*" the Latin was in all likelihood so translated from the MBT. Of more substance then, this reading of "*en*" is found in the ancient Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339). Another minority reading, "*epi*" is found in Minuscules 262 (10th century) and 1187 (11th century), and since "*epi*" plus a dative may mean "in," this is the same basic stylistic idea.

In Matthean Greek we find both the preposition "*en*" with the dative "*onomati*" meaning "in the name" (Matt. 21:9; 23:39); and also the preposition "*epi*" with the dative "*onomati*" and genitive "*mou* (of me)," meaning "in my name" (Matt. 18:5; 24:5). But the addition of such a preposition is not a necessary feature of Matthean Greek. It is absent not once, not twice, but thrice in a row at Matt. 7:22 with "*to* ('-, ' untranslated 'the,' neuter singular dative, definite article from *to*) *so* (neuter singular dative pronoun, from *sos*) *onomati* (neuter singular dative noun, from *onoma*)," where the dative is contextually sufficient for it to carry the meaning "in thy name" (AV) three times in a row.

There is therefore clearly no textual problem with the MBT reading of the Matthean Greek at Matt. 12:21, "*to* (-) *onomati* (name)," meaning "in ... name" in the wider words, "And *in* his name shall the Gentiles trust" (AV). Thus it looks to me like some scribes with an incomplete knowledge of Matthean Greek, at Matt. 12:21 gratuitously supplied either the preposition "*en*" from Matt. 21:9; 23:39 or the proposition "*epi*" from Matt. 18:5; 24:5. The MBT reading is followed in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad

(1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005); who on this occasion have all discovered the true TR.

As to why Erasmus selected this most improbable reading, it can only be assumed that this he wanted this to be one of the textual “trademarks” of an Erasmus text since it made no difference to the meaning or translation. And as to why it was continued by later 16th and 17th neo-Byzantines, it can only be assumed that they thereby sought to give an “in-house” honour to Erasmus and the fact that they were using what was originally an Erasmus text. *I too honour the name of the great Erasmus; and I also honour the names of such great neo-Byzantines as Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzevir family. And I thank God for the wonderful work that these mighty men of God did over more than a hundred years. But I honour the name of my much greater God first and foremost, and believe that his words in Matt. 5:18 forbid me from condoning this type of thing.* LET THE TEXTUAL “TRADMARK” BE REMOVED, Scrivener’s text should here be amended at Matt. 12.21.

AT MATT 12:32a, Scrivener’s Text reads, “*os an* (whosoever).” This is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., S 028, 10th century, Athanasius & Chrysostom), and found in Stephanus (1550). But the MBT reading (e.g., W 032, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968, Origen & Chrysostom), is “*os ean* (whosoever),” and found in Erasmus (1516 & 1522).

In Green’s Textual Apparatus, Pierpont says the MBT’s reading is followed by “95-100% of all manuscripts.” Von Soden only lists one manuscript in K group supporting the TR (S 028), although he also refers to its support by such ancient writers as e.g., Cyril of Alexandria and Didymus the Blind. While Pierpont might be right in his assessment that the reading, “*os an* (whosoever),” has less than 5% support, it is a methodological defect of his apparatus that he fails to factor in a sufficiently high error bar of c. 10% for von Soden’s groups, and so given the generalist nature of von Soden’s groups, I think it would be safer to say “less than c. 10%.” Though its attestation extends to ancient times with e.g., the ancient Greek church writers, *supra*, it must be said that its Greek manuscript support for Scrivener’s reading is slim.

In broad-brush terms, the TR & MBT readings correlate in St. Matthew’s Gospel for either “*os an* (whosoever)” (see Matt. 5:30; 5:32; 15:5; 19:9; 23:16) or “*os ean* (whosoever)” (see Matt. 5:19; 5:32; 10:42; 11:16; 18:5; 20:27; 23:18). It is notable from Matt. 23:16 (*os an*) and Matt. 23:18 (*os ean*), or even closer together, Matt. 5:32 (first occurrence, *os an*; second occurrence, *os ean*), that the two can even be used in close proximity to one another.

But for reasons of Matthean Hebraic or Aramaic parallelism (see comments at Matt. 12:28, *infra*), here at Matt. 12:32a, the strong parallelism of, “*Kai* (And) *os an* (whosoever) *eipe* (speaketh) *logon* (a word) *kata* (against) *tou* (the) *Yiou* (Son) *tou* (-) *anthropou* (of man), *aphethesetai* (it shall be forgiven) *autō* (him): *os d’ an* (but whosoever) *eipe* (speaketh) *kata* (against) *tou* (the) *Pneumatōs* (Ghost) *tou* (-) *Agiou* (Holy), *ouk* (not) *aphethesetai* (it shall be forgiven) *autō* (him),” evidently led Stephanus (1550) to draw the conclusion that the parallelism here required the minority Byzantine reading, “*os an* (whosoever).” Yet this argument evidently did not impress Erasmus (1516 & 1522). Why not? Let the reader not that the parallelism here is not as precise as Stephanus would have us believe, as seen in the non-repetition of “*logon* (a word)” after the “*eipe* (speaketh)” and before the “*logon* (a word) *kata* (against).” Such slight alteration is seemingly designed to grammatically reinforce the idea that there is difference in “speaking a word against the Son,” which though shocking and horrible, is not the same as “speaking against the Holy Ghost,” and this surely favours the MBT reading of Erasmus’s text.

Therefore on this occasion here at Matt. 12:32a, I agree with Erasmus over Stephanus, and accordingly maintain that Scrivener's Text should be altered. The MBT reading is found in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), who here say this majority reading should replace the "Textus Receptus" reading of "*os an*¹⁴"; Robinson & Pierpont (2005), who show no Byzantine text alternative; and Hodges & Farstad (1985), who show the reading of Scrivener's Text as the "TR" in a footnote but refer to no manuscript support for it. However, on this occasion, I would say that Burgon & Miller and Hodges & Farstad are wrong to refer to the reading of Stephanus (1550) and Scrivener (1894 & 1902) as the "TR," and they have in fact discovered the true TR found much earlier in Erasmus (1516 & 1522).

AT MATT. 12:32b, Scrivener's Text, like that of Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633), reads "*en* (in) *touto* (this) *to* (-) *aioni* (world)." In broad general terms this reading is found in less than about 5% of all manuscripts (Green's textual apparatus) or bearing in mind the generalist nature of von Soden's groups we might more safely say less than *c.* 10% of all manuscripts (von Soden). It is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, and N 022; Origen, & Chrysostom). By contrast, the MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968; Basil the Great & Epiphanius) reads "*en* (in) *to* (the) *nun* (present) *aioni* (world)."

In the Pauline corpus, the same type of terminology as the minority Byzantine reading at Matt. 12:32b, "*to* (-) *aioni* (world) *touto* (this)" is translated in the AV as "this world" at Rom. 12:2; I Cor. 3:18; Eph. 1:21. The same terminology as the MBT reading, "*en* (in) *to* (the) *nun* (present) *aioni* (world)," is likewise translated in the AV as "in this world" at I Tim. 6:17; although in Titus 2:12, "*en* (in) *to* (the) *nun* (present) *aioni* (world)," is rendered in the AV as "this present world." The fact that elsewhere in the NT the AV rendered the Greek terminology of both readings at Matt. 12:32b as "in this world," means that *prima facie* they may have followed either the MBT or minority reading at Matt. 12:32b.

Matthean Greek uses both the "*nun* (present)" of the MBT reading (Matt. 24:21; 26:65; 27:42,43) and the "*touto* (this)" of the minority reading (Matt. 8:9; 13:54,56; 17:20; 20:14; 21:21); and both are stylistically possible here at Matt. 12:32b. But since there is no clear and obvious textual problem with the MBT, it must stand. Thus this Erasmus text "trademark" should be removed from Scrivener's Text.

The MBT is followed in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). Burgon & Miller and Hodges & Farstad refer to the minority Byzantine reading as the "TR." But on this occasion they have simply discovered the true TR of the AV.

AT MATT. 12:35b the discussion revolves around the Greek word, "*agatha* ('good things,' neuter plural accusative adjective, from *agathos*)." Before considering the matter, I briefly digress to remind the reader that this Greek word gives rise to the female Christian name, "Agatha." St. Agatha's Day is a black letter day on the 1662 Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* Calendar for 5 February, and the *Church of England* has several churches dedicated to God in her

¹⁴ Burgon & Miller (1899), pp. vii & 95.

memory. A virgin and martyr under pagan Rome¹⁵, Agatha was martyred with torture at Catania in Sicily, Italy. She is mentioned by Damasus (Bishop of Rome, 366-384), referred to in the martyrology of Jerome (d. 420), and was put on the Calendar by Gregory (Bishop of Rome, 590-604). We do not know a lot about her, other than her name means “good” or “good things;” and she was martyred as a virgin under pagan Rome, and so upheld Christian moral purity.

According to tradition, she gave a Christian witness by being put to death as an act of revenge by a pagan Roman official whose immoral sexual advances she rebuffed, and for which she was horribly tortured to death. I think she gives an excellent example of the Christian virtue of chastity, and that we need to keep these type of positive Christian images before the people. E.g., school girls in puberty need to be told, “*Remember Agatha. It’s better to die than to lose your virginity before marriage!*” We sometimes say a Christian girl who keeps her virginity till marriage, (unless as occasionally occurs, per I Cor. 7, she is not called to marriage and so remains a virgin for life,) “a good girl.” Somehow, in both the meaning of her name as “good,” and her Christian witness as a virgin in a pagan Roman world full of fornication and adultery (I Cor. 6:9; Gal. 5:19), Agatha stands out as the epitome of “a good girl;” and she is thus one of those “ensamples to all that believe” (I Thess.1:7) that the church remembers in her hagiology. She reminds us that Christianity calls for separation from worldliness (II Cor. 6:14-18), and that by the grace of God, we are to “cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God” (II Cor. 7:1). I have long had a strong interest in this saint, finding in this virgin’s name meaning, “good,” and her preparedness to die as a martyr for Christ under pagan Rome, something deeply commendable and attractive. She is one of my favourite saints.

At Matt. 12:35b, in the words, “A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth *good things (agatha)*,” the absence of the definite article, “*ta* (neuter plural accusative definite article, from *to*),” before “*agatha* (good things)” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). In the first place, it is normative for Matthean Greek to lack such a definite article before *agatha* (Matt. 7:11, twice); and in the second place, such a usage occurs immediately before Matt. 12:35 in Matt. 12:34. The insertion of the “*ta* (‘the,’ redundant in English translation),” is found in Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633). Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) shows the MBT in four of his eight selections (Gospel manuscripts: v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ’s College, Cambridge, F. i. 8) (and also at the “second hand” of a scribe to P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18); and the minority Byzantine reading in one of his eight selected manuscripts (Gospel manuscript: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17); thus indicating he knew his text to be following a minority reading. It was evidently a popular textual “trademark” coming from Erasmus of Rotterdam. But let us be pure, not only in “the flesh,” but also in the “spirit” (II Cor. 7:1). Let the MBT stand, and Scrivener’s Text amended accordingly!

The MBT is followed here at Matt. 12:35b by the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). Burgon & Miller here say this majority text reading of “*agatha* (good things)” should replace the “Textus Receptus”

¹⁵ Usually considered to have probably occurred as part of the wider persecution of Christians under either under the Roman Emperors Decius (249-51) or Diocletian (284-305).

reading of “*ta (-) agatha* (good things)¹⁶”; and Hodges & Farstad (1985), likewise show the “*ta (-)*,” as the reading of the “TR” or “Textus Receptus” that they consider should be replaced with their majority text reading¹⁷. In a way “they are right,” since this textual “trademark” (like others in this Appendix 1), has been commonly printed in neo-Byzantine NT Greek texts derived from the 16th and 17th centuries. Different combinations of these “trademarks” act to identify a particular text, but the repeated use of any specific “trademark” amidst these diverse combinations, such as this one here at Matt. 12:35b, doubles for being a “mark of honour” e.g., in this instance to Erasmus. But in another way, Burgon & Miller and Hodges & Farstad “are wrong,” because these type of textual “trademarks” are placed *where there is no difference to English (or other language) translation*, and so one could not e.g., conclusively show one way or the other, which reading underpins the AV. Thus as in other instances found in the Appendix 1, I consider that they have simply discovered the true TR of the AV here at Matt. 12:35b.

AT MATT. 13:27, Scrivener’s Text, like that of Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633), includes the definite article, “*ta* (the),” and so read, “*ta (-) zizania* (tares).” In broad general terms this reading is found in less than about 5% of all manuscripts (Green’s textual apparatus), or (even though I sometimes cite the unrevised figures of Green’s textual apparatus as a generalist guide,) bearing in mind the generalist nature of von Soden’s groups we might more safely say less than c. 10% of all manuscripts (von Soden). It is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., Sigma 042; X 033, 10th century; & 476, 11th century). By contrast, the MBT (e.g., W 032, N 022, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) reads “*zizania* (tares).” Either way the reading is still, “from whence hath it tares?”

Inside the context of this passage we find that the definite article is absent before “*zizania* (tares),” at Matt. 13:25; and present as “*ta* (the) *zizania* (tares)” at Matt. 13:26,29,30. Therefore either the presence or absence of the definite article would be stylistically congruous at Matt. 13:27. There thus being no good textual argument against the MBT reading, it must stand. Hence Scrivener’s text should here be amended at Matt. 13:27, and this textual “trademark” of Erasmus removed¹⁸.

The MBT reading is found at Matt. 13:27 in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). Both Burgon & Miller and Hodges & Farstad, consider that the reading without the definite article, “*ta* (the),” here, is that of the TR¹⁹. In fact, when the English translation is the same from either reading, such as here, the issue of what underpinning text the AV translators used is *in dubio*. Thus notwithstanding certain methodological defects in the way they arrived at their conclusion, these majority texts have in fact in fact discovered the true TR here at Matt. 13:27.

¹⁶ Burgon & Miller (1899), pp. vii & 96.

¹⁷ Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xviii & 38.

¹⁸ The Alexandrian texts are split down the middle on this reading at Matt. 13:27, with *Codex Sinaiticus* including the definite article, and *Codex Vaticanus* lacking it. But for the wrong reasons, the right reading was here adopted in the NU Text *et al* due to the neo-Alexandrian penchant for “the shorter reading.”

¹⁹ Burgon & Miller (1899), pp. vii & 104; Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xviii & 42.

AT MATT. 13:30 Scrivener's Text, like that of Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633), includes the definite article, "τὸ (the)," and so read, "τὸ (the) *kairō* (time)." In broad general terms this reading is found in less than about 5% of all manuscripts (Green's textual apparatus), or bearing in mind the generalist nature of von Soden's groups we might more safely say less than *c.* 10% of all manuscripts (von Soden). It is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., 1188 (11th / 12th century). By contrast, the MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & N 022), manifested in Erasmus (1516 & 1522), reads "*kairō* ([the] time)."

Either way the reading is still, "the time" in the wider words, "and in the time of harvest" (AV). I.e., the reading must contextually be, "the time (*kairō*) of the harvest" (ASV & W-H), whether or not the definite article is present in the Greek. This sense remains, even if like the RSV, NRSV, and ESV, one does not actually use the English definite article e.g., the ESV renders this, "at harvest time"²⁰. I.e., one would not contextually render this, "at *a* harvest time."

Matthean Greek may (Matt. 11:25; 12:1; 14:1) or may not (Matt. 24:45) have the masculine singular dative form from "ο" of the definite article "τὸ (the)" before *kairō* (time)." There is certainly no textual problem with the MBT which should thus stand. Ought we to "honour" the name of e.g., the neo-Byzantine Stephanus by retaining this textual "trademark"? As one who honours the names and works of Stephanus, Beza, and Elzevir, I say, *Let us honour God first!* Let this textual "trademark" of Stephanus *et al* be removed, and Scrivener's text amended accordingly!

The MBT reading is found at Matt. 13:30 in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). Both Burgon & Miller and Hodges & Farstad consider that the minority reading of Stephanus is the "TR," and say that they wish to replace it with their majority text reading²¹. In fact, both have merely discovered the true TR, found long afore in the Greek Text of Erasmus (1516 & 1522).

AT MATT. 13:33, Scrivener's Text, like that of Erasmus (1522) and Stephanus (1550) reads, "*enekrupsen* ('she hid' = 'hid,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *egkruptō*, = *en* / 'in' + *kruptō* / 'hide')." In broad general terms this reading is found in between 20% and 39% of all manuscripts (Green's textual apparatus). This is a significant minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032; Clement Romanus & Chrysostom). By contrast, the MBT (e.g., Sigma 042 & N 022; Cyril of Alexandria & Chrysostom) reads, "*ekrupsen* ('she hid' = 'hid,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *kruptō*);" and was followed by Erasmus (1516).

There is certainly no clear and obvious textual problem with the MBT reading. Matt. 13:33 is part of a wider section of Matt. 13:33-43 followed by Matt. 13:44; and this very next

²⁰ The Alexandrian texts are split down the middle on this reading at Matt. 13:30, with *Codex Sinaiticus* including the definite article, and *Codex Vaticanus* lacking it. But for the wrong reasons, the right reading was here adopted in the NU Text *et al* due to the neo-Alexandrian penchant for "the shorter reading."

²¹ Burgon & Miller (1899), pp. vii & 105; Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xviii & 42.

section of Matt. 13:44 also uses “*ekrupsen*” (in Scrivener’s text without the optional “n” as it is not before a vowel,) for “he hideth (*ekrupse*)” (AV)²². The minority Byzantine reading appears to have been assimilated from Luke 13:21.

The MBT reading at Matt. 13:33 is found in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). Robinson & Farstad consider the MBT here is “significantly divided” with the minority reading. Both Burgon & Miller and Hodges & Farstad consider that the minority reading of Erasmus (1522) and Stephanus (1550) is the “TR,” and say that they wish to replace it with their majority text reading²³. In fact, both have merely discovered the true TR, found in the Greek text of Erasmus (1516), “*ekrupsen* (she hid),” before he started “day dreaming” about turning this into the textual “trademark” of “*enekrupsen* (she hid)” in his later Greek text (1522).

Let the MBT stand! Let this textual “trademark” that Erasmus dreamt up sometime between his 1516 and 1522 editions be removed! Some of my esteemed neo-Byzantine colleagues of yesteryear may say, “Let us honour Erasmus by retaining such ‘trademarks’;” but in reply I say, “Let us honour God first by not retaining such ‘trademarks’!” Let Scrivener’s Text be amended accordingly here at Matt. 13:33!

AT MATT. 13:40 Scrivener’s Text, like that of Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633), reads “*katakaietai* (‘burned,’ indicative passive present, 3rd person singular verb, from *katakaiō* = *kata* + *kaiō*).” In broad general terms this reading is found in less than about 5% of all manuscripts (Green’s textual apparatus). While von Soden here says the MBT reading, *infra*, has the support of the “K” group, bearing in mind the generalist nature of von Soden’s groups, we might more safely say the MBT reading has the support of between *c.* 90-100% of the K group and thus by reasonable projection *c.* 90% + of the MBT, and so less than about 10% of all manuscripts (von Soden) here follow this minority reading. It is a minority Byzantine reading (Minuscules 21, 12th century & 1010, 12th century; Cyril of Alexandria). By contrast, the MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042; Chrysostom) reads “*kaietai* (‘burned,’ indicative passive present, 3rd person singular verb)²⁴, from *kaiō*).”

Though both words are found elsewhere in the NT (*kaietai* at John 15:6 & *katakaietai* at Heb. 13:11), neither of these two words are used elsewhere in St. Matthew’s Gospel. The minority Byzantine reading is a compound word, whereas the MBT word is not. As noted at Matt. 13:33, *supra*, in terms of broad general style St. Matthew sometimes uses compound words and sometimes he does not. There is certainly no clear and obvious textual problem with the

²² Inside of Matthean Greek it is also twice used in the compound word, “*apokruptō*,” which comes from “*apo* (away)” and “*kruptō* (hide),” being found as “*apekrupsas* (‘thou hast hid,’ indicative active aorist, 2nd person singular verb, from *apokruptō*)” in Matt. 11:25, and as “*apekrupse* (‘he hid’ = ‘hid,’ AV, indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *apokruptō*)” in Matt. 25:18.

²³ Burgon & Miller (1899), pp. vii & 105; Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xviii & 43.

²⁴ The plural subject of the sentence, “*ta* (the) *zizania* (‘tares,’ neuter plural nominative noun, from *zizanon*),” is of neuter gender, and so the TR’s verbs are singular.

MBT reading which must thus stand.

The MBT reading at Matt. 13:40 is found in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). Both Burgon & Miller and Hodges & Farstad give this as an example of where they consider their majority text should replace what they call the “Textus Receptus²⁵.” The MBT reading is listed in Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) which gives a majority of five out of his eight manuscripts for it (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ’s College, Cambridge, F. i. 8). With both readings being possibilities that underpin the AV, on this occasion Burgon & Miller (1899) and Hodges & Farstad (1985) have simply discovered the true TR. This old textual “trademark” should be removed from Scrivener’s Text here at Matt. 13:40²⁶.

AT MATT. 14:14b, Scrivener’s Text, like that of Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633), reads “*ep’* (preposition *epi* with an accusative = ‘toward’ etc.) *autous* (‘them,’ masculine plural accusative, 3rd person personal pronoun, from *autos*).” In broad general terms this reading is found in less than about 5% of all manuscripts (Green’s textual apparatus), or bearing in mind the generalist nature of von Soden’s groups we might more safely say less than *c.* 10% of all manuscripts (von Soden). It is a minority Byzantine reading (Phi 043, 6th century, Matthew & Mark). By contrast, the MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) reads “*ep’* (preposition *epi* with a dative = ‘toward’ etc.) *autois* (‘them,’ masculine plural dative, 3rd person personal pronoun, from *autos*).” The MBT is manifested in Erasmus (1516 & 1522)²⁷.

St. Matthew uses *ep’* with the singular accusative form *auton* (masculine singular accusative) at Matt. 3:16 (“upon him”); 12:18 (“upon him”); 27:27 (“unto him,” AV; “before him,” ESV; “round him,” Moffatt), and with the singular accusative form *auten* at Matt. 9:18 (“upon her”) (feminine singular accusative). He uses *ep’* with a singular dative, *auto* at Matt. 18:13 (“rejoiceth ... of,” AV; “rejoiceth over,” ASV) (neuter singular dative). This broad usage of *ep’* with the accusative or dative of *autos*, shows Matthean Greek is consistent with both Byzantine readings.

²⁵ Burgon & Miller (1899), pp. vii & 107; Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xviii & 44.

²⁶ The minority Byzantine reading is also found in the two leading Alexandrian texts and leading Western text, and so followed by Tischendorf’s 8th edition, W-H, & Nestle’s 21st edition. The NU text is non-committal, reading “[*kata*]kaietai.”

²⁷ Swanson says G 011, K 017, & W 032 follow “*ep’ autous*,” whereas Tischendorf says G 011 & K 017 follow “*ep’ autois*,” and hence I refer to neither G 011 nor K 017. But Swanson is certainly wrong with respect to W 032 which in my photocopied photolithic copy clearly reads “*ep’ autois*.” Following the two leading Alexandrian texts, the NU Text *et al* also reads “*ep’ autois*.”

The reason for the adoption of this minority Byzantine reading by Stephanus *et al* is not one that I concur with. The adoption of this minority Byzantine reading may have been due to either “stylistic considerations,” *infra*, or as one of a number of identifying “trademarks” of this or that neo-Byzantine textual composer, or some combination of these two elements.

As discussed, *supra*, in my opinion it is contrary to general principles i.e., one never moves away from the representative Byzantine text unless there is a good textual reason to do so. Stephanus *et al* appear to have been attracted to the minority Byzantine reading for one of two broad reasons.

Did they think that either a partial paper fade of the right hand side of the upsilon “u” in a lower case manuscript might account for the origins of the “i” (iota) shape of the representative Byzantine reading, or a partial fade of the upper shape “V” on a capital upsilon, “Y” may have been “reconstructed” to form the capital “I” of the representative Byzantine reading? If so, with all due respect to them, they were *ultra vires* the general principles of the *Textus Receptus* to so elevate such a theory in their minds. *Put bluntly, if this was their thinking, they put the carriage in front of the horse.* That is because one must first have a good textual reason to depart from the representative Byzantine reading. (In my opinion, if the change was accidental then the more likely scenario is a complete paper fade of the “i” which was erroneously “reconstructed” by a scribe as a “u.”) Given that they were very good textual analysts, I consider we can dismiss this possibility as improbable.

The second possibility, and in my opinion the more realistically probable one as being generally consistent with the way they operated is this. Stephanus *et al* decided to use this minority Byzantine reading as a textual “trademark.” This still leaves some unanswered questions. Did Stephanus *et al* consider that a Byzantine scribe who first made this reading deliberately made this change, which does not affect the basic meaning of the text, as some kind of earlier handwritten scribal “trademark”²⁸? Or did they think it was an accidental change as a “reconstruction” following a paper fade / loss? We do not know. Either way, Stephanus *et al* decided to adopt this minority Byzantine reading so that in conjunction with other selected instances of these several types of variants that do not affect the basic meaning of the text, they thereby created a chain of such selections that when put together corporately formed their own corporate textual “trademark.” E.g., the fact that Erasmus had not earlier used this as a textual “trademark,” clearly marked out their texts as ones that had been through e.g., Stephanus and Beza, but not Erasmus (even though their texts included some Erasmus textual “trademarks” used in different combinations by Erasmus).

Thus Stephanus *et al* may well have said to fellow neo-Byzantines something like, “You use your trademarks and I’ll use mine. You’re business is your business, and my business is mine!”

As a package deal they are greater textual analysts than I, being as the sun that God granted great illumination to, whereas I am, by the grace of God, in general am more like unto the

²⁸ I shall return to this issue of handwritten manuscripts and scribal “trademarks” in the final volume of these commentaries, which will deal with the OT Hebrew Received Text. Specifically, with respect to, for instance, the usage of the dagesh in Codex Leningrad.

moon, being one that can but humbly reflect their greater glory. Nevertheless, on this issue I think that those who are greater than I were wrong, and I for one want nothing to do with this minority Byzantine reading or any other textual “trademarks” (unless we do not know what the MBT is, i.e., one that uses optional letters and / or spellings of certain proper nouns to create such a corporate network of “trademarks,” the totality of which in a given text is unique and distinctive to it). Thus because there is no good textual argument against the MBT reading, I prefer it over Scrivener’s text here at Matt. 14:14b. Thus I regard the TR as here reading “*ep’* (toward) *autois* (them).”

If a fellow neo-Byzantine textual analyst does not agree with me, then on general secondary rules he must still allow me this liberty, which thing he may prefer to call, “Gavin Basil McGrath’s trademark,” even though I regard it as something much more than simply, “Gavin McGrath’s trademark.”

The Greek *epi* with an accusative, may be rendered e.g., “toward,” or “on” or “at” or “up to” or “unto” or “to” something or someone. The Greek *epi* with a dative, may also be rendered e.g., “toward,” or “on” or “at” or “unto” or “to” something or someone²⁹. Thus at Matt. 14:14b, both can mean, e.g., “to” or “for” or “on.” Thus the renderings, “toward them” (AV), “on them” (ASV), or “for them” (Moffatt Bible), may be gotten from either Greek reading. Since either Byzantine reading might be rendered by the terminology, “moved with compassion toward them” (AV) or “had compassion on them” (ASV), *prima facie* we cannot conclusively show one way or the other, if the AV translators disagreed with me and were following the accusative reading of e.g., Stephanus (1550) adopted by Scrivener (1894 & 1902), or agreed with Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and I in following the dative reading of the representative Byzantine text. We do not know what they thought of such textual “trademarks” since while they largely revised Beza’s 1598 edition, they did not produce a Greek text that they published with the AV’s NT.

But since I do not see that one should detach primary rules from secondary rules (a distinguishing feature between myself as a 21st neo-Byzantine textual analyst and the 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantines textual analysts), and on general principles, one only moves away from the representative Byzantine reading if there is a good textual reason to do so, it means I follow the MBT reading. Thus at Matt. 14:14b I uphold this as the TR, and also the AV’s undoubtedly correct reading, “toward them.” In this context, I also note that the MBT and TR form at Matt. 14:14b, “*ep’ autois*” is also found in Mark 6:34 (MBT & TR), where this also reads, “Jesus” “was moved with compassion toward (*ep’*) them (*autois*)” (AV).

Appendix 2

**Minor variants between Scrivener’s Text
and the Majority Byzantine Text (MBT)
(or another possible reading),
including references to the neo-Alexandrian Text in those instances
where the neo-Alexandrian Texts agree with the MBT
in such an alternative reading to Scrivener’s Text;**

²⁹ See e.g., Wallace’s *Greek Grammar*, p. 376; Young’s *Greek*, pp 97-8.

**where such alternative readings do not affect,
or do not necessarily affect, the English translation,
so we cannot be certain which reading the AV translators followed.**

In various passages, *infra*, reference is made to the TR as set forth by Scrivener in which optional letters are left off, usually, the optional “n” is not added at the end of certain words; although less commonly another optional letter such as “s” at the end of a word, or “e” at the beginning of a word (e.g., Matt. 5:16; 7:12). In such instances I have followed Scrivener’s Text as “the TR,” although I have not generally checked the accuracy of Scrivener’s claims here; as they commonly cannot be checked, *supra*. As previously discussed, this issue touches upon the secondary rules of neo-Byzantine textual analysis where some diversity occurs between neo-Byzantines; and we simply lack the textual data to know what the MBT is. Certainly the matter is not one that affects translation.

We have no direct equivalent in English of optional letters, but perhaps the closest equivalent we have are optional full-stops for letters abbreviating words e.g., some refer to the Royal Australian Air Force as the “R.A.A.F.” and others as the “RAAF”, and the same person may use both forms on different occasions. (This may be spelt out i.e., “R, double A, F” *infra*, or pronounced like a word, “Raaf.”) Both “R.A.A.F.” and “RAAF” are correct, and if e.g., a person wrote, “I saw a Royal Australian Air Force plane, in which an ‘RAAF’ abbreviation was written on the side of the plane;” none would think that the person was wrong, if they saw in an accompanying photograph, that the abbreviation more literally read, “R.A.A.F.”³⁰. Thus I ask,

³⁰ Concerning “*a* Royal Australian Air Force plane,” as opposed to “*an* RAAF plane,” I

good reader, “May a copyist fairly add or delete such optional letters?”

In most instances, textual commentaries do not show differences in the addition or subtraction of optional letters. But for the purposes of giving the reader a feel for the usage of these optional letters, I shall comprehensively include such information from the beginning of St. Matthew’s Gospel, to the end of the Sermon on the Mount. This selection from Matt. 1-7, in which the MBT used is that of Robinson & Pierpont, is designed to give the reader an idea of the type of thing that occurs more generally throughout the NT with discrepancies between optional Greek letters. Thereafter, I shall only do this in some reactively rare selected instances, to remind the reader of this phenomena.

Furthermore, in Manuscript Washington (*Codex Freerianus*), David spelt “*Daueid*” (e.g., Matt. 1:6), is sometimes abbreviated to “*Dad*” (with a line across the top of these letters) at Matt. 12:23. The abbreviation, “ $\Delta\alpha\Delta$ ” (*DaD*) is also found with a bar over the last two letters at e.g., Matt. 1:1,6 in Lectionary 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*); and as “ $\delta\alpha\delta$ ” (*dad*) with

note that contrary to the common incomplete claim that “an” is used before vowels, it should be noted that it is also used *before vowel sounds*. E.g., “an hour-glass;” for which reason when we see “an” before “h” (pronounced as either *an* atch or *a* hatch; but never as, *a* atch or *an* hatch) at e.g., Gen. 5:3, we know that this was originally pronounced in old English as “an undred,” rather than the modern English, “a hundred.” (Some diversity still exists e.g., though “hierarchy” and “historian” are always spelt with the “h” before them, some say “an ierarchy” or “an istorian,” whereas most say, “a hierarchy” or “a historian.” Though both are correct, by contrast, it would be wrong to say “an historian,” although a person who pronounces this as “an istorian” would write it as “an historian.”)

a bar over the middle letter at e.g., Matt. 1:1,6 in Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). A scribe later seeking to spell this out in greater detail might spell it as e.g., “*Dabid*” or “*Dauid*.” This technique of one scribe using abbreviations for proper nouns (names), followed by a later scribe making a decision to spell the name out in full, has a modern sequel in that we do not know from von Soden what the MBT is here and so the exercise of a stylistic discretion at this point accounts not only for the variants in the spelling of “David” in Hodges & Farstad as “*Dabid*” (the spelling also found in Scrivener), as opposed to Burgon & Miller’s or Pierpont & Robinson’s “*Dauid*,” but also for at least some of the other variants in the spellings of other names.

When unqualified references are made to the ASV in conjunction with the NU Text, *infra*, it means that the reading of Westcott-Hort (W-H) is the same as the NU Text; and “NU Text” here equates “NU Text *et al.*” As in the main commentary, “NU Text *et al.*” refers to those neo-Alexandrian texts most especially considered in this textual commentary i.e., the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993), together with Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle’s 21st edition (1952), and the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions.

COMPREHENSIVELY SHOWING OPTIONAL LETTERS FOR MATT. 1-7.

We do not generally know from von Soden which optional letters are MBT and so a stylistic difference emerges between Robinson & Pierpont and Hodges & Farstad, *supra*. Though I use both of these von Soden based majority texts, for the purposes of this section, rather than referring to the “MBT” (Majority Byzantine Text) on such matters, I shall refer to “R & P” (Robinson & Pierpont) or less commonly, “H & F” (Hodges & Farstad), or “B & M” (Burgon & Miller). Moreover, while my general rule is simply to cite Scrivener’s Text as the “TR” on such matters, *supra*, to avoid confusion, in this section I shall more specifically refer to “Scrivener” rather than the “TR.”

Matthew 1.

Letters are also sometimes changed in the spellings of names. *Dabid* (six times, Matt. 1:1,6,17,20, Scrivener), is *Daueid* (W-H) or *Dauid* (B & M in Matt. 1:1; R & P and NU Text) i.e., “David” (AV & ASV). *Solomonta* (Matt. 1:6, Scrivener) is *Solomona* (R & P, H & F, and NU Text), i.e., “Solomon” (AV & ASV).

The optional stylistic letter “n,” which does not affect the meaning at all, is found at Matt. 1:23 where *kalesousi* (Scrivener, “they shall call,” AV) is *kalesousin* (R & P & NU Text); at Matt. 1:23 where *esti* (Scrivener, “is” AV) becomes *estin* (R & P & NU Text); at Matt. 1:24 where *paraleabe* (Scrivener i.e., “took,” AV) becomes *paraleben* (R & P & NU Text); at Matt. 1:25 where *eteke* (Scrivener i.e., “she had brought forth,” AV) becomes *eteken* (R & P & NU Text); and at Matt. 1:25 where *ekalese* (Scrivener i.e., “he called,” AV) becomes *ekealesen* (R & P & NU Text).

Matthew 2.

In Matt. 2:7, *ekrisbose* (Scrivener, “enquired,” AV), has the optional “n” at the end in R & P & NU Text and so is *ekrisbosen*. So too in Matt. 2:8, *eipe* (Scrivener, “said,” AV) is *eipen*

(R & P & NU Text); in Matt. 2:14 *paralabe* (Scrivener, “took,” AV) is *paralaben* (R & P & NU Text); or *aneile* in Matt. 2:16 (Scrivener, “slew, AV) is *aneilen* (R & P and NU Text); *ekribose* in Matt. 2:16 (Scrivener, “he had diligently enquired,” AV) is *ekribosen* (R & P and NU Text); *pasi* in Matt. 2:16 (Scrivener, “all” in “all the coasts,”) is *pasin* (R & P); *ethele* in Matt. 2:18 (Scrivener, “would,” AV) is *ethelen* (R & P & NU Text); *eisi* in Matt. 2:18 (Scrivener, “they are,” AV) is *eisin* (R & P and NU Text); *tethnekasi* in Matt. 2:20 (Scrivener, “are dead,” AV) is *tethnekasin* (R & P and NU Text); and in Matt. 2:21 *parelabe* (Scrivener, “took,” AV) is *parelaben* (R & P and NU Text).

At Matt. 2:5, *outo* (Scrivener, “thus,” AV), has the optional “s” at the end in R & P and NU Text and so reads *outos*. In Matt. 2:23, Scrivener’s *Nazareth* (“Nazareth,” AV) found also in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle’s 21st edition (1952), is *Nazaret* in the MBT & NU Text (“Nazareth,” ASV).

Matthew 3.

In Matt. 3:2, *eggike* (Scrivener, “is at hand,” AV), has the optional “n” at the end in the R & P and NU Text, and so reads *eggiken*. In Matt. 3:4, *eiche* (Scrivener, “had,” AV) is *eichen* (R & P and NU Text); in Matt. 3:15, *eipe* (Scrivener, “said,” AV) is *eipen* (R & P and NU Text); and at Matt. 3:16, *eide* (Scrivener, “he saw,” AV) is *eiden* (R & P and NU Text).

Matthew 4.

In Matt. 4:2, *epeinase* (Scrivener, “he hungered,”), has the optional “n” at the end in R & P and NU Text and so reads *epeinasen*. So too, at Matt. 4:4, *eipe* (Scrivener, “he said,”) is *eipen* (R & P and NU Text); at Matt. 4:6, *arousi* (Scrivener, “they shall bear,” AV) is *arousin* (R & P and NU Text); at Matt. 4:16 and 4:18, *eide* (Scrivener, “saw,” AV) is *eiden* (R & P and NU Text); and at Matt. 4:17, *eggike* (Scrivener, “is at hand,” AV), is *eggiken* (R & P and NU Text). At Matt. 4:13, “Nazareth” (AV) is the same whether “*Nazareth*” (Scrivener & a sizeable minority Byzantine reading), or “*Nazaret*” (R & P).

Matthew 5.

At Matt. 5:5, *kleronomesousi* (Scrivener, “they shall inherit,” AV) has the optional “n” present and so is *kleronomesousin* (R & P and NU Text). At Matt. 5:11, *diqzosi* (Scrivener, “persecute,” AV) is *diqzosi* (R & P and NU Text); and *eiposi* (Scrivener, “shall say”) is *eiposin* (R & P and NU Text); at Matt. 5:15, *kaiousi* (Scrivener, “do men light,” AV) and *pasi* (Scrivener, “all,” AV), is *kaiousin* and *pasin* respectively (R & P and NU Text). In Matt. 5:12,16,19 *outo* (Scrivener, “so,” AV), has the optional “s” present at the end in the R & P and NU Text and so is *outos*; and *doxasosi* (Scrivener, “glorify,” AV) has the optional “n” present at the end and so is *doxasosin* (R & P and NU Text). So too, at Matt. 5:34 (once), 35 (twice) and 48 (once) *esti* (Scrivener, “it is,” or in vs. 48, “is” in “is perfect,” AV) is *estin* (i.e., four times, in the R & P and NU Text). At Matt. 5:46, *to auto poiouosi* (Scrivener, “the same”) is *to auto poiouosin* (R & P and NU Text). At Matt. 5:47 *outo* (Scrivener, “so,” AV), has the optional “s” and so reads *outos* (R & P).

At Matt. 5:23, Scrivener reads, “and there” (*kakei*). Von Soden says “and there” (*kai ekei*) is followed by all but one manuscript in the K group (although given the generalist nature of

his groups, this means the one itemized manuscript is representative of anything from just one K group manuscript up to c. 10% of K group); and this is the reading found in both R & P and H & F; who thereby here follow in the earlier footsteps of B & M. (Cf. App. 1, in Vol. 4, at Matt. 28:10.)

Matthew 6.

In Matt. 6:2,16, the optional “n” is (twice) found in R & P and NU Text which reads *apechousin*, but not in Scrivener’s *apechousi* (“they have”), and likewise at Matt. 6:5 (R & P); in Matt. 6:5 *phanosi* (“may be seen”) is *phanosin* (R & P and NU Text); at Matt. 6:7 *dokousi* (Scrivener, “they think”) *dokousin* (R & P and NU Text); at Matt. 6:8 *oide* (“knoweth”) is *oiden* (R & P and NU Text); at Matt. 6:16 *aphanosi* (“they may appear”) is *aphanosin* (R & P and NU Text); in Matt. 6:19 *diorussousi* (“break through”) and *kleptousi* (“steal”) is *diorussousin* and *kleptousin* respectively (R & P and NU Text); at Matt. 6:23,25 *esti* (“is” in “the light that is in thee,” and “Is not the life ...?”) *estin* (R & P and NU Text); and at Matt. 6:32b *oide* (“knoweth”) is *oiden* (R & P and NU Text).

At Matt. 6:24 Scrivener’s *mammona* (“mammon,” AV), is spelt in R & P and NU Text with one “m” as *mamona* (“mammon,” ASV).

Matthew 7.

At Matt. 7:6 the optional “n” is found in the R & P and NU Text, but not in Scrivener’s *kusi* (“dogs”); in Matt. 7:15 *eisi* (Scrivener, “they are”) is *eisin* (R & P and NU Text), and *endumasi* (Scrivener, “clothing”) is *endumasin* (R & P and NU Text); in Matt. 7:22 *erousi* (Scrivener, “will say”) is *erousin* (R & P and NU Text); in Matt. 7:24,26 *okodomese* (Scrivener, twice, “built”) is *okodomese* (R & P and NU Text); and in Matt. 7:25,27 *epese* (Scrivener, twice, “it fell”) is *epesen* (R & P and NU Text).

At Matt. 7:12,17 Scrivener’s *outo* (“so” vs. 12 or “Even so” vs. 17), has the optional “s” at the end in R & P and NU Text.

N.B., THIS IS THE LAST CHAPTER WHERE I AM COMPREHENSIVELY SHOWING THIS ISSUE OF OPTIONAL LETTERS (see comments *supra*). When I refer to them below, even if a word containing them are referred to as “MBT” it should be understood that they are probably R & P, and if a word not containing them is referred to as “TR” it should be understood that they are probably Scrivener’s Text; and that we do not know for sure what the actual MBT is for them.

Matthew 8.

In Matt. 8:4a, the optional “a” (alpha) is not found in Scrivener’s *all’* (“but”), but this is *alla* in R & P. Since this makes no difference to translation, on what basis can one say that the AV translators preferred, or considered the TR was Scrivener’s *all’*, rather than the MBT’s *alla*? Did some or all of them even have a considered opinion on the matter?

At Matt. 8:4c, Scrivener reads “*Moses* (Moses);” as does the majority texts of both Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). But the majority text of Burgon &

Miller (1899) reads, “*Mouses* (Moses).” Von Soden (1913) says the TR’s reading here is supported inside his K group by the subgroups Kx and Kr. Combined these two groups constitute c. 68-72% of K group (see commentary Vol. 2, at Matt. 20:15c), and thus the MBT. Burgon & Miller here erred in using a limited manuscript count with many corrupt texts in it. E.g., they say that here at Matt. 8:4c they included such manuscripts as *Codex Vaticanus*, *Codex Sinaiticus*, the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version, and the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version.

Appendix 3

Minor variants between the NU Text and Textus Receptus (or between Beza’s Text of 1598 and the TR) not affecting, or not necessarily affecting, the English translation.

Introduction.

The Definite Article

- a) *The Definite Article (“the”) in Matthew 4:21; 8:23; 9:1; 13:2; 14:22d.*
- b) *The Definite Article and eleos.*

The conjunctions, for instance, “de” (and) and “oti” (that).

Matthew 1-10 (in detail).

End of Matt. 1-10 (in detail).

Matt. 11-14 (some more notable variants).

Introduction.

I have sometimes extended reference in the detailed section on Matt. 1-10 to some Matthean passages outside Matt. 1-10 where this is in the context of discussing Matt. 1-10 e.g., the section of the definite includes some further examples. In leaving a host of discrepancies between the TR and / or Scrivener’s Text on the one hand, and the NU on the other hand to an appendix on Matt. 1-10 (in detail) and Matt. 11-14 (in general); and then not generally discussing them beyond this; on the basis that they do not affect, or do not necessarily affect English translation, I do not thereby wish to indicate that these are unimportant. Moreover, this is a general rule, not an absolute rule (e.g., in main commentary, Matt. 13:28b).

FOR THOSE STUDYING THE UNDERPINNING GREEK, THE MEANING CERTAINLY CAN HAVE SOME DIFFERENT SHADES OF MEANING EVEN THOUGH THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION IS THE SAME; and I *may* make some passing reference to this (e.g., Matt. 12:36). I have also been guided in these decisions by the way the English translations I cite have dealt with the passage. E.g., the difference between the indicative active future and subjunctive active aorist clearly affects English translations at Matt. 12:29, and so this is placed in the main commentary. By contrast, this same distinction has not affected these translations at e.g., Matt. 7:6 or Matt. 7:10 which are both included in this appendix. For those studying the Greek, the difference between the correct neo-Byzantine *Textus Receptus* and the incorrect neo-Alexandrian texts of the NU Text *et al* is certainly important. Nevertheless, constraints of space and time mean that I have already left out a large number of variants where both the TR and NU Text are in agreement; and so too, constraints of space and time mean that I think these variants of App. 3 are best placed in an appendix on Matt. 1-10 with relatively limited

or no specific comment.

After Matt. 1-10, I will still continue to discuss a *selection* of minor textual variants which I think are more important or noteworthy, when I think it appropriate to do so. But from Matt. 11 onwards, I will be leaving out the more comprehensive consideration of variants found in Matt. 1-10. When I quote the ASV (1901) *infra*, unless otherwise stated, this means that whether or not I specifically refer to the Westcott-Hort Greek NT Text of 1881 (W-H), the *American Standard Version's* underpinning W-H, has the same reading at this point as the NU Text.

Though such minor variants are not commonly referred to in a textual commentary, and indeed even I, have generally left reference of them to this Appendix on Matt. 1-10, nevertheless, when seeing these in overview, one is forcefully reminded by them that a certain type of copyist, typified by, though not limited to, the Alexandrian scribes, took it upon themselves to make stylistic “improvements” to the text when it took their fancy to do so. While such minor alterations do not affect, or do not necessarily affect, the English translation, “pride goeth” “before a fall” (Prov. 16:18), and they exhibit a tendency that then spills over into some “stylistic” changes that do affect the text. E.g., if deliberate, in Matt. 1, the desire to stylistically “improve” the sound or spelling of a name, ultimately led to changing some names in Matt. 1:7,8 (Asa) and Matt. 1:10 (Amon). (However, it is possible that in some instances of name changes, this was accidental i.e., an incorrect reconstruction of a name following a paper loss or presence of some substance on the text, e.g., an ink blotch, blurring the relevant letters, or unravelling an abbreviation like “DAD” / “ΔΑΔ” for “DAViD,” *supra*.)

Thus the failure to restrain such proclivities when wilful, though at first “seemingly harmless,” in time manifests itself in harmful form. Eve first looked at the forbidden fruit, then touched the forbidden fruit, and finally ate the “apple” (S. of Sol. 8:5 cf. Gal. 4:5), and then gave it to her trusting husband (Gen. 3:6). So too, while it is difficult to reconstruct the past and one cannot always be sure whether some changes were accidental or deliberate, nevertheless, it would seem that at least in some instances, the Alexandrian scribes first looked at the text with wilful intent to change it; then touched it in a way that did not alter its meaning with these type of minor stylistic alterations; but then finally ate the forbidden fruit of changing the meaning in e.g., Matt. 1:7,8 (Asa) and Matt. 1:10 (Amon). Like Eve giving the apple to Adam, they then gave their ideas to others who in the Alexandrian School continued these practices.

The Definite Article

a) The Definite Article (“the”) in Matthew 4:21; 8:23; 9:1; 13:2; 14:22d.

At Matt. 8:23, the UBS 3rd & 3rd corrected edition considered “that there is a considerable degree of doubt” as to “whether the text” reading, “*to ploion*,” translatable as “the boat” (ESV), i.e., “*to (the) ploion (boat)*,” and found e.g., in the majority Byzantine Text and Chrysostom (d. 407); or “the apparatus” reading, “*ploion*,” translatable as “a boat” (ASV), and found e.g., in Origen (d. 254) and Lectionaries 2378 (twice in two different readings), and 1968 (twice in two different readings) was “the superior reading.” Scrivener’s Text, like e.g., Stephanus (1550), reads, “*to ploion*,” and the AV reads, “a ship,” not “the ship.” The definite article is also omitted in a minority Byzantine reading of Matt. 9:1 (Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), *infra*.

In Latin, there is no specific definite article (“the”), although there are some rarely used indefinite articles (“a” / “an”), for instance, *unus* (see Matt. 9:18, *infra*) or *quidam*. E.g., in Matt. 5:18 we read of the Scriptures, than not “a” / “one” (Latin, *unus*) jot or “a” / “one” (Latin, *unus*) tittle shall pass away; or in Matt. 8:19 of “*unus* (a certain) *scriba* (scribe).” While “*quidam*” may mean “some” (e.g., Matt. 27:47; 28:11,17), it is used in e.g., Matt. 21:28 (Clementine Vulgate, following old Latin Versions, a, b, ff2, h, f, ff1, & c.), as “*Homo* (man) *quidam* (a / certain one)” i.e., “A man” or “A certain man.” The issue of whether one uses a definite article or indefinite article in translating the Latin, is thus usually left to a translator’s discretion.

E.g., an abuse of this discretion, has led some to argue that the Latin title first used (before the Reformation) by King Henry VIII, *Fidei Defensor* (abbreviated, *Fid. Def.* or *FD / fd*), and meaning, “Defender of the Faith,” might be reinterpreted from its Protestant Christian meaning (acquired after the Reformation), to some vague universalist religious meaning, “Defender of faith.” But this is unacceptable due to the fact that Latin, “*Fidei* (of the Faith) *Defensor* (Defender),” has historically been consistently translated into English as “Defender of the Faith,” which in e.g., the legal context of the monarch as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* is clearly its proper and intended meaning. This is the authoritative meaning of *Fidei Defensor* as seen e.g., in the fact that the Act of Uniformity (1662) made the King James Version (1611) the Authorized Version, stating that the “portions of holy Scripture ... are now ordered to be read according to the last Translation” i.e., the King James Version. In the Preface of the KJV, “the most high and mighty prince James,” is said “by the grace of God,” to be “King of Great Britain, [Brittany in] France, and Ireland, *Defender of the Faith*, etc.” (emphasis mine).

I include some reference to the Latin, *infra*, showing this discretion with respect to the definite article, and some variations in its use. E.g., at Matt. 8:23, the Latin Vulgate and Clementine Vulgate both read, “*navicula*,” which is translated as “a little ship” by Wycliffe (1380), but as “the boat” by the Douay-Rheims NT (1582).

The presence of the definite article in the Greek and / or English is disputed at Matt. 9:1 (omitted in a minority Byzantine reading; cf. Latin Vulgate and Clementine Vulgate reading, “*naviculam*,” translated as “a boat” by both Wycliffe, 1380, and the Douay-Rheims NT, 1582); 13:2 (Latin Vulgate and Clementine Vulgate reading, “*naviculam*,” translated as “a boat” by both Wycliffe, 1380, and the Douay-Rheims NT, 1582); 14:22d (omitted by Eusebius; the Latin Vulgate and Clementine Vulgate reading, “*navicula*,” is translated as “a boat” by Wycliffe, 1380, and “the boat” by the Douay-Rheims NT, 1582); and these are all translated in the AV as “a ship.”

In the Greek of Matt. 4:21, the definite article (i.e., “the”) proceeds the noun. At Matt. 4:21 where the presence of the definite article is not disputed in the Greek manuscripts, the Latin reads, “*navi*,” translated as “a ship” by both Wycliffe (1380), and by the Douay-Rheims NT (1582).

At Matt. 9:1 the definite article is the MBT reading, and given that St. Matthew usually (e.g., Matt. 4:23; 8:23,24; 14:22,32) though not always (see Matt. 14:24) includes the definite article, with no good textual argument against it the MBT here at Matt. 9:1 I consider it is the

correct reading³¹. Thus Matt. 9:1 is translated as “o (the) *plouo* (a ship),” i.e., “the ship” in Tyndale (1526). By contrast, is it translated as “*plouo* (a ship),” i.e., “a ship” on a “reconstruction” omitting the definite article in the Greek and thus agreeing with e.g., Origen, X 033 (10th century), and Lectionaries 2378 & 1968 where it is omitted? Or is there another explanation?

Sometimes the definite article is used for a generic class. I.e., rather than distinguishing one person or one thing from others, it acts to distinguish *one class* of objects from *other classes* of objects³². E.g., “an hireling” in John 10:12 has the definite article in Greek, “But he that is an hireling (*o misthontos*), and not the shepherd” etc. . Here Christ does not mean *one particular* “hireling,” but rather, hirelings *as a class* of people as opposed to the shepherd *as another class* of people. Though this isolation is important, paradoxically, it would be less literal in English to be overly literal, and translate it as, “the hireling.”

Since the definite article may be used to distinguish classes rather than objects, does this mean that this is how the AV (and Geneva Bible) translators understood the rendering of “o (-) *plouo* (a ship),” thus reading “a ship” in the Geneva Bible (1560) and AV? I.e., is the conceptualization the class of ships as opposed to e.g., the class of “chariots” (Acts 8:28,29,38; Rev. 9:9; 18:13). If so, did the AV translators consider the class of ships is here being viewed corporately as characterized by its common traits? Is this the meaning here at Matt. 9:1, with a focus on “depart out of their coasts” (Matt. 8:34) carrying a connotation like, “Get the ship out of here!”, i.e., in which “the ship” means any ship i.e., “a ship,” and hence the meaning in English of Matt. 9:1 being, “a ship”?

The definite article is also MBT at Matt. 8:23. So is the AV’s “in a ship” in e.g., Matt. 8:23, a reconstruction of the Greek with reference to Origen (an omission also found in Lectionaries 2378 & 1968)? The issue posed by “*en* (in)” (Matt. 4:21) or “*eis* (in)” (Matt. 8:23; 9:1; 13:2; 14:22) “to (-) *plouon* (ship)” Matt. 4:21 (MBT e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968); 8:23 (MBT e.g., W 032); 9:1 (MBT e.g., W 032); 13:2 (MBT e.g., E 07, F 09³³); 14:22d (MBT e.g.,

³¹ An example of scribes seeking to remove the definite article is found in Matt. 13:2 where von Soden says the reading “*to plouon*” is found in the K group, other than the Kr subgroup. In a K group of just under 1,000 manuscripts, Kr is c. 21% of K group (and on von Soden’s generalist group figures this means c. 90%-100% of them make this omission).

³² Young’s *Greek*, pp. 56,57.

³³ At Matt. 13:2 in W 032, there is a dot, followed by what appears to be an “O” at the end of line 8 (p. 44, Matt. 12:49-13:10), and on the next line, “PLOION.” It is possible that this dot is the faded remnant of a “T,” followed by an “O.” But I have examined the photographic facsimile of W 032 at Sydney University, a gift from Michigan University, USA, (and a photocopy of which I use for my work on this codex,) and the copy is not good enough to know if this is a faded “T,” so that the original would have to be inspected to make a final decision on it. (This is not an easy matter due to the fragility of the manuscript’s condition, evident to me when in March 2009 the Librarian at the Freer Gallery in Washington D.C., USA, allowed me to look at W 032, but not to go through its pages.) But *prima facie*, both the size of the paper space around the dot, and the following “O,” both indicate that on the presently available data, a paper fade of a “T” (tau) is a reasonable possibility.

twice in two different readings in Lectionary 2378; & Lectionary 1968) is found in the following question. Did the AV translators consider that in one or more of these passages, for instance, Matt. 9:1, the definite article properly precedes the noun in the original Greek, but considered it was redundant in English translation, and the general meaning in English is “a ship” rather than specifically “the ship”?

Or in one or more of these passages, did they reconstruct the original Greek from within the closed class of sources, to omit the definite article in these passages, and hence the reading they followed was, quite literally, “a ship” in the Greek?

As with all such questions, my position is that the MBT stands unless there is a clear and obvious textual argument against it. While that might *prima facie* seem to seal the case on this, and similar questions, in favour of the AV translators supporting the same reading as myself, the matter is not necessarily quite so simple. The nub of the problem is multi-faceted. Firstly, when the rendering into English is, or may be, the same either way, e.g., Matt. 9:1, *supra*, we do not know if they may have supported some kind of textual “trademark” variant that they took to mean the same thing in English translation. Secondly, there was always some level of variation between 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantines in the order of “under 400” differences (Moorman), and “according to Scrivener ..., there are ... 252 places in which Erasmus, Stephanus, Elzevir, Beza, and [the] Complutensian Polyglot disagree sufficiently to affect the English translation” (Cloud)³⁴. Thirdly, the AV translators may not have been unified on this matter. I.e., some might have, and others might not have. Furthermore, since they were not simultaneously printing a Greek NT text (or Hebrew OT text), they may not have given matured consideration to this matter. *The inclusion of the definite article at Matt. 4:21; 8:23; 9:1; 13:2; 14:22d is the MBT reading in all instances, and there being no good textual argument against it, I would agree with Scrivener that its inclusion is part of the Greek Received Text.*

The AV translates Matt. 4:21 as “a ship,” i.e., “And going on from thence, he saw other two brethren, James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother, in a ship (*τὴ πλοῖῳ*) with Zebedee their father, mending their nets, and he called them.” But in the parallel Gospel reading of Mark 1:19,20, the AV reads, “the ship,” i.e., “and when he had gone a little farther thence, he saw James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother, who also were in the (*τὴ*) ship (*πλοῖῳ*) mending their nets, and straightway he called them: and they left their father Zebedee” etc. (where the Vulgate and Clementine Vulgate read, “*navi*,” translated as “a boat” by Wycliffe, 1380, but as “the ship” by the Douay-Rheims NT, 1582). Comparative analysis of Matt. 4:21 and Mark 1:19 thus indicates that the AV translators regarded it as optional to use either “a ship” (Matt. 4:21) or “the ship” (Mark 1:19) in this context; and so for them the matter was not one of reconstructing the Greek text from within the closed class of sources. What was their basis for this?

³⁴ Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, “*Determining the representative Byzantine Text.”

Why e.g., is Matt. 4:21 is rendered as “a ship” (Geneva Bible, 1560, & AV, 1611) rather than “the ship” (Tyndale 1526). Notably, where the definite article exists it may best be untranslated as it is distinguishing one person or thing from others³⁵. Thus *where the definite article exists in Greek it is not always translated into English*. E.g., in Matt. 18:17, the definite article acts to isolate a particular person from a larger group, for “publican” is “*o* (the) *telones* (publican)” when Christ says, “let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican.” Here where the NU Text agrees with the TR, this may also be translated as “a tax collector” (ESV). Though this isolation is important, paradoxically, it would be less literal in English to be overly literal, and translate it with the definite article as, “the publican” (ASV).

Thus e.g., did the AV translators consider that at Matt. 4:21 the definite article was distinguishing one ship from a group of ships? If so, given the lack of any specific statement in the text about other ships being present, did this mean that for their purposes of English translation the AV translators considered that they had to either add lengthy italics i.e., “James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother, in the ship *that was in the midst of the other ships in dock*, mending their nets,” or simply render it “a ship”? If so, here and elsewhere, was this simply regarded as the best way to deal with a difficult translation issue with a minimalist usage of italics?

We thus see from the comparison of e.g., Matt. 4:21 in Tyndale (1526) and the AV (1611), that at times translators may be in some disagreement as to how to best render a passage.

In this context, let us also consider e.g., the traditionally entitled, “Sermon on the (*to*) Mount (*oros*);” from the words of Matt. 5:1, “*anebe* (he went up) *eis* (into) *to* (the) *oros* (mount).” This traditional title, might be taken to mean that *a particular* mountain was known as “*the* mountain” or “*the* mount.” Such a view among neo-Alexandrian translations is followed in the ASV which reads, “he went up into the mountain.” E.g., when I was privileged to visit Israel in 2002, I visited a number of sites around the Sea of Galilee including one site called, “the Mount of Beatitudes,” which *according to an uncertain tradition* is where Christ preached the Sermon on the Mount. A church now marks this site. While this mount is a picturesque site of a Christian church with a multiple arched veranda and a cross on top of its ornate dome³⁶, bending palm trees, and the Sea of Galilee in close site, the tradition identifying this as *the* mount that Jesus preached his Matt. 5-7 sermon on, is at best, uncertain. It nevertheless reflects a desire among Christians, or at least some Christians, to try and identify a definitive site for the words of Matt. 5:1.

However, in the Greek text of Matt. 5:1, the alternative view is that the definite article here isolates *one class* of geographic objects i.e., mountains, from *other classes* of geographical objects e.g., valleys and plains. This is the view found among neo-Byzantine text translators in the AV, which like Tyndale (1526 & 1534), Cranmer (1539) and the Geneva Bible (1557 & 1560) before it, translates Matt. 5:1 as Jesus going up “a mountain” i.e., otherwise unidentified.

³⁵ Young’s *Greek*, p. 56.

³⁶ Concerning my usage of the term “Christian” in these commentaries, see Commentary Vol. 1, Preface section “10) Miscellaneous Matters,” subsection “a) Christians: Professed Christians and True Christians.”

Among neo-Alexandrian text translations, this view is found in the NIV as, “he went up on a mountainside.”

This is clearly relevant to our discussion of Matt. 4:21; 8:23; 9:1; 13:2; 14:22d. In these passages, the TR rightly uses the definite article before “ship.” The issue of the definite article in most of these passages is a matter of dispute among neo-Alexandrians e.g., at Matt. 14:22d Tischendorf’s 2nd edition (1842) omits the definite article and criticizes Stephanus for having it; whereas Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72) does an about-turn and includes the definite article at Matt. 14:22d. Or Westcott and Hort’s Greek NT (1881) have the definite article at Matt. 4:21; 14:22d (as does the NU Text), and this is translated in the ASV as “the boat;” whereas W-H lack the definite article at Matt. 8:23 (unlike the NU Text); 9:1 (like the NU Text); 13:2 (like the NU Text), and this is translated in the ASV as “a boat.” These ASV translations of the Westcott-Hort Text manifest its uncommendable overly simplistic approach to its commendable goal of formal equivalence.

One view is that here at Matt. 4:21; 8:23; 9:1; 13:2; 14:22d, the definite article isolates or specifies a particular ship i.e., this was “*the* ship,” presumably belonging to one or more of the disciples. If so, it is called, “the ship,” something like a man and his wife, and their children, refer to “the car” i.e., “the” family “car” is “*the* car,” as opposed to other cars. The other view is that the definite article here isolates *one class* of objects i.e., ships or boats as modes of transport, from *other classes* of transport e.g., horse drawn chariots or harnessed donkeys.

Hence at Matt 9:1; 13:2; 14:22d the AV translates this as “a ship,” as did Tyndale (1534), Cranmer (1539), and the Geneva Bible (1557 & 1560) before them; and for Matt. 13:2, 14:22d by Tyndale (1526), although this is rendered at Matt. 9:1 as “the ship” by Tyndale (1526). At Matt. 4:21, though Tyndale (1534) and Cranmer (1539) translated this as “the ship;” the Geneva Bible (1557 & 1560) and AV (1611) translated this as “a ship.” At Matt. 8:23, though the Geneva Bible (1557 & 1560) translated this “the ship;” Tyndale (1526 & 1534), Cranmer (1539), and the AV translate this as “a ship.” None of these translations used footnote alternative readings, and the fact that in Matt. 4:21, the Geneva Bible (1557 & 1560) and AV translate this as “a ship,” but at Mark 1:19, the Geneva Bible (1557 & 1560) and AV (like Tyndale 1526 & 1534 and Cranmer), translate this as “the ship,” may thus be taken to mean these are the Geneva Bible (1557 & 1560) and AV (1611) equivalent to footnote alternative readings i.e., they were not dogmatic on the issue as to whether or not these passages refer to “a ship” or “the ship,” and evidently saw some merit in both views. Did they wish to create some English difference mirroring a wider stylistic difference between Gospel writers here?

Since the issue of whether or not the definite article does or does not exist at Matt. 4:21; 8:23; 9:1; 13:2; 14:22d; does not one *necessarily* affect English translation, since there is a complex interplay here of different views as to how to render or not render the definite article if present, I shall not discuss these TR and NU text variants in detail in the main part of this commentary. *I now leave further study of the issues posed and raised by Matt. 4:21; 8:23; 9:1; 13:2; 14:22d to the reader’s study.*

In Greek, the definite article, “the,” is so named because it limits or specifies a function of the noun i.e., making it definite. E.g., in John 10:7,9, Jesus says, “I am the (*ἡ*) door (*thurā*);” and in John 14:6, “Jesus saith unto him, I am the (*ἡ*) way (*odos*), the (*ἡ*) truth (*alētheia*), and the (*ἡ*) life (*zōē*): no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.” Scripture here teaches that Jesus Christ is

not simply *a* “door,” or *a* “way” or *a* “truth” that one may come to God by, i.e., making e.g., various Greco-Roman pagan religions, or contemporary heathen religions such as Hinduism or Buddhism, or infidel religions such as Mohammedanism, simply an alternative “door” or “way” or “truth;” but rather, the definite article limits or specifics the function, so that Christ is “*the* door,” “*the* way,” and “*the* truth.” Thus there can be no other “door” or “way” to God e.g., through the Roman Catholic’s “co-mediator” (or in the feminine declension sometimes used in Mariolatry, “co-mediatrix,”) of Mary, or any other so called “Saint mediator” that Roman Catholics (or those following their Romish teachings such as semi-Romanist Eastern Orthodox or Puseyites) “invoke,” because Christ is “the (*ē*) door (*thura*),” not simply *a* door. Thus “by” Christ “if any man enter in, he shall be saved;” for he is “the (*ē*) way (*odos*),” not simply, *a* way, and “*no* man (*oudeis*) cometh unto the Father, but by” “Jesus” (John 10:7,9; 14:6). (Cf. I Tim. 2:5; Heb. 12:24.) The Greek here is clear, and it supports the teachings of Protestant Christianity against all comers.

When the definite article is absent, context must determine whether or not the noun is or is not definite. E.g., in Matt. 22:19, we read, Jesus says, “Shew me the tribute money. And they brought unto him a penny (*denarion*).” Here, the lack of the definite article shows that the “penny” (or denarius) was *not* a special penny, it was simply, “a penny” (Matt. 22:19), like any other penny.

By contrast, in John 1:1 we read, “In the beginning was (*ēn*) the Word, and the Word was with God (*ton Theon*), and the Word was God (*Theos*).” Some rightly note a similarity between John 1:1 and Gen. 1:1. But whereas Gen. 1:1 states, “In the beginning God created;” John 1:1 here *does not*, as the Arian heretics claim, say the Word was created “in the beginning;” but rather, it says the Word (or Son) “was (*ēn*)” already there, i.e., co-existing with God the Father, “in the beginning.” Having first isolated “God” by saying, “the Word was with God (*ton Theon*),” it follows, that even though the definite article is not present on the next “God,” it must be to this same Supreme Being that the words refer, “and the Word was God (*Theos*).” (Cf. John 1:15 where John Baptist says, “He that cometh after me,” though Christ was born six months after him, “was before me,” 5:18; 8:58; 10:30; 20:28,29³⁷.) This shows a plurality of Divine

³⁷ The Son is “without father” as touching his humanity; and “without mother” as touching his Divinity. Thus as symbolically typed by “Melchisedec, king of Salem,” he is “without father, without mother,” and has no “beginning of days” (Heb. 7:1,3). I.e., he is “from everlasting” (Micah 5:2).

Persons, i.e., the Father and the Son, (and from later passages such as John 14:26; 15:26; also the Holy Ghost,) being part of the *one* Supreme Being of God i.e., three Persons and one God. Thus there is no justification for Arian heretics such as those of the Jehovah's Witness cult, to translate John 1:1 in their *New World Translation* (1961) as the Word being "a god."

The Jehovah's Witnesses' translation of John 1:1 is a denial of the Divinity of Christ, further safeguarded in e.g., John 20:28, where, "Thomas" "said unto him, My Lord and my God."

Moreover, I recall e.g., three times during the four months I was living at Sydenham alone (Oct. 05-Feb. 06), on my longer six months fourth trip to London (Oct. 05-April 06), how I was approached by Jehovah's Witnesses: in a London bus, at a Sydenham bus stop, and at the Crystal Palace shops. As I have repeatedly pointed out to such members of the Jehovah's Witnesses cult who have approached me, the gospels record that John the Baptist *prepared the way for Christ* in fulfilment of Isa. 40:3, "Prepare ye *the way of the Lord*, make his paths straight" (Matt. 3:3; Mark 1:3; Luke 3:4; John 1:23). But if one looks at Isa. 40:3, "the Lord" is "Jehovah," and so *Jesus is Jehovah!*

I have also defended the Deity of Christ and Trinity against Mohammedan infidels. Unlike the Jehovah's Witnesses who have approached me in an entirely "off the cuff" manner, I have generally found the Mohammedans to follow a threefold *modus operandi*. Firstly, they do not like the Jehovah's Witnesses operate with specific proselytizers roaming the streets and public places. Rather, in a context like the workplace, they wait to see some indicator that a person is "a religious type" e.g., a general comment about, or reference to, "God" or "church." As one who sometimes makes these kind of comments, I have found that in most, though not all instances, it is only then that the Mohammedans prepare to go to the second tier of their more conversational approach. They wait for a more private context when others cannot hear and then ask me something like, "Are you a Christian?" or "What religion are you?"

When they know for sure I am a Christian, I have found the third tier of their methodology to *almost always* be some kind of attack on the doctrine of the Trinity³⁸. Their anti-Trinitarian methodological approach generally takes one of two forms. One approach is to try and pour ridicule on the idea of the incarnation, which they do by first focusing on the nativity scene of Christ in the manger, and then saying of the Christ child something like, "Do you believe a baby can be God?" or "How can a baby be God?" And the other approach has been to say that the 3:1 (3 Persons in one God) element of the Trinity "does not make sense." This reflects false teachings in Mohammedan's *Koran* e.g., "It beseemeth not a man [i.e., Christ], that God should give him the Scriptures and the Wisdom, and the gift of prophecy, and that then he should say to his followers, 'Be ye worshippers of me, as well as of God'" (Sura 3:73); or "And they [Christians] say, 'God hath a Son:' No!" (Sura 2:110); or "This is Jesus, the son of Mary; ... It beseemeth not God to beget a Son" (Sura 19:35,36); or "Is it not a falsehood ..., when they say 'God hath begotten'? They are indeed liars" (Sura 37:151,152); or "The Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary, is only an apostle of God ... Believe therefore in God ..., and say not, 'Three:' (there is a Trinity) ... God is only one God ..." (Sura 4:169); or "the Christians ... say, 'God is the

³⁸ The most common pork product I eat are slices of cold ham e.g., a ham salad. Only once did a Mohammedan use an approach of trying to persuade me that pork and pork products are "dirty" and bad, in which he repeatedly used the terminology, "Get off the pork! Get off the pork!"

Messiah, Son of Mary,' They ... who say 'God is the third of three:' ... if they refrain not from what they say, a grievous chastisement shall light on ... them ..." (Sura 5:73,76,77)³⁹.

I have responded to such Mohammedans with regard to both the issue of Christ being *fully God* and *fully man* (Incarnation); and also the fact that there are *three Divine Persons* in the *one Supreme Being* (Trinity). But in the end, having sown the seeds of Biblical Christian truth, I have then left the matter to God to impress them with the power of his Holy Spirit in accordance with his holy will. The heretical Jehovah's Witnesses in a number of ways remind me of the infidel Mohammedans. Both come from an Arian root; and both seek to impose old Jewish dietary rules (Jehovah's Witnesses follow Jewish rules against eating blood, Lev. 17:10,11; Mohammedans follow Jewish rules against eating "the swine" in Lev. 11:7, and some form of the Jewish blood rules of Lev. 17:10,11, in their "halal" food rules⁴⁰). The Mohammedan's ascetic prohibition on the moderate consumption of alcohol is also well known. To Jehovah's Witness and Mohammedan alike our response must be the same. "Let no man ... judge you in meat, or in drink" (Col. 2:16); but rather, let our focus be on "Christ" (Col. 2:17,20), "For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (Col. 2:9).

This teaching of Christ's Divinity is one element of the meaning of "Lord" in the *Apostles' Creed*, which says in Articles 1 & 2, "I believe ... in Jesus Christ ... our Lord." For one cannot truly say, "Jesus is the Lord" (I Cor. 12:3) in the Biblical sense, without recognizing his Divinity (I Cor. 8:5,6); as more fully stated in the *Nicene* and *Athanasian Creeds*. We cannot doubt the accuracy of the AV's translation of John 1:1, "In the beginning was (*en*) the Word, and the Word was with God (*ton Theon*), and the Word was God (*Theos*)."

Likewise at Matt. 27:54, there is no definite article (*o*) before "Son" (*Yios*) in, "*alethos* (Truly) *Theou* (of God) *Yios* (Son) *en* (was) *outos* (this man)."

However, contextually, this is a statement of faith by the centurion, giving an example which with the enablement of the Holy Ghost is designed to elicit faith from the listener of this Gospel, so that he likewise recognizes that Christ is the Son of God. Hence it should be translated, "Truly this was the Son of God" (AV). It stands in contrast to those of disbelief, who mockingly said, (also without the definite article before "Son,") "If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross" (Matt. 27:40), and "He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him: for he said, "I am the Son of God" (Matt. 27:43). In this sense, the centurion's statement of faith in Matt. 27:54, is further comparable with Matt. 14:33, which also lacks the definite article before "Son" i.e., *Yios* not *o Yios*, in, "thou art the Son of God."

Therefore the centurion's statement of faith in Matt. 27:54 is an early instance of that truth which we find in Articles 1 & 2 of the *Apostles' Creed*, "I believe in God the Father ..., and in Jesus Christ his only Son ... ;" and Section 1 of the Reformation Motto, "*sola fide*" (faith alone), showing saving faith in Christ. While the correct reading of Matt. 27:54 is retained in the

³⁹ *The Koran*, translated by J.M. Rodwell (1861 & 1876), 1909 Everyman's Library edition, *op. cit.*, pp. 84 (Sura 37:151,152); 120 (Sura 19:35,36); 350 (Sura 2:110), 393 (Sura 3:73), 428 (Sura 4:169) & 494 (Sura 5:73,76,77).

⁴⁰ See Mohammedan prohibitions on eating "blood, and swine's flesh" in the *Koran*, *op. cit.*, pp. 356 (Sura 2:168) & 485 (Sura 5:4).

main text of the RSV, NRSV, and ESV, footnotes in the RSV, NRSV, and ESV claims Matt. 27:54 may also be rendered without the definite article before, and capitalization of, *Son*. E.g., the RSV and ESV footnote alternative reading is the same, and the ESV reads, “Truly this was a son of God” (ESV fn). Moffatt gives only this rendering, reading, “This man was certainly a son of God!” (Moffatt Bible). The footnote reading at Matt 27:54 in the RSV, NRSV, and ESV, and the only reading at Matt. 27:54 in the Moffatt Bible, is a blasphemous denial of an important Scripture relevant to both *the purpose* that St. Matthew’s Gospel was written for, namely, to illicit faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God; and also the protection of this truth in the *Reformation Motto* and the *Apostles’ Creed*.

The Definite Article

b) The Definite Article and eleos.

God’s “grace” (e.g., Rom. 3:24; 4:14,16; Eph. 2:8) refers to his *unmerited favour*, and God’s “mercy” (e.g., Rom. 9:23; 11:30) refers to his *compassion* (Rom. 9:15); but in some Scriptures the two concepts are intertwined (Isa. 55:3; Matt. 12:7)⁴¹. At Matt. 9:13a, the translation is “mercy” (AV & ASV) from “*eleos* (accusative singular neuter noun, from *eleos-ous*)” (NU Text), or “*eleon* (accusative singular masculine noun, from *eleos-ou*)” (TR). The NU Text reading is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts and leading Western Text. The TR’s “*eleon*” is supported by the MBT (e.g., Lectionary 2378 with variant spelling, “*elaion*,” and Lectionary 1968,) and St. Basil the Great. With no good textual argument against it, the Majority Byzantine Text (MBT) reading stands sure.

So too at Matt. 12:7; quoting Hosea 6:6, the TR’s “*Eleon* (mercy) *thelō* (I will have),” has the support of the MBT, Origen and St. Chrysostom. There is no good textual argument against the MBT, which is thus correct. It is translated the same into English from the two leading Alexandrian texts and leading Western Text, also followed by Origen, as the NU Text’s “*Eleos* (mercy) *thelō* (I will have).” Origen uses both forms, and in all likelihood was the originator of this variant. Both may be rendered, “I will have mercy” (AV) or “I desire mercy” (ASV).

At Matt. 23:23, this time with the definite article, the TR reads, “*ton (-) eleon* (mercy),” in the words, “judgment, mercy, and faith.” This is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968, from Cyprus, p. 148a), and supported by e.g., the holy and learned Bishop Epiphanius (d. 403), Bishop of Salamine in Cyprus. There being no good textual argument against it, it is surely the correct reading. However, following the two leading Alexandrian texts and leading Western Text, the NU Text reads, “*to (-) eleos* (mercy),” which nevertheless, means the same thing.

The Greek *eleous-ous*, *to*, here used thrice in the NU Text, is a third declension neuter noun. Liddell & Scott’s *Greek-English Lexicon*, refer to instances where it is so regarded. E.g., in classical Greek in Polybius’s *Historicus* 1:88:2 (2nd century B.C.); or in the OT Septuagint Greek of Gen. 19:19 (LXX) or Ps. 17:7 (LXX).

The Greek *eleos-ou*, *o*, here used thrice in the TR, is a second declension masculine noun.

⁴¹ See Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, pp. 71-2 (“The grace of God”) & 72 (“The mercy of God”).

Liddell & Scott also refers to instances where it is so regarded. E.g., in classical Greek in Polybius's *Historicus* 33:11:3 (2nd century B.C.), or Agartharchides' *Geographus* 83 (2nd century B.C.); and in the OT Septuagint Greek of Ps. 84:11, "For the Lord loves mercy (*eleon*, accusative singular) and truth" (LXX).

This diversity raises an interesting abstract question of Greek grammar theory, "Who determines whether *eleon* is a second declension masculine noun or a third declension neuter noun anyway?" (Cf. comments on Latin *fructus* at Matt. 3:8 commentary).

It is surely notable that in classical Greek, Polybius's *Historicus* uses both forms, and likewise, in OT Septuagint Greek, both forms are used, *supra*. This same interchangeability is also found in NT Greek. On the one hand, there are some occasions where the *Textus Receptus* clearly regards *eleos* as a second declension masculine noun, using the accusative form, *eleon*, from *eleos-ou* (Matt. 9:13; 12:7; 23:23; Titus 3:5; Heb. 4:16). But on the other hand, there are some occasions where the *Textus Receptus* clearly regards *eleos* as a third declension neuter noun, using the genitive form, *eleous*, from *eleos-ous* (Luke 1:54,78; Rom. 9:23; 15:9; Jas. 3:17).

Given that both forms clearly existed in NT Greek, and given that the nominative singular form of both *eleos-ou* and *eleos-ous* is *eleos*, raises the question of which declension is being used when the nominative singular form *eleos* appears in the NT? In at least some instances, we can determine this through reference to the definite article. As seen in the readings at Matt. 23:23, where the second declension masculine form, *eleos-ou* is used, the definite article, if present, is masculine i.e., "*ton (-) eleon* (mercy)" for the accusative (Matt. 23:23, TR), or *o eleon* for the nominative singular. Alternatively, where the third declension neuter form, *eleos-ous*, is used, the definite article, if present, is neuter i.e., "*to (-) eleos* (mercy)" for the accusative (Matt. 23:23, NU Text), or *to eleos* for the nominative singular.

In the TR of Luke 1:50,58; 10:37, the reading is "*to eleos*" and so "mercy" here is clearly being treated as a third declension neuter noun. While the definite article is absent in Luke 1:72 which simply reads, "*eleos*," the presence of the neuter definite article in Luke 1:50,58 is a sufficient qualification to say that this is surely how it should be also regarded in Luke 1:72. So likewise, even though Jude 2 reads, "*eleos*," the presence of the definite article in Jude 21 which reads, "*to eleos*," is once again a sufficient qualification to be able to reasonably say that both occurrences in the Book of Jude (Jude 2,21) should be regarded as third declension neuter nouns.

But where there is no other indicators such as a participle or adjective (participles like adjectives, agree with nouns in gender, number, and case), or definite article, how should one regard *eleos*? *Though the matter does not affect English translation*, the reader interested in pursuing this issue of Greek grammar further may e.g., wish to consult Liddell & Scott or other Greek lexicons, or consider the usage of, "*eleos*," in Gal. 6:16; I Tim. 1:2; II Tim. 1:16,18; Titus 1:4; Jas. 2:13 (2); I Peter 1:3; II John 3.

The conjunctions, for instance, "de" (and) and "oti" (that).

A conjunction is a link-word. In Greek it links different words, different clauses, or different sentences. There are *coordinating conjunctions* and *subordinating conjunctions*. The Greek "*kai*" or "*de*" are coordinating conjunctions, and coordinating conjunctions can connect different words, clauses, etc., without thereby implying any particular relationship of structural

rank between what is being connected. By contrast, Greek *oti* is a subordinating conjunction, and subordinating conjunctions are used to connect a dependent clause to its main independent clause.

The Greek conjunction, “*de*” means e.g., “and” or “but.” It may be sometimes left untranslated e.g., for reasons of English literary style. E.g., at Matt. 8:1, “When (*de*) [-] he was come down from the mountain” etc, not “But (*de*) when he was come down from the mountain” etc. . Or it may be translated e.g., at Matt. 4:4, “But (*de*) he answered and said” etc. .

At e.g., Matt. 3:1, the “*de*” is MBT, and found in Scrivener’s text i.e., untranslated in the AV, “*En (in) de (-) tais (the) emerais (days) ekeinai (those),*” i.e., “In those days” (AV) etc., although “*de (-)*” is omitted as a minority Byzantine reading. I shall not generally enter into textual analysis of such passages but simply note that in such instances, whether present or not, it forms no necessary component of English translation.

However, at times the matter may be the source of great debate. E.g., in the OT, the Hebrew “*v*” (*vav / ו*) likewise means “and,” “then,” etc., i.e., “And (*v*) the earth was without form” etc. . It is found at Gen. 1:2 in the Greek Septuagint (LXX) as *de*; and in the Latin Vulgate as *autem*. Its removal by e.g., the NASB and NKJV is an unwarranted omission, seemingly driven by theological reasons, namely, to prevent gap school creationists using the verse.

Article 1 of the *Apostles’ Creed* says, “I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth” (Acts 17:24). The *Nicene Creed* says “God the Father Almighty” is “maker of heaven and earth;” “all things were made” “by” the “Son of God;” and “the Holy Ghost” is the “giver of life” i.e., creation was a Trinitarian process (Gen. 1:2,26). On the one hand, orthodoxy requires a belief in creation not macroevolution, and acceptance of the infallibility, and thus absolute reliability and accuracy of Genesis 1-3 (and indeed all of Scripture). But on the other hand, the orthodox historically disagree on some elements of interpretation in Genesis 1-11.

There are three broad circles of agreement and disagreement on my understanding of Genesis 1-11. *The first broad area is agreed to by all orthodox (and some unorthodox) i.e., creation not macroevolution.* This is relevant to e.g., the creation of Adam and Eve as the parents of the human race, the fall, the anthropologically universal nature of Noah’s flood, and the authority of Scripture. *The second area is one that some orthodox agree with me on, and some do not, namely, that there is a gap in time between the first two verses of Genesis.* The Hebrew “*yowm*” for “day” can mean a 24 hour “day,” or a longer period of “time” e.g., “the time (*yowm*) that he reigned ... was forty years” (II Chron. 29:27); and with the Lord 1000 years are as a day or “a watch in the night” (Ps. 90:4; II Peter 3:8). But in the context of Gen. 1:2b-2:3, literal 24 hour days are required by the Gen. 1 phrase, “the evening and the morning;” and also because this explains why we work 6 days and rest every 7th day (Exod. 20:8-11). Indeed, this is MORE LITERAL than the young earth view since to have “the evening and the morning” of the first 3 days requires the sun was made in Gen. 1:1; and so the sun, moon, and stars of the 4th day were made as in Job 9:7,9 (cf. Isa. 45:7) i.e., “set” means “appointed” (Hebrew *nathan*, Gen. 1:17; I Chron. 6:48) after some “darkness” caused by thick clouds (Gen. 1:2,7), not fully lifted till the 4th day. But at Gen. 2:4 when we read of “the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created (Hebrew, *bara*)” NOT evolved, “in the day (*yowm*) that the Lord made the earth and the heavens,” since there is no such limitation device as “the evening and the

morning,” I consider this “day” of Gen. 2:4 elucidating on Gen. 1:1, which existed before Gen. 1:2b, was evidently a long period spanning many “generations” (Gen. 2:4) and including a succession of multiple “worlds” / ages (Heb. 1:2; 11:3). Church history (e.g., Ronald Number’s *The Creationists*, California University, USA, 1992) indicates that for much of the 19th and 20th centuries, far more orthodox (and some unorthodox) agreed with me on this view than is presently the case.

The third area is one that Church history indicates very few orthodox have ever agreed with me on, namely, that the creation of Gen. 1:2b-2:3 is a local creation of Eden (Gen. 2:10); Noah’s Flood was anthropologically universal *but geographically local* to a portion of south-west Asia, that there are gaps in the Hebrew genealogies spanning Adam back tens of thousands of years (when Gen 5 & 11 say x begot y, I think y sometimes means x’s descendant further removed than an immediate son as seen by the absence of Cainan in Gen. 11, cf. Luke 3:36, Heb. 7:5,9,10); and that the Tower of Babel story in Gen. 11:1-9 refers to the local linguistic creation of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Babylonian (the full number of Middle East languages is not specifically stated) from Sumerian under King Nimrod (Sargon I). In this I consider that civilizations of the 3rd to 5th millennia B.C. *type* much earlier and long lost civilizations now under the waters of the Persian Gulf (which is where I think the Sumerians came from as the waters of the Persian Gulf rose following the end of the last great ice age). E.g., I consider a local Mesopotamian flood of the 3rd millennia B.C. symbolically types the much earlier Noah’s Flood⁴².

Thus some orthodox brethren follow the gap school creationist view that Gen. 1:1 refers to the creation of the universe’s heavens and a global earth; followed by a time gap of undisclosed duration between the first two verses of Genesis (cf. e.g., the gap to “and the day of vengeance of our God” in Isa. 61:1,2; Luke 4:18,19); either followed by a local deluge in Gen. 1:2, and then a local creation on the local earth under the local heaven of Eden’s world in six 24 hour days (minority gap school view, Pye Smith, Henry Alcock, *et al*)⁴³; or followed by a global deluge in Gen. 1:2, and then a global creation on the global earth under the global heaven of this present world in six 24 hour days (majority gap school view, Thomas Chalmers, William Buckland, *et al*). Other orthodox brethren take a non-gap school creationist view of Genesis 1, whether the Day-Age School (followed in contemporary times by Hugh Ross *et al*)⁴⁴, or the

⁴² See e.g., McGrath, G.B. (myself), “Old Earth Creationists,” *English Churchman* (7779) (6 & 13 Nov. 2009), p. 2; & McGrath, G.B. (myself), “Old Earth Creation,” *English Churchman* (7782) (18 & 25 Dec. 2009), p. 2.

⁴³ Was the larger region of Eden (containing the smaller inner sanctum of the Garden of Eden,) which constitutes the six day local creation of Gen. 1:2b-2:3, more the size of a great city like London (Greater London is c. 1,600 square kilometres or c. 600 square miles), or more the size of a country like England (which is c. 130,000 square kilometres or c. 50,000 square miles)? Given that its remains are now under the waters of the Persian Gulf, we simply do not know.

⁴⁴ My fellow old earth creationists of the Day-Age School say these days are long periods of time. I agree with Ross that the Hebrew word for “day” (*yowm*) can, and sometimes does mean, a long period of time e.g., “in that day” (Isa. 3:18; cf. Ps. 90:4; II Peter 3:8). Thus it means, and may reasonably be translated, “time” in e.g., Gen. 2:4; 26:8; 38:12 (so Gen. 2:4 // Gen. 1:1 as a long “day” / time with multiple “generations of the heavens and of the earth”). But I

Young Earth School (followed in contemporary times by Whitcombe and Morris's *The Genesis Flood, et al*⁴⁵).

It is one thing for e.g., the NASB and NKJV translators to not themselves subscribe to a gap school view of Gen. 1:2b-2:3. E.g., it is one thing for them not to subscribe to the view of "God made (Hebrew '*asah*) two great lights" and "the stars" on the fourth day (Gen. 1:14-19), as referring to a covering of clouds resulting from when God "commandeth the sun and it riseth not; and sealeth up the stars;" followed by when he "maketh (Hebrew '*asah*)" the stars by removing the cloud covering (Job 9:7,9; cf. Pss. 104:19,20; 147:8; Isa. 45:7) i.e., the sun, moon, and stars were created at Gen. 1:1. They may not agree with the gap man, Bob Jones Sr. (1883-1968), founder of Bob Jones University, South Carolina, USA, who said, "You can talk about how long it takes a ray of light to come from a distant star to this earth, and figure it out accurately God struck a match on the rock of his Omnipotence, and lighted that world from which that ray of light took millions of years to come to this earth⁴⁶."

consider context rules out this possibility for the creation days of Gen. 1:2b-2:3 (i.e., from, "and darkness was upon the face of the deep" etc.), since we read that each "day" had an "evening" and a "morning," this is a Hebrew idiom meaning 24 hours (cf. Dan. 8:14, where the AV's "days" is literally "evenings [and] mornings"). Moreover, Exod. 20:8-11 indicates 24 hour days, since God's example of working six 24 hour days, and then resting on the seventh 24 hour day, gives rise to the sabbath (cf. Gen. 2:1-3; Exod. 31:15,17). Re: "made" (Exod. 20:11), see gap man Arthur Pink's *Gleanings in Genesis* (1922, Moody Bible Institute, Illinois, USA, 1978, p. 11).

⁴⁵ Berkhof's *Systematic Theology*, pp. 155-60; 187-8 (Price). On the one hand, in the context of historically modern times dating from recent centuries, though not in times before this, I find the young earth creationist claims to be contrary to Biblical teaching requiring that we use reason or natural law that is subject to the Divine Revelation, but never contrary to the Divine revelation (e.g., Job 12:7,8; I Cor. 11:14). But on the other hand, I consider the Darwinian theory of macroevolution to also be ridiculous. The more thoughtful minds and more spiritually mature men, are now generally gone from colleges / universities and many other teaching positions, deprived of such positions by a system controlled by their intellectual and moral inferiors, and so these type of highly improbable views flourish among the secularist intellectual cripples of *the formally recognized, but by no means bona fide*, "academia." (I speak in relativistic terms, they are really intellectually intermediate, intellectually slothful, spiritually blinded in varying degrees, and part of a bad "group think" system.) In fairness to the young earth creationists, whose views with regard to the age of the earth and a global flood I repudiate, it is still possible for them to hold to the broad fundamental orthodox truths of Scripture from their paradigm, whereas this is not the case for those who embrace the Darwinian paradigm. Because I recognize that there are presently many intellectually and spiritually "weaker" brethren (Rom. 14 & I Cor. 8) who have embraced the young earth creationist institutes' propaganda, I exercise a certain tolerance towards suchlike, seeking to unite when and where appropriate on the big issues e.g., creation not macroevolution, the absolute authority of the Bible, man's common descent from Adam and the creation of Adam and Eve in a state of original righteousness with conditional bodily immortality, and a historical fall occasioning original sin and human mortality.

⁴⁶ Bob Jones Sr., star-light (WOT 318), *Word of Truth* (WOT), cassettes, Bob Jones University, Greenville, South Carolina, USA [c. 1950s].

A traditional Jewish chronology dates Adam at 3,760 B.C. (year starts Oct. 3,761 B.C.). Or on the well known Protestant chronology of the Anglican Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of Ireland, James Ussher (1581-1656), Adam is dated at 4,004 B.C. . Or if e.g., Abraham is dated to 2,206 B.C., then on the Septuagint's *prima facie* chronology of Gen. 5 & 11, Adam dates to 5,620 B.C. . It is one thing for e.g., the NASB and NKJV translators not to think that comparison of Gen. 11:12,13 with Luke 3:35,36 means that the Hebrew terminology, "And Arphaxad lived five and thirty years, and begat Salah" (Gen. 11:12), in fact means "Arphaxad" "begat" *the forbear of* "Salah," so that there are gaps in these (as in other Hebrew) genealogies of undisclosed generations.

It is one thing for e.g., the NKJV and NASB translators not to think that Ps. 105:8 teaches that the "covenant" of grace had been "commanded to a thousand generations" i.e., in about 1,000 B.C., there had to have been "a thousand generations" who had received the covenant of grace, of which "Abraham," "Isaac," and "Jacob" are three generations (Ps. 105:9,10); so that Adam must probably date to somewhere between about 35,000 B.C. to 70,000 B.C. . But it is another thing for them to pervert the Word of God to suit these ends. Whether or not he agrees with me (the matter is one of private interpretation and the orthodox greatly disagree with each other on certain elements of Gen. 1-11), let the reader consider my conclusion of Adam's date with respect to the following five matters: the 1,000 generations, the Sumerian King List, the regression of the Persian Gulf *c.* 70,000 years ago, the borders of Eden, and the anthropological data.

Firstly, the Biblical teaching of a thousand generations gives us more probable a *prima facie* date for Adam of somewhere between *c.* 35,000 B.C. to *c.* 130,000 B.C (although at its outer limits one might argue as low as *c.* 30,000 B.C. or as high as *c.* 157,000 B.C.)⁴⁷.

Secondly, I consider the Tower of Babel Story (Gen. 11:1-9) shows a strong historical connection between the Hebrews and Sumerians (see textual commentary at Matt. 1:23, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," "The Second Matter: Part C – Hebrew & Aramaic with respect to The Tower of Babel"). This means that it is reasonable to allow that Sumerian King Lists formed part of the extra-Biblical non-inspired generally available, accessible, and knowable

⁴⁷ In the genealogies of Gen. 11 the average age a father begat his first son in the nine generations listed from Shem to Terah's begetting of the 10th generation of Abraham (Gen. 11:10-26) was *c.* 43; and if one adds in Abraham who was 86 (Gen. 17:24,25) then this makes the average *c.* 48; but some were as young as 29 (Nahor, Gen. 11:23), 30 (Serug, Gen. 11:22), or 35 (Arphaxad, Gen. 11:12), and some were as old as 70 (Terah, Gen. 11:26) or 100 (Shem, Gen. 11:10). In the genealogies of Gen. 5 the average age a father begat his first son in the nine generations listed from Adam to Lamech begetting of the 10th generation of Noah (Gen. 5:3-31) was *c.* 117, but if one add in Noah who begat at 500 (Gen. 5:32), this makes the average age *c.* 156. Looking at this lower range of generations means I think we can say 1,000 generations covers from somewhere starting around 35,000 B.C. . Given that Noah's begetting at 500 was unusual, I think we can take the average of *c.* 117 to mean over 1,000 generations from *c.* 1,000 B.C. means we have an upper date of *c.* 120,000 B.C., although given the date on Noah one could always argue a "safer" upper date might be *c.* 130,000 B.C. (and one *could always insist* on an upper *possible date* of *c.* 157,000 B.C.).

historical date of the ancient OT world. The Sumerians were a racially broad-headed Mediterranean people who arrived in Sumer about 3,300-3,000 B.C. and assimilated the pre-existing Ubaid culture into their own.

The principal Sumerian king lists says there were 134 kings from the Flood to the eleventh king of Isin in 2,201 B.C. totaling 28,876 years (although an alternative tablet gives 139 kings and 25,063 years). This yields a Flood date of 31,077 B.C. (or on the alternative tablet, 27,264 B.C.). For example, Arpu reigned 720 years and Etan 635 years. The shortest reign was 410 years, and the longest reign was 1,200 years. Given the ages men lived in Gen. 5, 9, & 11, a reign of 1,200 years is *just possible* on the basis that the difference between an average man living to 70 and an unusual man living to 100 today gives a ratio of 7:10, and on this same ratio of 7:10 since Adam lived 930 years another could live 1,328 years, since Methuselah lived 969 years another could live 1,384 years, and since Noah lived 950 years another could live 1,357 years. Someone living to 100 years today is rare, and someone living on this ratio of 7:10 basis to over 1,300 years would also be rare, but since the post-flood Sumerian King classifies the 1,200 year reign as unusual this heightens the possibility that it *might* be correct.

The Sumerian King List then says that before the Flood there were ten antediluvian kings from Alorus reigning 120 *sars*, and a *sar* is 3,600 years so this is usually calculated to 432,000 years⁴⁸. But this *prima facie* figure cannot be correct since it outside the Biblical parameters which point to a more probable upper date of *c.* 130,000 B.C., and an absolute upper *possible date* of *c.* 157,000 B.C. . However, calendars sometimes change between solar and lunar reckonings. *And if the ten kings are understood as ten dynasties of kings, and if the pre-flood chronology is understood to be in lunar years rather than solar years, the Sumerian pre-flood dates fit within these Biblical limits, and hence become more credible.* Notably, a *sar* of 3,600 years is easily divisible by 12 lunar months, making about 300 solar years. Thus 432,000 lunar years is approximately 36,000 solar years or (multiplying 36,000 by 360 and dividing by 365.2442) more precisely 35,483 years and some months. When added to the Sumerian flood date of 31,077 B.C., this would date the first Sumerian king, Alorus, to 66,560 B.C. (or on the alternative flood date tablet, 62,747 B.C.).

The discrepancy between the rival Sumerian King Lists illustrates both that perfectly accurate records were not kept by the Sumerians, and also that the approximate dates given in both tablets are fairly close and therefore these rough dates may be said to have been *to some extent* independently corroborated. If one concludes that the Sumerian King Lists as interpreted above are historically credible in broad terms, then the discrepancy between the two king lists is 3,813 years (the difference between Alorus at 66,560 B.C. or 62,747 B.C., or the Flood at 31,077 B.C. or 27,264 B.C.) i.e., about 4,000 years. This admitted error bar of *c.* 4,000 years is a two-edged sword, since it therefore means one must allow for the possibility of this error both ways i.e., a Flood date of *c.* 31,000 B.C. +/- 4,000 years; and a date for Alorus of *c.* 66,500 B.C. +/- 4,000 years.

Thirdly, at this point, the geological evidence becomes quite telling, for we know that

⁴⁸ Bury, J.B. *et al* (Editors), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 1923, 2nd edition, 1924, Vol. 1, pp. 150,152,365; Jacobsen, T., *The Sumerian King List*, Chicago University Press, Illinois, Chicago, USA, 1939.

about 70,000 years ago, or *c.* 68,000 B.C., there was a regression of the Persian Gulf *c.* 68,000 B.C. . I.e., from *c.* 70,000-17,000 years ago in most of the region that is now the Persian Gulf, there were continental conditions. The sea withdrew to the Hormuz Strait, and at maximum regression the basin was a large river carrying Tigris-Euphrates water directly into the Gulf of Oman. But there was a partial return of the sea, previously thought to be either *c.* 30,000-45,000 years ago (Fairbridge) or *c.* 25,000 years ago (Curry)⁴⁹; although more recent research has indicated the Persian Gulf waters' regression was interspersed by a relatively short-lived transgression of sea waters *c.* 29,400-22,800 years ago (Swift *et al*)⁵⁰.

If the waters covering the Persian Gulf for some tens of thousands of years before *c.* 68,000 B.C. are identified with the pre-Adamite flood of Gen. 1:2; then we have a reasonable correlation with the terminus of this pre-Adamite flood and the creation of the world of Eden (Gen. 2:10-14) in the area now under the Persian Gulf sometime around 70,000 years ago.

Fourthly, the topography of this area fits well with what we know of Eden. The plausibility of a Flood in this region has been shown by Olson, (although much later than my date,) who demonstrated the existence of two basins in the Persian Gulf, and during the late Ice Age the western basin had rich soil and sunshine⁵¹. On my Noachic Flood date of *c.* 35,000 B.C. (though possibly earlier, but clearly after the pre-Adamite flood ended *c.* 68,000 B.C.), the Persian Gulf which is fairly flat could have been flooded by both "rain" (Gen. 7:12), and also by God melting large amounts of ice age water to feed into the Shatt al-Arab and possibly other lesser routes into this area, so that these mighty gushing of waters meant "all the fountains of the great deep" were "broken up" (Gen. 7:11). Then after "the fountains ... of the deep and the windows of heaven were stopped, and the rain from heaven was restrained" (Gen. 8:2), "the waters returned from off the earth continually" (Gen. 8:30) as they flowed out the Gulf of Oman, in what, due to the lower sea levels caused by the Ice Age, was a one-way exit flow i.e., with no salt water coming back up to damage the soil of this region. (Of course, the pre-Adamite Flood of Gen. 1:2 was a salt water flood; but its withdrawal from the Persian Gulf saw the creation events of Gen. 1:2b-2:3, with God miraculously providing rich fertile soil for Eden, Gen. 1:9-13.

But no such miracles being found after the Noachic Flood must surely require that Noah's Flood was a fresh water flood.)

What of Gen. 2:10-14? At some point these seemingly connected into at least two "seas" in Eden (Gen. 1:22), which were *possibly* something like Lake Huleh and the Sea of Galilee in Israel (which in their instance both connect with the River Jordan). This means Eden's entrance water-way was connected to the Shatt al-Arab. Calmet has earlier argued in harmony with my

⁴⁹ Kessler, P., "The Structural & Geomorphic Evolution of the Persian Gulf," pp. 11-32, at pp. 24,32; in Purser, B.H. (Ed.) *The Persian Gulf*, Springer-Verlog, Berlin & New York, 1973.

⁵⁰ Swift, S.A. *et al*, "Gas venting and late Quaternary sedimentation in the Persian (Arabian) Gulf," *Marine Geology*, 129 (1996) 237-269.

⁵¹ Olson, W.S., "Has Science Dated the Biblical Flood?" *Zygon: Journal of Religion & Science*, Vol. 2, 1967, pp. 274-277. Olson's *Glacial Melt Theory* cannot be correct since it means the antediluvian's homeland remained "submerged under the waters of the Great Flood" (p. 277); but Gen. 8:3 says The Flood waters "returned" after The Deluge.

view that the description of this water-ways parting includes both its entrance and exit water-ways⁵². Thus the Pison was a southern exist route that flowed into the Gulf of Oman, Arabian Sea, and Red Sea. The Hebrew *sabab* in Gen. 2:11,13, meaning “compasseth” (AV) may be used figuratively, especially with reference to borders, to mean curve or turn round (Num. 34:4; Josh. 15:10; 19:14; 16:6). I.e., the waters from the Pison curved round the south-eastern, southern, and western sides of Arabia, and thus round Havilah in Arabia (Gen. 25:12-18; I Sam. 15:7)⁵³.

What of the Gihon? I consider this was an Edenic exit water-way. I.e., there were two exists from Eden, so that the waters of Gihon and Pison joined up in, or had already joined by the time they reached, the waters of the Arabian Sea. Thus as with the waters from the Pison, there can be no doubt the waters from the Gihon curved round the south-eastern, southern, and western sides of Arabia via the Gulfs of Oman, Masira, and Aden, and then into the Red Sea and Gulfs of Suez and Aqaba; and also southward at northern Somalia down the eastward side of Africa. I.e., opposite Biblical Ethiopia on the east of the Gihon’s waters in the Red Sea - comprising a joint Hamite-Semite western strip on Arabia (something like Alsace-Lorraine) from “Sheba” (Gen. 10:7b,21,28) in the “south” (I Kgs 10:1; Matt. 12:42), through “Midian” east of the Gulf of Aqaba (Gen. 25:1,2,6; Hab. 3:7 - where “Cushan” and “Midian” are placed in Hebraic poetical parallel; and Moses’ wife Zipporah is described variously as Midianite or Ethiopian, Exod. 2:15,16,21; Num. 12:1), and Havilah east of Egypt (Gen. 10:7a,21,29; 25:18); and Biblical Ethiopia comprising north-east Africa south of Egypt (Gen. 10:6,7a; Ezek. 29:10) i.e., west of the Gihon’s waters in the Red Sea below Egypt, and west and south of the Gihon’s waters in the Gulf of Aden around north Somalia. Thus the Gihon “compassed” around (Biblical) Ethiopia. Hence the intermingling of the waters from the Pison and Gihon to form a joint Pison-Gihon water-way “compassing” (what in Moses’ day were called) Havilah and Ethiopia; is contextually similar to the intermingling of Tigris-Euphrates waters in the Shatt al-Arab to feed the Edenic water-way.

⁵² Bailey, L.R., *Noah*, South Carolina University Press, 1989, p. 80. Calmet considered an Edenic exist water-way divided into the Gihon and Pison, and thereafter they both flowed into the Persian Gulf.

⁵³ How far Havilah extended in a southerly direction on Arabia is uncertain. North of Mecca, gold has been mined a Mahd Al-Dhahab (c. 160 km or 100 miles S.E. of Medina) since the 2nd millennium B.C., and so it is a candidate for King Solomon’s Mines (I Kgs 9:26-28). Given the phenomenon of shared border regions, the fact that “Sheba, and Ophir, and Havilah” are mentioned together in Gen. 10:28,29 means that it is certainly possible that if Mahd Al-Dhahab is Ophir, it was on the southern border of Havilah - a fact also consistent with the more southerly Queen of Sheba hearing about Solomon (IKgs 9:26 - x. 13). Further north, gold has also been found at Sukhaybarat (about 300 km or 185 miles east of Medina.) (Peterson, J.E., *Historical Dictionary of Saudi Arabia*, Scarecrow Press, USA, 1993, pp. 96-97). Thus both Mahd Al-Dhahab and Sukhaybarat must also be candidates for “Havilah ... gold” (Gen. 2:11). If “bdellium” (AV & NASB) means “pearls” (NIV ftn.), then the far east of Havilah in a post-flood period well after Adam’s and Noah’s times would have contained “pearls,” since the Persian Gulf contains the relevant mollusks. However, it is possible that pearls were found elsewhere in Havilah at an earlier time; or if Mahd Al-Dhahab is both Ophir and the source of Havilah gold, then the “precious stones” there (I Kgs 10:11) might have included “bdellium” and/or “onyx” (Gen. 2:12); or “aromatic resin” (Gen. 2:12, NIV) might have come from Ophir or elsewhere.

It might also be observed that “the mountains of Ararat” (Gen. 8:4), on this view refer to the Ararat Mountain range which joins the Zagros mountains, and their foothills would, on this view, reach into what is now the Persian Gulf region. I.e., the later distinction between the Ararat Mountain Range and the Zagros Mountain range did not exist, and they were all simply called, “the mountains of Ararat” (Gen. 8:4)⁵⁴. This in broad terms is therefore the date and place that I would put Adam.

Fifthly, a flood date of c. 35,000 B.C. or 37,000 years ago, with man then spreading out, also fits well with the anthropological data such as we have it. E.g., I think the evidence for so called “Cro-Magnon” man being Adamite is very strong, and his appearance about 35,000 years ago or c. 33,000 B.C., fits a flood date of about 2,000 years earlier, which was anthropologically universal, but geographically local to the Persian Gulf. Cro-Magnoids are not some “missing link” in “human evolution,” but are still alive and well today. A relatively pure Cro-Magnoid stock survived with the Cro-Magnoids of Spain’s Canary Islands. But after discovery by the Spanish, over about the last 600 years these Cro-Magnoids have intermarried with the Spanish, stereotypically European males marrying Canary Islander females. Indeed, Y chromosome human genome testing indicates over 90% of them have paternal lineages to European men, with only 10% retaining Cro-Magnoid paternal lineages. Both of these Cro-Magnoid groups had brown complexion (from the mixed race Spanish element), light blondish hair, and blue or grey eyes. These racial characteristics remain with a large number of contemporary Cro-Magnoid admixed Canary Islanders. The Canary Islander Cro-Magnoids sought at least some elements of God’s common grace (Rom. 1), for when the Spanish discovered them at the beginning of the 15th century A.D., they were found to be monotheistic. This is important in accounting for the lack of evidence of idols in early Cro-Magnon culture, that is, the Cro-Magnon’s originally worshipped God not idols (though either without altar worship, or with altars that have either not survived or not yet been discovered,) and hence the mother-goddess idols do not appear till a much later time. (This is a very different view to Darwinists and secular anthropologists who claim man first was an idolater and later became a monotheist, and who thus interpret the idolatry data as a commencement point of religious expression, rather than as a corruption of religious expression.) Another group of Cro-Magnoids are evident today in the cranial morphology of the Dal people from Dalarna (formerly Dalecarlia) in Sweden.

The Day-Age old earth creationist, Hugh Ross (b. 1945), (a Wesleyan Baptist member of Sierra Madre Congregational Church in California, USA,) is skeptical about such a proposition of man’s antiquity being this great (even though he allows a date of up to 60,000 years ago), and insists that one cannot absolutely prove spiritual expression by men earlier than about 24,000 years ago, i.e., c. 22,000 B.C., which is the date of a stone-age sanctuary in Spain⁵⁵. On the one

⁵⁴ See McGrath, G.B. (myself), “The Gap [School] ...,” *Perspective on Science and Christian Faith*, Vol. 59 (Dec. 2007), pp. 318-319; and other PSCF, *supra*.

⁵⁵ Ross, H., *The Genesis Question*, Navpress, Colorado, USA, 1998, 2nd edition 2001, p. 110,223. In the late 1980s and earlier 1990s Ross gave his outer limits for Adam and Eve as 6,000-50,000 years ago (*Species Development*, 1990, cassette recording, Reasons to Believe, Pasadena, California, USA; *Dinosaurs, Cavemen and the Fossil Record*, 1990, cassette recording Reasons to Believe, Pasadena, California, USA; & *The Flood*, 1990, cassette recording, Reasons to Believe, Pasadena, California, USA); and he gave his preferred dates of “10,000 and 35,000

hand, I agree with Ross that religiosity is a defining feature of Adamites (Gen. 2:7; 8:20-22), whether that is pure or impure worship (Gen. 4:3-7). Thus when seeking to distinguish man from animals (including satyr beasts which it must be admitted shared many features with man), this issue is of crucial importance. But on the other hand, Ross does not consider the issue of long lost altars that are now under the waters of the Persian Gulf. Moreover, I consider one can find older religious expressions of the soul than Ross will allow with his date of *c.* 22,000 B.C., e.g., man's idolatry can be found in the Venus figurines of southern France (Aurignac, Haute-Garonne), carved in ivory and dated to *c.* 24,800 B.C.⁵⁶. Furthermore, Cro-Magnon's idolatry is evidenced in the female idol Venus figurine (or statuette) of Dolni Vestonice, in the Czech Republic (from a basin south of Brno in Moravia, Czech), made of baked clay and dating to somewhere between *c.* 25,000 B.C. to 29,000 B.C.⁵⁷. This most ugly idol, is typical of the type of emphasis one finds in a number of mother-goddess fertility idols e.g., nudity and breast emphasis (in this instance long breasts); and its immoral nudity also exhibits sexual "covetousness, which is idolatry" (Col. 3:5; cf. Exod. 20:17). It is thus fairly classified as a "Venus" idol i.e., its properties indicate similarities with the much later pagan Venus cult⁵⁸. With the evidence from the Canary Islands that Cro-Magnoids preserved an original monotheism, I would also say the gap between the first appearance in the geological record of Cro-Magnoids at *c.* 33,000 B.C., and the first evidence of their idolatry somewhere between *c.* 29,000 B.C. and *c.* 25,000 B.C. is consistent with this interpretation.

years" with "the outside limits being 6,000 and 50,000 years" (*Fingerprint of God*, Promise Publishing, California, USA, 1989, p. 159). He later revised these upwards to up to "60,000 years ago" ("Art & Fabric Shed New Light on Human History, *Facts & Faith*, Reasons To Believe, 9:3, 1995, p. 2, & "Searching for Adam" *Facts & Faith*, Reasons To Believe, 10:1, 1996, p. 4), and allowed the possibility of an even earlier date, saying "Adam and Eve could possibly be dated as far back as 60,000 years ago (less reasonably, even earlier)" ("The Meaning of Art & Music," *Facts & Faith*, Reasons To Believe, 10:4, 1996, p. 6, emphasis mine). He also revised his flood dates to between "about 6,000 and 50,000 years ago," and made a "tentative" proposition that "God commanded Adam and Eve and their descendants to till the earth about 40,000 years ago" ("Synchronizing clocks in astronomy and anthropology with Scripture," *Facts & Faith*, Reasons To Believe, 10:3, 1996, pp. 5,6). Ross thus allows an "even earlier" Adamic date than "60,000 years ago," although he is clearly skeptical about it.

⁵⁶ "Prehistoric Peoples & Culture: Cultural History of the Stone Ages: Europe: Paleolithic: Upper Paleolithic: Aurignacian" (*Encyclopedia Britannica*, Multimedia Edition, CD, International Version 1999, Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc. 1994-1999).

⁵⁷ "Venus of Dolni Vestonice" *Wikipedia* (1 Jan. 2010), the article includes pictures of the nude idol's front, back, and two sides. This ugly idol which was discovered in 1925, (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Venus_of_Doln%C3%AD_V%C49Bstonice%).

⁵⁸ The pagan Venus cult was found in much later Greco-Roman times in Italy e.g., at Rome and Pompey, and the pagan Romans came to identify her with the pagan Greek goddess, Aphrodite. The pagan goddess, Venus, was a heathen fertility mother goddess, whose cult was established in Rome in the capitol in 215 B.C., and outside the Colline gate in 181 B.C., and Venus was connected with temple prostitution. Hence her name gives rise to our English terminology of "venereal disease" (i.e., "venereal" from the Latin proper noun, *Venus*, with the adjective being *Venerius* and the singular feminine genitive noun being, *veneris*).

The only *prima facie* area of serious dispute with my dates would be with the Australian Aborigines, which secular macroevolutionist anthropologists in Australia like to date to *c.* 40,000 years ago. Certainly I would accept that there were satyr beasts in Australia from this time, but were they Adamites? Hugh Ross takes the view that “Australian Aborigines” only “date back to 25,000 B.C.,” although says that “there is some evidence in Australia that maybe the Aborigines go back 30,000 years, it’s not firm evidence⁵⁹.” Though the matter is one of dispute, on the presently available data, I think Hugh Ross is right. I note, e.g., that Alan Thorne of the Australian National University distinguished between “a ‘gracile’ human form” in Mungo Male, and “a later migration, maybe as recent as 25,000 years ago” to Australia in 23,000 B.C., “of people with ‘robust’ skeletal form.” How these two groups inter-related is a matter of further dispute. “According to” “Thorne, these two tribes interbred, giving rise to Australian Aborigines⁶⁰.” But the claim of interbreeding is a guess that lacks substantiation, Mungo male DNA mitochondria shows no linkage with Aborigines; and the thick boned “robust” skeletal group, with flat, receding foreheads, pronounced brow ridges and large jaws, clearly survived as a separate group. Despite the claims of highly conjectural interpretations for Mungo male as one showing religious expression on the basis of some red ochre at the time of his burial; the available evidence may be interpreted to mean that the earlier gracile skeletal group were non-Adamites, showed no religious expression evidencing souls, and were wiped out by the incoming robust skeletal group, whether by disease, hunting of them, or some combination thereof. This process may have taken up to *c.* 20,000 years, so it was not “a quick war of attrition.” Over this time, the Adamite Aborigines (robust skeletal) seem to have adopted elements of the animal culture of the gracile satyr beasts, thus debasing themselves greatly. Due to gene drift, the robust skeletal Aboriginal also developed some plurality of form while remaining broadly Australoid. If Ross and I are wrong, this would then necessitate an earlier flood date i.e., before 38,000 B.C. .

More generally, it would appear that man was force segregated into the region now under the Persian Gulf before the Flood (Gen. 2:10-14); and this confined area became grossly overpopulated with half-castes and quarter-castes from inter-racial marriages between Seth’s race and Cain’s race in the 100 or so years before Noah’s Flood (Gen. 6:1-4). The mechanism for this forced segregation is unknown, but may have included “the carrot” of fertile ground and “the stick” of cherubims with flaming swords at certain Edenic exit points, like the one who stood at the gate of Eden’s inner sanctum to the Garden of Eden (Gen. 3:24). After the anthropologically universal but geographically local Noah’s Flood; God graciously gave man dominion over this wider planet-wide world (Gen. 9:1,11-17; 10), which had hitherto been his exclusive playground, and strictly OUT OF BOUNDS to man (Gen. 1:1; 2:4; Heb. 1:2; 11:3).

E.g., Jehovah sometimes likes to play, “Thread the Needle” with crocodiles (Job 41:5), a game in which he enjoys placing hooks through the noses of carnivorous and deadly dangerous crocodiles (Job 41:2); at which time any such powerful sharp toothed beast cowers in his awesome presence. These highly dangerous killers dare not resist His Divine Majesty, but

⁵⁹ Ross, H., *The Genesis Question, op. cit.*, p. 108, and *The Flood*, 1990 (cassette recording), Reasons to Believe, Pasadena, California, USA.

⁶⁰ “Can Mungo Man challenge evolution theory?” 9 Feb 2000, at “Revisit the Mungo Man Challenge,” in Amanhotep.co./2003/migration.html. Guy Nolch, “Mungo ... DNA shakes the Homo Family Tree” (www-personal.une.edu.au/~pbrown3/nolch.pdf).

rather, this ferocious beast goes quiet as a mouse when the Lord cometh, for he knoweth that his Creator and Master draweth nigh (Job 41:4). Man was originally made a gentle fruitarian with just vegetarian animals in Eden (Gen. 2:29,30), and possibly was never shown these type of things. Possibly something similar will happen on the new heaven and new earth i.e., it *might* be regional to only part of the planet with certain OUT OF BOUNDS areas. If so, whether or not God ever invites myself or anyone else into such an OUTER REGION, and behind some safety net there to watch him play, “Thread the Needle,” I do not know. But either way, I shall be happy. Whatever God does *is his business*. I for one, am just glad that he will provide us with a world of gentle safe creatures (Isa. 11:6-9). And if God has OUT OF BOUNDS regions where he does his pleasure in some other way, that *is God’s business!* Let us not be anthropocentric, but Theocentric!!

I detest the anthropocentric arrogance of the Young Earth Creationist Institutes, which dares to dictate to God that “the worlds” he created (Gen. 2:4; Heb. 1:2; 11:3) either in the Gap between the first two verses of Genesis, or outside of the Edenic region which were contemporary with Eden, had to be of the same type as the Edenic world (Gen. 2:8-14) God made for man i.e., with harmless vegetarian animals (Gen. 1:30). Or their desire to put a premium on ignorance by claiming that passages referring to “the” human “creature” or “whole” human “creation” (Rom. 8:20-23) apply to animals, for if so, then they too must be “waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of” their “body” (Rom. 8:23). But how blasphemous is it to suggest that Christ’s atoning redemption applies to any other than Adam’s race (Rom. 5:11-21) i.e., “by one man sin” and “death” “entered into” man’s “world” (Rom. 5:12)? And while it is true that this included changes to the animal-life (Gen. 3:14) and plant-life (Gen. 3:17-19) of Eden, so that it came to approximate that which was beyond the world of Eden, that is not the basic issue.

That the reader may have some idea of the wickedness spoken by these persons, let him consider the following blasphemous words spoken by the Young Earth Creationists, Mark Van Bebber (b. 1961) and Paul Taylor (b. 1953), in *Creation and Time: A Report on the Progressive Creationist Book by Hugh Ross* (1995)⁶¹. E.g., reference is made to “Henry Morris’s claim that a good, loving and merciful God would not create” a “world” with “billions of years of death, pain and suffering” which was “all prior to man’s original sin.”

In this, I find their inappropriate usage of human terms such as “innocent” and “unmerciful to the weak,” when applied to animals, to be reminiscent of the type of thing extremist “animal rights” macroevolutionists go on with. “Christ – Sadistic or totally good and loving? If Christ, the Creator ... used millions of years of suffering and death to make the animals, how can he be all-loving and all-good? Under the Progressive Creation scenario, Christ designed the animals to devour each other, ripping with claws and teeth. He then further allowed these innocent creatures ... to die by the trillions for millions of years due to every

⁶¹ Eden Communications, Mesa, Arizona, USA, 2nd ed. 1994 & 195 (ISBN 1-877775-02-9). Though many of my creationist views are much closer to those of my fellow old earth creationist, Hugh Ross, than to Van Bebber or Taylor, I do not share Ross’s Day-Age School views. In this context, I think Van Bebber and Taylor have undertaken a reasonable critique of Ross’s unsustainable claim that the animals of the 6th creation day refer to only birds and mammals (*Ibid.*, pp. 80, 86-91).

catastrophe conceivable. God allowed (or possibly even sent) a multitude of afflictions down on these animals, including diseases ..., plagues, volcanoes, earthquakes, bombardments from outer space, floods, etc. As a result, animals of many types were killed to extinction. Thus the Progressive Creation scenario involves ... death by fang and claw – cold and unmerciful to the weak. Could even a sadist think of a more cruel and ugly way to produce animals ...? What a horrible thing”

And though it pains me to report such blasphemy, I shall give the reader this final example of Van Bebbler and Taylor’s work. “If the Bible is God’s Word (as it repeatedly claims), and if ... [there was] death, disease, and degeneration before Adam – no humans until the last moment of billions-of-years ..., then God has been deceptive⁶².” Of course, those who are subjected to this type of nonsense are in the first instance programmed to believe in Young Earth Creationism, and in the second instance, programmed to believe that if Old Earth Creationists are correct, then God is “cruel,” “horrible,” and “deceptive.” The practical effect of this, is that if one of them realizes from his study of the Book of Nature (Job 12:7-9; Ps. 19:1-3) that indeed God did create multiple “worlds” / “ages” before Adam that had such features as “death by fang and claw,” then *they think they have cast off their programming which claimed Young Earth Creationism.*

But in fact, they may still retain the second element of their programming, and thus a rip’n’tear programme exit hook remains in place. Thus beginning to understand the Book of Nature, this rip’n’tear programme exit hook means that as these precious human beings move away from Young Earth Creationism they simultaneously start to believe “that therefore” God is “cruel,” “horrible,” and “deceptive,” and so they may e.g., then become Deists, agnostics, or atheists. Those Young Earth Creationist programmers responsible for so “offend[ing] one of these little ones” (Matt. 18:6), then claim “this proves what we always said about all of those not agreeing with us being Deists, atheists” etc. Thus these hurtful, ghastly, and dishonest Young Earth Creationist programmers then say to others they still control, “Make sure you agree with us or this is what will happen to you too!” (Certainly I do not include in my thunderous condemnations of these Young Earth Creationist Institutes, the many gullible and naïve persons hoodwinked by them; indeed, I extend to such “little ones” Matt. 18:6 a much greater tolerance, focusing with them more on areas of agreement, especially the issues of CREATION NOT MACROEVOLUTION and the ABSOLUTE AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLE.)

In fact, God is glorified in his making of carnivorous, omnivorous, and dangerous animals (Job 8:39-41; 39:13-18; 27-30; 49:23-33). E.g., the eagle whose young ones “suck up blood” from the prey their parent has killed, are good because in acting this way they are obeying God’s command. Likewise the clouds and waters can satisfy an ecological system “wherein there is no man” (Job 38:25-27) and sometimes produce thunder storms, floods, and hail; or the scorching sun is sometimes responsible for bushfires which burn some of the vegetation. But because the rain, frost, snow, thunder, or whirlwinds (Job 37:5,6,9,10) or fire are “fulfilling his word;” like all the “fruitful trees,” “cedars,” animals, or “stars,” they “praise the Lord” (Ps. 148:1,3-10). Hence even though man was not originally meant to live in such a world, death is only a bad thing in the context of it entering man’s world (Gen. 2:17; Rom. 5:12). What the mighty Creator God did in worlds beyond and before he created the local heaven and earth of the Edenic world, is something

⁶² *Ibid.*, pp. 21 (emphasis mine), 42, 85 (emphasis mine).

man has in more recent centuries been privileged to be allowed to wonder at by reading the geological record to the glory of God. Yet both Young Earth Creationists like Van Bebbler and Taylor, and Darwinists alike, fail to recognize “his eternal power and Godhead” “from the creation of the world” (Rom. 1:20); although it must be said, that the macroevolutionists are far worse on this issue than the Young Earth Creationists Institute writers, who if they be like Henry Morris, Van Bebbler, and Taylor are blasphemers, but nevertheless still recognize the Creator.

Thus let us be thankful that after the Flood, man’s mandate over the local earth of Eden (Gen. 1:26; 2:8-14), was extended to become a mandate over the planet (Gen. 9:1-3; 10:1-32). Let us be grateful for God’s great kindness and generosity in letting man go out from the old world of Eden into what for him was the new world of the planet. Alas, God’s goodness and kindness appears to have been quickly abused. Finding there satyr beasts such as those of Australia which had been there since *c.* 38,000 B.C., these Adamites arriving about 28,000 B.C. to 23,000 B.C. essentially replaced their position in the ecological niche. I.e., by killing them off and then adopting similar but more sophisticated forms of a hunter-gatherer living, *they chose to live like animals*. While the secular macroevolutionists see this as an “evolutionary advance,” in fact it was a devolutionary debasement of man. Thus e.g., when the Christian white man found the Australian Aborigines, in about 25,000-30,000 years on the Australian Continent, they had essentially cast away their agricultural and other skills (although some small amount of yam farming and boat usage existed among a small number of them).

Did the earlier civilization of the Persian Gulf survive anywhere? It looks to me as though it only survived in the Persian Gulf region. Thus after some thousands of years after the Noachic Flood of *c.* 35,000 B.C., as this area became increasingly flooded due to the melt as the Last Ice Age ended, men moved up north in Mesopotamia and west into Egypt, thus transporting with them this civilization culture. Hence what is regarded by secular anthropologists as “the start” of civilization in this era, is on my scenario the transference of a pre-existing civilization by different population groups increasingly migrating out of the old Persian Gulf region, which in time was completely inundated with water like it still is at this day.

Of course, this scenario for dating man is based on natural law (reason) taken from both records of written history in the Sumerian King List, and anthropological data; in a manner that is harmonious with the Divine revelation. We know the Bible is infallible, but we cannot say this for other sources of information. Nevertheless, on the available data, this seems to me to be “the big picture⁶³.” Thus I am an old earth creationist, taking a literal view of Gen. 1 & 2, on the Gap

⁶³ The scenario I give is the best I can determine on the data available to me. But I do not claim infallibility. Therefore I here place three caveats. *Caveat 1:* Only the Bible is infallible, and its parameters give an upper reasonable date for Adam of *c.* 130,000 B.C. (with a *possible* though *unlikely* upper date of *c.* 157,000 B.C.). Therefore, if my interpretation of the Persian Gulf’s history and Sumerian King List are wrong, it is also possible that my start date from Adam of *c.* 68,000 B.C. is in fact *too late* in time. *Caveat 2:* If the Sumerian King List is less reliable than I have taken it to be, the general start date of *c.* 68,000 B.C. remains valid by reference to the Persian Gulf’s regression. However, it would then be possible that the Noachic Flood was somewhat earlier than my date of *c.* 35,000 B.C. . *Caveat 3:* If there were one or more smaller regressions of the Persian Gulf after *c.* 68,000 B.C., then it is possible that one of these is the pre-Adamite Flood, in which instance, my start date of *c.* 68,000 B.C. might be *too early* in time.

School model of a local six 24 hour day creation followed by such Protestants as Pye Smith (d. 1851) (a Congregationalist), Henry Alcock (d. 1915) (an Anglican), and the contemporary John Sailhamer (Evangelical Free Church, presently of Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, Brea, San Francisco, California, USA), with the Edenic region being located in an area now under the waters of the Persian Gulf

Thus returning to the issue that e.g., the NKJV and NASB translators do not to think that Ps. 105:8 teaches that the “covenant” of grace had been “commanded to a thousand generations” i.e., in about 1,000 B.C., there had to have been “a thousand generations” who had received the covenant of grace, of which “Abraham,” “Isaac,” and “Jacob” are three generations (Ps. 105:9,10); I would further note that some in the wider Gap School would agree with them. Gen. 1:2ff global world gap school creationists (majority gap school view, following Thomas Chalmers *et al*), in agreeing with them, would prefer an Adamic date of somewhere around 3,760 B.C., 4,004 B.C., or 5,620 B.C.; whereas most Gen. 1:2ff local world gap school creationists (minority gap school view, following Pye Smith *et al*), would be more likely to prefer an Adamic date of somewhere around 37,600 B.C., 44,004 B.C., 56,200 B.C., or 68,000 B.C. .

The global world creation gap man, and well known Baptist preacher of Metropolitan Tabernacle in London, Charles Spurgeon (1834-1892), said, “Can any man tell me when the beginning was?” “Thousands of years before” “Adam,” “God was preparing chaotic matter to make” “this world” “a fit abode for man, putting races of creatures upon it who might die and leave behind the marks of his handiwork and marvellous skill.” “But that was not the beginning, for revelation points us to a period long ere this world was fashioned, to the days when the morning stars were begotten” (i.e., the “heaven” of Gen. 1:1 preceded “the earth” of Gen. 1:1, and the completed “heaven and the earth” of Gen. 1:1 contained successive “worlds” Heb. 1:2; 11:3), “when, like drops of dew, from the fingers of the morning, stars and constellations fell trickling from the hand of God; when by his own lips, he launched forth ponderous orbs; when with his own hand he sent comets, like thunderbolts, wandering through the sky, to find one day their proper sphere. We go back to years gone by, when ‘worlds’ [Heb. 1:2; 11:3] were made and systems fashioned.” (Sermon, 1855). “What a short time it is since Adam walked in the Garden of Eden; compared with the ages of the rocks, compared with the history of the stars, compared with the life of God, it is as the winking of an eye, or as a flash of lightning” (Sermon, 1877)⁶⁴ .

Or the global world creation gap man, Bob Jones Sr., said “God” “spoke ‘worlds’ into existence” (Heb. 1:2; 11:3); referred to Isa. 57:15, God “inhabiteth eternity;” and said of Gen. 1:1,2, “you can put all the time you want, millions of ages, as much as you please, between the first and second verse of revelation and be Scriptural.” Concerning Adam, he took the view,

⁶⁴ Spurgeon’s Sermon on II Thess. 2:13,14 (1855), *New Park Street Pulpit*, Passmore & Alabaster, London, UK, Volume 1, p. 318; & Sermon on Matt. 25:64 (1877), *Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit*, Passmore & Alabaster, London, UK, Volume 23, p. 402. That he conceptualized these with a global creation in six days is further evident from his other comments on Gen. 1 (e.g., Gen. 1:5,23) in *Spurgeon’s Devotional Bible* (originally *The Interpreter*, Passmore & Alabaster, London, UK, 1870), Baker Books, Michigan, USA, 1964, UK ed., 1995.

“We go back ... about 6,000 years, since man’s been on the face of the earth.”⁶⁵ By contrast, the local world creation gap man, John Sailhamer, a Hebrew and Old Testament scholar, who has held faculty positions at a number of colleges, including, as the Senior Professor of Old Testament, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, North Carolina, USA, prefers to date Adam no later than *c.* 30,000 B.C., and possibly earlier than this⁶⁶.

Like gap school creationists, the non-gap school translators of e.g., the NASB and NKJV are entitled to their opinions. However, it is quite another thing for the translators of e.g., the NASB and NKJV to distort Gen. 1:2, and other Scriptures⁶⁷, so as to prevent a gap school interpretation. That e.g., the NASB and NKJV translators would both start their versions with such a statement in Gen. 1:2, that removes the “And” (Hebrew, *vav*; Greek LXX, *de*), is a matter of their particular creationist interpretation, not a matter of translation. The fact that like the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and Moffatt Bible, which also removes this “and,” it means the NASB and NKJV translators are prepared to tamper with God’s holy Word and twist it in order to promote their preferred non-gap school views of Genesis 1, is an ominous foreboding and warning to the reader. For Christ himself said, “Think not that I am come to destroy the Law, or the prophets” i.e., the Old Testament, “For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law” (Matt. 5:17,18). Since on the first page of the Old Testament, the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NKJV, and Moffatt Bible translators pervert Scripture so as to deny the doctrine of Divine preservation by removing a “vav” (and) (Matt. 5:18), we ought not to be surprised that the rest of their translations are often so unsatisfactory also.

We orthodox are agreed that Genesis 1-11 teaches *creation not macroevolution*. We are agreed that God created Adam and Eve as the parents of the human race in a state of original righteousness i.e., “God made man upright” (Eccl. 7:29, ASV), and in a state of conditional bodily immortality (Gen. 2:17). We recognize that man’s inherent sinfulness (original sin, Ps. 51:5) and our human mortality is traceable to a historic fall by the progenitor of the human race, Adam (Rom. 5:12-14). We agree on the anthropologically universal nature of Noah’s flood, i.e., that all human beings other than the eight in the ark were drowned in that great deluge, and that

⁶⁵ Bob Jones Sr., gap school (WOT 235, 407 cf. 320), *Word of Truth* (WOT), cassettes, Bob Jones University, Greenville, South Carolina, USA [c. 1950s].

⁶⁶ Sailhamer, J.H., *Genesis Unbound, op. cit.*, pp. 145; cf. pp. 216 (ftn 4) at p. 257 (Pye Smith).

⁶⁷ The gap school view that Gen. 1:1 refers to a succession of “generations” in which Hebrew *toledoth* is in the plural at Gen. 2:4 (cf. Gen. 5:1; 6:9; 10:1, *et al*), becomes in the NASB, “the account,” or in the NKJV, “the history,” rather than “generations.” The associated belief that in Gen. 1:1 God created a succession of “worlds” (AV) or “ages” (Greek *aionas*) (Heb. 1:2; 11:3), is badly distorted in the NIV’s “universe;” although at Gen. 1:2 they say, “Now the earth was formless and empty” (NIV), could “possibly” be translated, “Now the earth became formless and empty” (NIV footnote). While one gap man may prefer this NIV translation, another gap man may prefer to leave it as in the AV, and understand it through analogous language in Jer. 4:23, dealing with a Middle Eastern destruction event on a local “earth” and local “heavens” (1st heaven = atmosphere and 2nd heaven = space containing the sun, moon, and stars being blocked by clouds so there was “no light,” cf. II Cor. 12:2 where the 3rd heaven = glory).

all peoples alive today are descendants of those eight (Gen. 10). We recognize the authority of Scripture. We may not agree on all of the finer particulars of Genesis 1-11, but we are agreed on these broad fundamentals of Gen. 1-11. If we so uphold the authority of Scripture, let us not condone those who would twist God's Word to try and make our secondary disagreements on Gen. 1-11 into primary matters by creating Bible versions that falsely depict their view by not translating parts they disagree with, such as the "And" of Gen. 1:2 in the NKJV or NASB; or perverting parts they do not want people to think about, such as Gen. 2:4 in the NKJV. Even if we cannot agree on exactly what it means, let us agree on the clearly accurate rendering of the King James Version, "And the earth was without form, and void" (Gen. 1:2). Let us stand united in our opposition to the attempt to *prune the text of Scripture* at Gen. 1:2 in modern versions such as the NASB, NKJV, *et al.*

The push to change the NT text at this level of the Greek *de* by NU Text advocates (or equivalent OT Hebrew *vav*), may on occasion, lead me to undertake relevant textual analysis (see Matt. 6:1a). Likewise, Scrivener's sometimes uncritical usage of the representative Byzantine text, may on occasion lead me to undertake relevant textual analysis (see Matt. 5:31a; 7:15; although some may disagree with me in these instances and instead agree with Scrivener, that *de* exists in Matt. 5:31a; 7:15, and was simply untranslated by the AV translators).

Discussion of *de* may be found at Matt. 5:31a. Nevertheless, I shall not always discuss these matters of conjunctions such as the Greek *de* (or *kai*), since unlike Gen. 1:2 in the OT, they do not always *necessarily* affect English translation.

The Greek conjunction, "*oti*" means e.g., "that," or "for." It may be sometimes left untranslated e.g., for reasons of English literary style.

Moreover, under what is known as the rule of *oti recitativum*, it is not translated when it introduces a *direct discourse*. E.g., in Matt. 4:6 we read that Satan said to Christ, "If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, (*oti*) [-] He shall give his angels charge concerning thee" etc. . Or at Matt. 5:31, "It hath been said, (*oti*) [-] Whosoever shall put away his wife" etc. Or at Matt. 7:23, Christ says, "And then will I profess unto them, (*oti*) [-] I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." Or at Matt. 10:7, our Lord says, "And as ye go, preach; saying, (*oti*) [-] The kingdom of heaven is at hand."

I shall not now enter into textual analysis of the relevant passages relevant to *oti recitativum*, but simply note the following. At Matt. 5:31b (MBT e.g., W 032); 6:5b (MBT e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968); 6:16 (MBT e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), *oti* is found in the MBT (and Scrivener's text), though it is omitted in a minority Byzantine reading (Matt. 5:31), or by various ancient church writers (Matt. 6:5,16). It is also omitted in the NU Text at Matt. 5:31; 6:5,16. At Matt. 9:18, *oti* (TR, MBT, & NU Text) is omitted in e.g., London Sinaiticus and Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72). At Matt. 9:33 *oti* is absent in Scrivener's text and the MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968), though added after "*legontes* (saying)" in the minority Byzantine reading of V 031 (9th century & Lectionary 2378⁶⁸); and followed by e.g., Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598)

⁶⁸ In my photocopy of the microfilm form of Lectionary 2378, there is simply a "TI" visible at the start of one line. Having checked the original at Sydney University, I found a still visible, but much lighter "O" is present at the end of the previous line. The reading is thus "OTI."

and the Elzevir (1633). Since in such instances, whether present or not, it forms no necessary component of English translation, I shall not generally discuss these.

UNLESS specifically stated otherwise, in the following sections on Matt. 1-14 the MBT is regarded as correctly reflecting the TR with no good textual argument against it.

Matthew 1-10 (in detail).

Matthew 1.

This section has been more thoroughly revised than most sections for the revised Volume 1. Unlike other parts of this Revised Volume 1 (2010) which have not been generally rechecked relative to Robinson & Pierpont's (1991) most recent edition (2005), as part of the integration of data from Lectionaries 2378 & 1968, the MBT readings in the following sub-sections have all been rechecked relative to the MBT from Robinson & Pierpont's 2005 edition. Where the reading cannot be illustrated from Lectionaries 2378 & 1968 because their selections do not include reference to that verse, I have illustratively referred to other Byzantine Text manuscripts, usually W 032, Sigma 042, and (where its readings cover the verse) N 022.

Matt. 1:1-20,23,24,25 (minor variants not affecting, or not necessarily affecting, the English translation).

Though not affecting the basic English translation, one finds a number of minor alterations in the NU Text of Matt. 1. Throughout Matt. 1:2-16, like R & P, Scrivener's *egennese* meaning "begat," has the optional letter "n" (Greek "nu") added at the end, i.e., *egennesen*.

In the context of Matt. 1:18, *gennesis* (TR) means "birth" (AV), and *genesis* (NU Text *et al*) means "birth" (ASV). The TR's *gennesis* is to be preferred as the better reading (MBT, e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968; Jerome's Latin Vulgate, and various ancient church writers e.g., Irenaeus, Origen, and Chrysostom); as there is no justification in moving away from the MBT reading here. The NU Text's reading (with support from the Alexandrian Text and e.g., Armenian Version), has the danger that *genesis* (nominative singular feminine, from *genesis-eos, e*) can also mean "creation," so that an Arian heretic could misuse the NU Text's altered reading in a way he could not misuse the TR's reading of *gennesis* (nominative singular feminine, from *gennesis-eos, e*). I.e., an Arian could claim Christ's "genesis" or origins or existence (cf. James 3:6) date from his conception in Mary's womb. But because the context of Matt. 1:18 has led those using the NU Text's *genesis* here to translate it as "birth" (ASV), I include the reading here with qualification, as one "not necessarily affecting the English translation," although an ASV footnote says at "birth," "Or, 'generation,'" though then qualifies this as being synonymous with the "generation" of Matt. 1:1. Nevertheless, the danger still exists, that a heretic could say that he "agrees with e.g., the ASV, NASB, and NIV translation, but when one looks at the underlying Greek in the W-H or NU Text, it shows that Christ's 'genesis' or origins were at his conception in Mary." Thus the neo-Alexandrian versions open the door to a much greater potential of serious Trinitarian heresy (cf. my comments on "the Spirit of God" at Matt. 3:16).

Also in Matt. 1:18, the Received Text is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and

literally reads, “being betrothed for (*gar*) the mother of him, Mary, to Joseph,” meaning, “When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph” (AV). The NU text *et al* omits “*gar* (for),” but the translation is still, “when his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph” (ASV). Thus with or without the Greek “for (*gar*),” one would translate the verse the same.

At Matt. 1:22, the untranslated “the (*tou*)” before “*Kuriou* (Lord)” (TR) is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968; & Eusebius), but in a typical Alexandrian pruning it is removed in the leading Alexandrian Texts, and also the NU Text. Though the same English translation may be used, of “being raised” (AV) or “being aroused” (NKJV), in Matt. 1:24, the TR’s “*diegertheis*” which is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) becomes “*eyertheis*” (NU Text). So too, in Matt. 1:19, the TR reads “*paradeigmatisai* (to expose publicly)” which is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968; & Eusebius), and the better reading. By contrast, the NU Text (with e.g. the support of Rome Vaticanus), like the W-H text before it, reads “*deigmatisai* (to hold up as an example).” In Matt. 1:19, the Received Text’s “*paradeigmatisai*” is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and is (together with “her”) translated, “to make her a publick example” in the AV; whereas W-H’s “*deigmatisai*” is translated, “to make her a public example” in the ASV.

Letters are also sometimes changed in the spellings of names. The TR’s “*Booz*” (twice) at Matt. 1:5 is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) i.e., “Booz” (AV) or “Boaz,” becomes “*Boes*” in the NU Text i.e., “Boaz” (ASV). The TR’s “*Obed*” (twice) at Matt. 1:5 is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968), and there is a minority Byzantine reading of “*Obith*” (“ομιθ,” Lectionary 2378, whose cursive script may use “μ” for “β”), but the TR’s reading of “Obed” (AV) becomes “*Iobed*” in the NU Text i.e., “Obed” (ASV).

The TR’s “*Eliakeim*” (twice) at Matt. 1:13 is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). On the first occasion at Matt. 1:13, Lectionary 1968 writes the “*ei*” of the name like as “*cj*” with no dot on the “*j*,” i.e., “*c*” = “*e*” and “*j*” = “*i*” joined together; but on the second occasion, which is the very next word, these same two letters appear unjoined as “*ei*”. Thus we are reminded that handwritten letter forms may vary within a manuscript, for no apparent reason beyond the fancy of the scribe. At Matt. 1:13, the TR’s “*Eliakeim*” i.e., “Eliakim” (AV) becomes “*Eliakim*” in the NU Text i.e., “Eliakim” (ASV).

At Matt. 1:14 (twice), the TR’s “*Achein*” is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) i.e., “Achim” (AV), becomes “*Achim*” in the NU Text, i.e., “Achim” (ASV). At Matt. 1:20, the TR’s “*Mariam*” which is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) i.e., “Mary” (AV) becomes “*Marian*” in the NU Text i.e., “Mary” (ASV).

In Matt. 1:8,9 with support from the TR’s text in the sixteenth century’s Complutensian NT (1514), Colinaeus (1534), Stephanus (four editions, 1546-1551), Plantin’s Polyglot (1572); and with support from the MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968); the TR’s text reads ‘*Ozian* and ‘*Ozias* meaning “Ozias” (AV) or “Uzziah.” Also meaning Uzziah, (changing ‘ to ‘), this reads ‘*Ozian* and ‘*Ozias* in the Greek NT’s of Erasmus (five editions, 1516-1535); Aldus (1518), and Beza (five editions, 1560-1598).

Matthew 2.

In Matt. 2:3, the Greek word order, “*Hrodēs* (‘Herod,’ word 1) *o* (‘the,’ word 2) *basileus*

(‘king,’ word 3)” in the TR is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and is changed to the NU Text to word order 2,3,1 (which is also a minority Latin word order e.g., c & k). The Greek word order in Matt. 2:8, “*akribos* (‘diligently,’ word 1) *exetasate* (‘search,’ word 2) in the TR is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and is changed to the NU Text word order 2,1 (which is also a minority Byzantine reading found in e.g., W 032). The Greek word order in Matt. 2:19, “*kat* (‘in,’ word 1) *onar* (‘a dream,’ word 2) *phainetai* (‘appeareth,’ word 3) in the TR is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and is changed to the NU Text word order 3,1,2 (which is also a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 924). The Greek word order in Matt. 2:22, “*Hrodou* (‘Herod,’ word 1) *tou* (‘the,’ word 2) *patros* (‘father,’ word 3) *autou* (‘of him,’ word 4)” in the TR is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and is changed to the NU Text to word order 2,3,4,1 (which is also a minority Byzantine reading found in W 032).

In Matt. 2:5, the TR’s “*eipon* (‘they said,’ AV, indicative active second aorist, 3rd person plural, from the verb, *lego*)” is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and is changed to the NU Text’s “*eipan* (‘they said,’ ASV, indicative active first aorist, 3rd person plural, from the verb, *lego*).” Changing ‘*to*’ to ‘before the *I* (here and also in Matt. 16:14), in Matt. 2:17; 16:14; 27:9, Scrivener’s ‘*Ieremiou* (‘Jeremy,’ AV or ‘Jeremiah’), became Beza’s ‘*Ieremiou* in his first (1560) edition. In Matt. 2:9, the TR’s “*este* (‘it ... stood,’ AV),” is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and is changed to the NU Text’s “*estathe* (‘it ... stood,’ ASV).” In Matt 2:15, the TR’s untranslated “*tou* (the)” before “*Kuriou* (Lord)” is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and is omitted in the NU Text. In Matt. 2:17, the TR’s “*upo*” meaning “by” in “by Jeremy” (AV), is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968; due to scribal error, Lectionary 2378 here jumps from the “*dia*” / “by” of verse 15, to an “*e*” / eta, to the “*eremiou*” of “*Ieremiou*” / “Jeremy” in verse 17, and so lacks the “*upo*” reading), but is changed in the NU Text to *dia*, which can also mean “by.” In Matt. 2:21, the TR’s “*elthen eis* (‘came into, AV)” is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and is changed in the NU Text to, “*eiselthen eis* (‘came into,’ ASV).” In Matt. 2:22, the TR’s “*basileuei epi*” meaning (he) “did reign” (AV) or “was reigning over” (NKJV) is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and is changed in the NU Text to, “*basileuei*,” meaning “was reigning over” (ASV).

Matthew 3.

In Matt. 3:4, the TR’s Greek word order, “*trophe* (‘meat,’ word 1) *autou* (‘of him,’ word 2 = ‘his,’ AV) *en* (‘was,’ word 3)” is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and is changed in the NU Text (following the two leading Alexandrian and Western texts) to word order 1,3,2. In Matt. 3:11, the TR’s Greek word order, “*baptizo* (‘baptize,’ word 1) *umas* (‘you,’ word 2)” is MBT (e.g., Sigma 042), and is changed in a minority Byzantine reading (W 032) also found in the NU Text (following London Sinaiticus and ancient church writers e.g., Origen,) to word order 2,1. In Matt. 3:16, the TR’s Greek word order, “*Kai* (‘And,’ word 1) *baptistheis* (‘when he was baptized,’ word 2),” is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and is changed in the NU Text to word order 2,1 (following the two leading Alexandrian texts; and also e.g., some old Latin versions), and word 2 “*kai* (‘And,’ AV)” is altered to “*de* (‘also,’ here meaning “And”). Also in Matt. 3:16, the TR’s Greek word order, “*anebe* (‘went up,’ word 1) *euthus* (‘straightway,’ word 2),” is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and is changed to the NU Text to word order 2,1 (following the two leading Alexandrian texts; this is also a minority Byzantine reading found in W 032).

The TR’s “*Hsaiou* (‘Esaias,’ AV or Isaiah),” is MBT at Matt. 3:3 (e.g., Lectionaries 2378

& 1968), Matt. 4:14 (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and Matt. 12:17 (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968, the latter of which is with some difficulty still readable notwithstanding an ink smudge). Breathings are added and not part of the original text (hence they were omitted in Robinson & Pierpont's 1991 MBT edition, although included in their 2005 edition). (See "Uzziah" at Matt. 1:8,9 and "Jeremy" at Matt. 2:17; *supra*.) Changing Scrivener's ' to ' before the *H* (here and also in Matt. 4:14; 12:17), in Matt. 3:3, 4:14; 12:17 (such added breathings are capable of acting as "trademarks"), Scrivener's "'*Hsaïou* (Esaias)" became Beza's "'*Hsaïou*" in his second (1565) to fifth (1598) editions.

In Matt. 3:2, the "*kai* (and)" is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 2378), and also found in the Latin Vulgate, and a part of the old Latin versions. It is omitted in a minority Byzantine reading (Lectionary 1968), probably due to an undetected paper fade. It is also omitted in Rome Vaticanus and London Sinaiticus, either due to a typical fade or a typical Alexandrian prunist's "stylistic improvement." The "*kai* (and)" is made optional in the NU Text and placed in square brackets. Since it may be included, it does not necessarily make a difference. This position in the contemporary NU Text i.e., Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) NU Text, is an improvement on Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952), both of which omitted the "*kai*."

In Matt. 3:15, the TR's "*pros* (unto) *auton* (him)," i.e., the "unto him" in, "and Jesus answering said unto him" (AV), is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). A variant reading, "*auto*," i.e., also meaning, "unto him," is followed by Eusebius (d. 339). On general principles, there being no good textual argument against the MBT reading, it must necessarily stand. Outside the closed class of three sources, this correct reading, "*pros auton*," is followed in e.g., the Alexandrian Text's London Sinaiticus (4th century), the (mixed text type) C 04 (5th century), and a later supplement to the leading representatives of the Western text, D 05 (as the original is missing at this point in the manuscript). The variant reading, "*auto*," also meaning, "unto him," is found in e.g., the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus (4th century). The incorrect reading, "*auto*," was adopted in the main text of Nestle's 21st edition (1952), though the NU Text has gone back to the correct reading, "*pros auton*."

In Matt. 3:14, "*Ioannes* (John)" is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and there is no good reason to doubt it. Though removed in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952) because it was omitted by the two leading Alexandrian Texts; it has been restored to the text in the NU Text's Nestle-Aland 27th edition (1993) and UBS 4th revised edition (1993).

Matthew 4.

Matt. 4:14 (Beza), see Matt. 3:3.

In Matt. 4:5, the TR's "*istesin* ('setteth,' present indicative active athematic, 3rd person singular verb, from *istemi*)," is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). There is no good textual reason to doubt it, and so it should stand. Outside the closed class of three sources an alternative reading, "*estesin* (indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *istemi*)," which appears to be an assimilation with "set" (AV) (*estesin*) in Luke 4:9, is found in e.g., the leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); (the mixed text type) C 04 (5th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, D 05 (5th

century). The latter Alexandrian and Western reading was adopted by e.g., Westcott and Hort, Nestle's 21st edition, and the NU Text.

In Matt. 4:5, the Greek "*istēsīn*" (TR) (from *istēmi*) literally means, "he ["the devil,"] causes to stand" i.e., the Devil "setteth (*istēsīn*)" (AV) Christ on the pinnacle. By contrast, "*estēsen*" (NU Text) literally means, "he ["the devil,"] stood" Christ on the pinnacle. Though there is a different shade of meaning in the Greek, as seen by the AV's translation of "*istēsīn*" followed by "*auton* (him)" in Matt. 4:5 as "setteth him," and the AV's translation of "*estēsen*" followed by "*auton* (him)" in Luke 4:9 as "set him," no necessary conflict in English translation arises from whether one follows the TR's "*istēsīn*" or the NU Text's "*estēsen*" at Matt. 4:5. Likewise, the NKJV translates both "*istēsīn auton*" at Matt. 4:5 and "*estēsen auton*" at Luke 4:9, as "set him" (NKJV). Moreover, in the ASV, W-H's "*estēsen auton*" has been so translated as "set him" (ASV) at both Matt. 4:5 and Luke 4:9. At Matt. 4:5, the NU Text's "*estēsen auton*" may also be translated as, "had him stand" (NASB).

At Matt. 4:9, the TR's Greek "*legei*" ('he saith' / 'he says,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular, from *legō*), i.e., "saith" in the words, "and saith unto him" (AV) is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) with no good argument against it. But in the NU Text it becomes "*eipen*" ('he said,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular, from *legō*) i.e., the "said" in "and he said unto him" (ASV). Was this a Greek literary stylistic "improvement"? If so, why was this "improvement" not adopted elsewhere? Alternatively, both Greek words have the same number of letters. If due to a paper (or other parchment) loss, the copyist's page, perhaps in capitals / unicals looked something like ":::::E:."; then a copyist, working out from context the correct meaning of "he saith," may have reconstructed "*eipen*" for the missing letters of *legei*. Possibly the former, though probably the latter, it makes no difference to the English translation.

The TR's Greek word order at Matt. 4:3 (TR), "*auto* ('to him,' word 1), *o* ('the,' word 2) *peirazōn* ('tempter,' word 3) *eipen* ('he said,' word 4)," is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968); and is changed to word order 2,3,4,1 (NU Text, following the two leading Alexandrian texts; this is also e.g., a minority old Latin word order). At Matt. 4:9, the TR's word order, "*Panta* ('All,' word 1) *soi* ('thee,' word 2)" is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968); and is changed to word order 2,1 (NU Text, following the two leading Alexandrian texts & e.g., Origen). At Matt. 4:16 the TR's "*eide* ('saw,' word 1) *phōs* ('light,' word 2)," is MBT (Lectionary 2378 reading for *eide*, "ιΔ" with the "ε" over the delta, then "φωc"; & Lectionary 1968, reading "ειδε φωc"); and is changed to word order 2,1 (NU Text).

At Matt. 4:13 the TR's "*Kapernaoum* ('Capernaum,' AV)" is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and is changed in the NU Text to "*Kapharnaoum* ('Capernaum,' ASV)." At Matt. 4:24, the TR's "*kai* (and)," in the words, "and those which were possessed with devils," is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042), with no good argument against it; but it is surrounded with square brackets and made optional in the NU Text, so that there is not necessarily a conflict with the TR since one could still use the "and." At Matt. 4:13,15 the TR's spelling (twice) of "*Nephthaleim*" is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 2378 in the second instance with the second letter, epsilon, sometimes written like here as a "c" over the first letter, followed by "*phthaleim*" in which the second epsilon is written as an "ε"; & Lectionary 1968, in the first instance forming the last two letters as "ετ" but in the second instance, forming these same letters something like the English letters "cj" joined together – but unlike in English with no dot on the "j" / iota). The TR's spelling at Matt. 4:13,15 is changed in the NU Text to "*Nephtalim*."

At Matt. 4:13 the TR's reading, "*Nazaret*" (see Appendix 1, *supra*) is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and correct, although a minority Byzantine reading found in Scrivener's Text is "*Nazareth*" (see Appendix 1, *supra*). Both "*Nazaret*" and "*Nazareth*" are properly rendered into English as "Nazareth" (AV). But the TR's "*Nazaret*" becomes the NU Text's "*Nazara*" i.e., "Nazareth" (ASV).

Matthew 5.

The TR's Greek word order at Matt. 5:20, "*ε* ('the,' word 1) *dikaisone* ('righteousness,' word 2) *umon* ('of you,' word 3)," in the words, "your righteousness" (AV) is MBT (e.g., Sigma 042), although word order 3,1,2 is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032), also found in the NU Text. Burgon & Miller (1899) thought the 3,1,2, word order was better, although Miller puts a question mark before the reading, i.e., "*?umon ε dikaisone*" indicating some doubt about this. But unlike Burgon & Miller, both Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005) follow the word order 1,2,3, although Hodges & Farstad show a major split in the in their majority text textual apparatus, whereas Robinson & Pierpont do not think it worth mentioning.

At Matt. 5:21 the TR's "*errethe* ('It hath been said,' indicative passive aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *lego*)" is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042) and found in the main text of the majority texts of both Hodges & Farstad (1985) Robinson & Pierpont (2005), neither of which show any variants here. However, a spelling variant, "*errethe*," is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., E 07, 8th century & K 017, 9th century). The minority reading is found in the majority text of Burgon & Miller (1899), a fact reflecting the dangers of using corrupted texts in what on this occasion was a too small sample "majority text" count. Texts here consulted that are itemized in Burgon & Miller include "B" (Rome Vaticanus) and D 05 (the leading Western Text). Hence the subsequent majority texts of both Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont understandably seek to fumigate themselves from the stench of Burgon & Miller's "majority text" at Matt. 5:21. But "the pong" of being a Burgonite, never really goes away!⁶⁹

At Matt. 5:25, the TR's Greek word order, "*en* ('in,' word 1) *te* ('the,' word 2) *odo* ('way,' word 3) *met* ('with,' word 4) *autou* ('him,' word 5)," is MBT (e.g., Sigma 042), although word order 4,5,1,2,3 is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032), also found in the NU Text. At Matt. 5:36, the TR's word order "*ε* ('or,' word 1) *melainan* ('black,' word 2) *poiesai* ('to make,' word 3)," in the words, "thou canst not *make* one hair white *or black*" (AV), is MBT (e.g., Sigma 042), although word order 3,1,2 is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032, spelling word 2 as, "*melanan*"), also found in the NU Text. At Matt. 5:39, the TR's word order "*sou* ('thy,' word 1) *siagona* ('cheek,' word 2)," is a minority Byzantine reading (see main commentary at Matt. 5:39b), which becomes with word 1 in square brackets, the NU Text's word order 2,1.

In Matt. 5:32, the TR's "*moichasthai* ('to commit adultery,' AV, middle infinitive aorist verb, from *moichao*)," has support from the MBT (e.g., Sigma 042) and St. Basil the Great; although a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032), also found in the NU Text, changes this to "*moicheuthenai* ('to commit adultery,' or non-literally as a dynamic equivalent, 'maketh her an

⁶⁹ "Pong" is a colloquialism meaning a "stink".

adulteress,’ ASV, cf. NIV 2nd ed.; although the ‘to’ is regarded as redundant in the NASB translation, literally, ‘to commit adultery,’ i.e., passive infinitive first aorist verb, from *moicheuo*,)’ a reading found in Origen and the leading Alexandrian Texts. Is this a typical paper fade / loss “reconstruction,” or is this a typical “stylistic improvement”?

At Matt. 5:28, the TR (see Appendix 1) is the MBT (e.g., W 032; Origen, Eusebius, & Chrysostom) reading, “*autēn* (her),” in “to make her a publick example” (AV). The MBT at Matt. 5:28 is also found in the NU Text *et al*, although being found in one Alexandrian Text (Rome Vaticanus) and omitted in the other (London Sinaiticus), the “*autēs* (of her)” is placed in square brackets as an optional reading in W-H & Nestle’s 21st ed. . The reading is the same in the AV & TR as the ASV & W-H, “to lust after her.”

At Matt. 5:39 the TR’s “*epi* (on)” in “on (*epi*) thy right cheek” (AV) is MBT (e.g., E 07; Eusebius & Basil the Great); although a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., Sigma 042 & W 032), also found in the NU Text, changes this to “*eis*,” which can also mean “on” in “on (*eis*) thy right cheek” (ASV), or less literally, “on (*eis*) the right cheek” (ESV).

At Matt. 5:42, the TR’s “*didou* (‘thou give,’ active imperative present, 2nd person singular athematic verb, from *didomi*),” is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). It is changed in the NU Text *et al* to “*dos* (‘thou give,’ active imperative aorist, 2nd person singular athematic verb, from *didomi*).” But there is no difference in the basic English translation between the TR’s, “Give to him that asketh of thee” (AV), and NU Text *et al*, “Give to him that asketh thee” (ASV).

At Matt. 5:45, Scrivener’s TR reading, “*tou* (‘-,’ untranslated in English, masculine singular genitive definite article, from *o*) *en* (in) *ouranois* (heavens)” is a sizeable minority Byzantine reading⁷⁰, e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968, Origen & Eusebius. However, the MBT has “*tois* (the)” before “*ouranois* (heaven),” but this is not translated in English. Thus in either instance the terminology reads, “your Father which is in heaven.”

Prima facie, the Matt. 5:45 MBT terminology of “*tois* (the) *ouranois* (heavens)” is Matthean Greek (Matt. 5:12,16; 6:2,9; 7:11; 16:17,19); as is the minority terminology, “*en* (in) *ouranois* (heaven)” (Matt. 18:10a; 19:21). But in Matthean Greek when the “*tou* (-)” appears before this terminology, the reading is always “*tou* (-) *en* (in) *ouranois* (heavens)” (Matt. 7:21; 10:32,33; 12:50; 18:10b,14,19). The stylistic “crashing sound” of the MBT at Matt. 5:45 thus clangs on the ears as bad Matthean Greek, and to relieve the pain done to the text we must here adopt the minority Byzantine reading. The TR’s reading was manifested in the Greek NTs of e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550).

At Matt. 5:46, the TR’s “*auto* (‘the same,’ AV)” is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and certainly correct. This is changed to “*outos* (‘such’)” (e.g., Lucifer of Cagliari); and also

⁷⁰ Pierpont in Green’s Textual Apparatus says the variant which adds “*tois*” is followed by 61-79% of manuscripts, i.e., the TR’s reading is followed by about 20-39% of all Greek texts. This clearly makes it a significant minority Byzantine reading.

being found in the leading Western Text (D 05), it is given as an alternative in a side note of W-H. But it is not followed, and the main text reading “*auto*” is retained in the ASV’s “the same.”

Matthew 6.

In Matt 6:1, the basic words, “*mege* (not)” or “*me ge*” are MBT. They are found in continuous script in e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968, and the difficulties of unraveling a continuous script are seen in comparison of the majority texts of Robinson & Pierpont which reads “*mege* (not)” and Hodges & Farstad which reads “*me ge* (not).” So too, we find that Scrivener’s Text has one word “*mege* (not),” in “*ei* (if) *de* (but) *mege* (not)” = “otherwise” (AV), in the words, “otherwise ye have no reward” (AV), whereas this is two words in the NU Text’s “*me ge*.” *Ad libitum!*⁷¹

At Matt. 6:6, the TR’s “*tamieion*” meaning “closet” (AV) or “room” (NKJV) is MBT (e.g., spelt as “*tamieio*” in Lectionary 2378; & spelt as “*tamieion*” in Lectionary 1968). It is spelt in the NU Text as “*tameion*” but the meaning remains “inner chamber” (ASV) or “room” (ESV). I.e., the root word is “*tameion*” / “*tamieion*” (cf. these same spelling variants for “secret chambers” at Matt. 24:26).

At Matt. 6:7, the TR’s “*battologesete*” meaning, “use vain repetitions” (AV),” is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968), although in a minority Byzantine spelling variant it has one “t” i.e., “*batologesete*” (E 07, G 011, & Lectionary 2378). It is found in the NU Text with the spelling variant, “*battalogesete*,” thus still meaning, “use vain repetitions” (ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 6:10, the TR’s untranslated “*tes* (the)” before “*ges* (earth)” is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), but is omitted in the NU Text. At Matt 6:16, the TR’s “*osper* (‘as’ in ‘as the hypocrites’),” is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968)⁷²; and becomes the NU Text’s “*os* (‘as,’ ASV).” At Matt. 6:18, the TR’s “*krupto* (‘in secret,’ twice, AV, singular dative adjective, from *kruptos-e-on*),” is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 2378; and with the spelling, “*krepto*,” Lectionary 1968); and with no good textual reason becomes the NU Text’s “*kruphaiq* (‘in secret, twice, ASV, singular dative adjective, from *kruphaios-a-on*).” At Matt. 6:22, the TR’s word order, “*o* (‘the,’ word 1) *ophthalmos* (‘eye,’ word 2) *sou* (‘of thee,’ word 3) *aplous* (‘single,’ word

⁷¹ Latin, (dynamic equivalent) meaning, “As you like it!”

⁷² In Lectionary 2378, the “*osper*” is written clearly at Matt. 6:2 (p. 56a) but not as clearly on the next page at Matt. 6:16 (p. 56b). In the cursive script of Lectionary 2378, the first letter, omega, is a “ω” that is closed at the top with a line over it (like one finds over a pi / “π”) and at Matt. 6:2 followed by “*ερ*” (although sometimes it is closed in a curving fashion, something like “oo” joined together, as indeed it is for the omega at both Matt. 6:2 and Matt. 6:16). But in the cursive script, the closed omega shape may also be used for “p” (pi), and at Matt. 6:16, the “*osper*” is written as a closed “ω” (omega) followed by a “c” (sigma) another closed “ω” (pi) then “*ερ*” (epsilon, rho), but the top bar over the pi also crosses the top of the “c” (sigma), so one could initially misread it as e.g., “*ps*” or “*os*” rather than “*sp*”. The difference in the usage of a standard “π” for pi in the “*osper*” on page 56a (Matt. 6:2) and a closed “ω” for pi in the “*osper*” on the following page 56b (Matt. 6:16), is a good example of the type of scribal variations one must sometimes deal with in handwritten manuscripts.

4) ϵ ('be,' word 5)," is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 2378 spelling word 5 as, "*ei*"⁷³; & Lectionary 1968); but this becomes the NU Text's word order 5,1,2,3,4.

In Matt. 6:28, the plural subject of the sentence, "*krina* ('lilies,' neuter plural nominative noun, from *krinon*)" is of neuter gender, and so the TR's verbs are singular i.e., "*pos* (how) *auzanei* (indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *auxano*, translated 'they grow' not 'it grows') *ou* (not) *kopia* (indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *kopiao*⁷⁴, translated 'they toil' not 'it toils') *oude* (neither) *nethei* (indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *netho*, translated 'do they spin' not 'does it spin')." I.e., "how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin" (AV). This is supported by the MBT (e.g., Lectionary 2378 with variant spelling of "*nethei*" as "*nithe*"; Lectionary 1968; & St. Basil) (cf. Matt. 6:32; Luke 12:27). But this was changed to the plural verb forms, and so quoted by e.g., Athanasius. While there are a number of variants it generally came to read, "*pos* (how) *auzanosin* ('they grow,' indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *auxano*) *ou* (not) *kopiosin* ('they toil,' indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *kopiao*) *oude* (neither) *nethosin* ('do they spin,' indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *netho*)." There is no good textual argument against the MBT reading which must thus stand. The matter does not affect the English translation. The NU Text *et al* use the plural of the two leading Alexandrian texts, but the reading is still, "how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

In Greek, a neuter plural subject usually, though not always, has singular verbs⁷⁵. At

⁷³ While Greek, "*ei*" can mean "thou art" (indicative active present, 2nd person singular verb, from *eimi*); context here disallows this meaning, so that this must be some kind of localized dialect spelling for " ϵ (subjunctive active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *eimi*; the meaning is not 'it be;' since the plural subject, '*ophthalmos*' / 'eyes' is of neuter gender, and so the verb is singular, i.e., 'they be' = 'be', AV,)". Its usage is inconsistent in Lectionary 2378, for while "*ei*" is also used for " ϵ " in the following verse 23; further on again in the verse 24, the spelling " ϵ " is then used.

⁷⁴ Because the stem is in "*a*" i.e., "*ao*" not "*o*," the rule of *a* + *ei* = *a* (with a small iota under the alpha) applies, and hence in my transliterations "*kopia*" i.e., I do not transliterate the iota in such instances. My apologies to those Greek readers who dislike my transliterations, but I am trying to make things as simple as I can for as many readers as possible.

⁷⁵ The exception to the general rule occurs where one wants to emphasize the individuality of each subject in the plural subject. E.g., at Matt. 13:38 we read, "*ta* (the) *de* (but) *zizania* ('tares,' nominative plural, second declension neuter noun, from *zizanion*) *eisin* ('they are,' present indicative, 3rd person plural of the verb 'to be,' *eimi*; NOT *estin*, present indicative 3rd person singular of *eimi*) *oi* (the) *uioi* (sons) *tou* (of the) *ponerou* (wicked)," i.e., adding "one" in italics, "but the tares are the children of the wicked one" (AV). The individual is here stressed. Matt. 13:29, which prohibits any man to "gather up the tares," "lest" "ye root up also the wheat;" is reconciled to passages calling for church discipline such as Matt. 18:17; I Cor. 5:1-5,11), by distinguishing between a man's *profession of faith*, which as a general rule we *are never to dispute* (Matt. 13:29), and his stated beliefs (II John 7-11) or conduct, which we may judge (e.g., I Cor. 5:1,4,5,11; 6:9,10). To this there are a small number of Biblically sanctioned exceptions e.g., wilfully unrepentant murderers (I John 3:15), or those involved in the illegalities of seditious rebellion to overthrow the "higher powers" "receive to themselves damnation" (Rom.

13:1,2) (for which reasons many of those in e.g., the French and American revolutions became Deists or vaguely defined Theists). Thus such persons may be described as “sons of Belial” i.e., among those who know “not the Lord” (I Sam. 2:12). But as a general rule, if a man recognizes the gospel found in the Reformation Motto, together with the broad fundamentals of the faith evident in the *Apostles’ & Nicene Creeds*, and professes Christ as Saviour and Lord, then while we may judge his profession of faith relative to such broad moral principles as the *Ten Commandments*, we are *never* to say to him, “I don’t think you’re a Christian because” If a person should so “offend one of” Christ’s “which believe in” him, by denying his *profession of faith* contrary to Matt. 13:29; “it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck,

Matt. 6:32, the plural subject of the sentence, “*ethne* (‘Gentiles,’ neuter plural nominative noun, from *ethnos*),” is of neuter gender, and so the TR’s verb is singular, “*epizetei* (‘seek,’ indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *epizeteo*).” The TR’s reading is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968; & St. Chrysostom) (cf. Matt. 6:28). Though there is no good textual argument against the MBT reading at Matt. 6:32; this was changed to the plural, “*epizetousin* (indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *epizeteo*),” i.e., “they seek” in e.g., the two leading Alexandrian Texts, Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the translation is still, “all these things do the Gentiles seek” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

The language of Matt. 6:32 is unapologetically racist in that it stereotypes Gentiles as synonymous with heathens. (This is relevant to the main commentary at Matt. 6:33.) The deep-seated racist character of a holy and righteous God is evident in the issue of original sin (Rom 5-8), since for the sin of our progenitor, the entire Adamic race is accursed and subjected to the racial slavery of sin and death; and also in the issue of election, evident in e.g., the Apostle Paul’s *magnum opus*, The Book of Romans. For instance, in Rom 9-11 it is clear that God first chose those of the Jewish race, as a general rule discriminating in favour of persons of the Jewish race, and against persons of Gentile race, for the purposes of salvation. It was during this time that the

and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea” (Matt. 18:6). But we may say, “*Since you profess Christ, you should follow the Biblical teaching ...*,” and on that basis, excommunicate e.g., fornicators (I Cor. 5:11). But our prayers and longer term desire is that such persons repent.

In the Greek words from St. Matthew’s vocabulary here selected by the Holy Ghost for St. Matthew, Christ here stresses the importance of the individual in Matt. 13:29, even where that is a wicked individual; and he demands that as a general rule, *he alone* judge a man’s profession of faith, and not another. Let us be careful and diligent to obey all of his holy commandments.

words of Matt. 6:32 were said. Then God chose those of the Gentile race, as a general rule discriminating in favour of persons of the Gentile race, and against persons of Jewish race, for the purposes of salvation. Then, when “the fulness of the Gentiles be come in” (Rom. 11:25), he will again choose those of the Jewish race, as a general rule discriminating in favour of persons of the Jewish race, and against persons of Gentile race, for the purposes of salvation. (These general rules were always subject to exceptions i.e., some Gentiles were saved in OT times, some Jews have been saved since NT times, and when it switches back again to a focus on the Jews, presumably the odd Gentile will still be saved from time to time.)

The recognition that God first racially discriminates in favour of the Jewish race and against the Gentile race; then racially discriminates in favour of the Gentile race and against the Jewish race; and then once again racially discriminates in favour of the Jewish race and against the Gentile race; means that the doctrine of election is clearly racist from go to woe. Racism and election are thus indissolubly intertwined, and so for those of the holy Reformed faith, who in various Protestant confessions accept the teaching of Rom. 9-11 (and other passages) on election, the racist character of God is undeniable. Since racist discrimination, first in favour of the Jewish race, then in favour of the Gentile race, and then in favour of the Jewish race, is integral to the doctrine of election; it follows that some forms of racial discrimination are a Divine Attribute of Almighty God. While this does not mean that all forms of racial discrimination are morally justifiable, it does mean that some forms of racial discrimination are, e.g., the preservation of the God created racial groups by prohibiting inter-marriage between them is clearly harmonious with the directive will of God in the Divine creation of racial groups (Gen. 10 & 11). I.e., there are good racists, e.g., anti-miscegenationists (Gen. 6:1-4; 10:8,9; 11:6; Dan. 2:43,44; Matt. 24:37-39), and bad racists e.g., black Africans of Zimbabwe who kill white farmers and / or steal their farming lands (Exod. 20:13,15; Rom. 13:9). Hence those seeking the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination are blaspheming against a Divine Attribute of a holy and mighty God; and ultimately fighting against the character and Being of God himself (Ps. 139:20).

The racist language of Matt. 6:32 should humble us before a holy and awesome God. When it was said, God's focus was still primarily on the Jew and not the Gentile (Matt. 10:5,6). We who are of the Gentile race would all be heathens were it not for the grace of God, generally electing us from NT times on after the stoning of St. Stephen (Acts 6); a process that will continue till just before the Second Advent when God again generally elects those of the Jewish race. Those of the Jewish race now saved, are like the odd Gentile saved in OT times and are exceptions to the general rule, so they too should stand humbly before God. None of us can boast. We are saved by grace alone through faith alone, whether by race we are Jew or Gentile. (Concerning the usage of racist stereotypes such as Matt. 6:32; which are generally correct; even if not always so in a particular instance, compare the usage of “Cretians” or Cretans i.e., persons from the Island of Crete, in Titus 1:12).

Connected with this Jew-Gentile contrast, the NT usage of “Greek” (Greek, *Hellen*) for Gentile, is also deeply racist, in that it stereotypes the typical Gentile as a “Greek” i.e., a white Caucasian⁷⁶; even though it is clear that the promise to Gentiles goes to both whites (Japhethites)

⁷⁶ In the inter-testamental period, Jewish tradition described one of Noah's three sons as “white” (Enoch 89:9). The continuation of this tradition is also evident in the midrash of Rabbi Eliezer. Commenting on Gen. 9:25-27, he says, Noah “blessed Japheth and his sons, (making)

and coloureds (Hamites and Gentile Shemites or Semites) (e.g., Matt. 28:18-20; Acts 8:5,14,27,37; 10:1). But in Divine Providence, the greatest Gentile blessing goes to the Japhethites (Gen. 9:27; 10:1-5); and so such white racist language i.e., Gentile race generics of “Greeks,” reflects the Divine order; in the same way that patriarchal sexist language i.e., male gender generics such as “mankind,” reflects the Divine order (Gen. 2:21-24; 3:16; I Cor. 11:3,8,9; 14:34). Thus the NT language of “Jew and Greek” reflects and manifests the blessing of Shem to Jewish Semites (Gen. 9:26), and the blessing of Japheth (Gen. 9:27). “I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith” (Rom. 1:16,17).

Matthew 7.

In Matt. 7:6, the TR’s “*katapatesosin* (‘they may trample,’ or simply ‘they trample,’ AV, subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *katapateō*),” is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968, Clement of Rome, & Clement of Alexandria). This is altered in a minority Byzantine reading to “*katapatesousin* (‘they will trample,’ indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *katapateō*)” (X 033 & Lectionary 2378); also found in the Alexandrian Text’s Rome Vaticanus, and adopted in the NU Text *et al.* Though the meaning in the Greek is different, *infra*, both may be translated, “lest they trample” (AV & TR; ESV & NU Text).

The correct reading of the TR at Matt. 7:6 is subjunctive i.e., “the dogs” and “swine” *might* “trample them under foot.” By contrast, the NU Text’s reading removes the subjunctive mood which indicates *possibility*. On the one hand, it is possible to argue that the NU Text’s retention before *katapatesousin* of the TR’s “*mepote* (lest),” acts to restore the conditional nature of “they” *might / may* trample.” In this context, it is notable that both the NIV and Moffatt Bible, following the Alexandrian reading, indicate possibility, e.g., “in case (*mepote*) they trample them under foot” (Moffatt Bible). But on the other hand, it is also possible to argue that the indicative future active of the NU Text’s “*katapatesousin* (they trample),” when compared and contrasted with the NU Text’s retention of the TR’s subjunctive for “*rexsosin* (‘they rend,’ subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person singular, from *regnumi*)” in “and turn again and rend (*rexsosin*) you,” means that contextually there is a higher probability “the dogs” and “swine” will “trample them under their feet,” and a correspondingly lower probability that they will then “turn again and rend you.”

them entirely white” (Friedlander, G. translator, *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*, The Chapters of Rabbi Eliezer the Great, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., London; Bloch, New York, USA, 1916, pp. 172-173.). This was written in the latter half of the first century A.D. or early decades of the second century, though some might date it later (*Ibid.*, p. xiii.). This indicates that in the late first or early second centuries A.D., south west Europe and Asia Minor, e.g., southern Spain (see Tarshish, Gen. x. 4), Greece (see Javan, Gen. x. 2), and Asia Minor (see Gomer, Gen. x. 3), were still discernibly Caucasian; although since that time, as a consequence of miscegenation many of the Japhethite lands, Greece included, have lost their racial blessing and in general are no longer white (although the historic aristocracy of Greece is). Such miscegenation in southern Europe coincided with, and was responsible for, the loss of creative genius and military strategic capacity that built the Greco-Roman world.

I.e., if at Matt. 7:6 one made the contrast between “*katapatēsousin* (they will trample)” as an indicative active future, with the idea of the subjunctive active aorist they “turn again and rend (*rexosin*, subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person singular plural, from *regnumi*) you,” then one might further argue that while the swine definitely “will” (future) “trample them under foot,” it is only a possibility that they then additionally “turn again and rend you.” Such a contrast is quite false relative to the Greek of the Received Text, but possible within the Greek of the NU Text. Thus I remind the reader that this Appendix is a time-saving device, by which I generally remove more detailed discussion of variants where the English translation is the same. Nevertheless, I am not thereby suggesting that such differences are necessarily unimportant.

Hence even though the English translation is the same from the TR and NU Text *et al* at Matt. 7:6, the incorrect NU Text *et al* introduces a possible meaning into the Greek that is lacking in the correct TR. Thus the NU Text *et al* allows for great distortion to be done to this verse when e.g., it is being propounded by a Minister in a sermon explaining the meaning of the underpinning Greek from the NU Text *et al*. This danger is compounded by the fact, that the Minister may be using the AV, and not realize that the neo-Alexandrian based commentary that he gets his information from is using a different text to the TR; since the English rendering, “lest they trample” in the AV, might also be the English rendering in the commentary. *We of the holy Protestant faith need to be very careful about these things!* Therefore my advice to my fellow Protestants, whether with regard to this text of Scripture or any other text of the NT, is simple. It is the same whether addressed to a Christian Minister of the Gospel, or another good Christian studying the NT. It is this. If you wish to propound the Greek of the New Testament, then make sure you are using the *Textus Receptus*. Its apographs preserve the autographs. Thus it is the best text.

At Matt. 7:10 we read in the MBT (e.g., E 07, K 017, S 028; & Clement of Alexandria) and TR, “*ean* (if) *ichthun* (‘a fish’) [the son] *aitēsē* (‘he may ask,’ subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *aiteō*)” i.e., since conditional clauses are formed by *ean* and a subjunctive, this reads, “if he ask a fish” (AV). There is no good textual argument against the MBT which must thus stand. A minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032, Sigma 0 42, & N 022), also found in the NU Text *et al*, reads, “*ichthun* (a fish) *aitēsei* (‘he will ask,’ indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *aiteō*).” Without entering into the details on disputations that exist among grammarians on the precise meaning of the Greek future tense; (unlike myself,) some insist that it conveys an absolute future certainty, and so here means, “when he asks a fish.”

But others, (like myself,) consider that context can determine that an event in the future tense may not necessarily transpire⁷⁷. Those taking the latter view in their translation of “*aitēsei* (‘he will ask,’ future tense),” are clearly in the majority here at Matt. 7:10, since this is rendered, “if he shall ask” by the ASV, and likewise as a conditional future by the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. Thus while there is a different shade of meaning in the Greek between the TR (focusing on the *conditional quality* of “if he ask,”) and the NU Text (focusing on the *future quality* of “if he ask), there is no necessary difference *in English translation* between the TR and NU Text, i.e., “if he asks for a fish” (NKJV & TR; ESV & NU Text).

An interesting issue is presented to us here at Matt. 7:10 in Lectionary 2378, which reads,

⁷⁷ Young’s *Greek*, p. 117.

“*aitesei*,” as it does also at Matt. 7:9 (MBT & TR, *aitese*) and John 11:22 (MBT & TR, *aitese*)⁷⁸. As discussed at Matt. 6:22, *supra*, Lectionary 2378 sometimes adopts a localized vowel pronunciation induced alternative spelling, that interchanges “*ei*” and “*ē*”; but it is inconsistent in doing so. Such inconsistency now causes difficulties of interpretation. What is the meaning of Lectionary 2378 here in Matt. 7:10, or in Matt. 7:9 (minority Byzantine reading, “*aitesei*,” Minuscules 2 & 28) or John 11:22 (minority Byzantine reading, “*aitesei*,” M 021 & Gamma 036)? Does Lectionary 2378 follow other minority Byzantine readings at Matt. 7:9,10; John 11:22, and read, “*aitesei*” as an indicative active future verb? Or does Lectionary 2378 follow the majority Byzantine reading at Matt. 7:9,10; John 11:22, and read, “*aitesei*” as a subjunctive active aorist verb, i.e., in which it uses alternative vowel spellings in which the suffix “*ē*” (eta) becomes the suffix “*ei*” (epsilon, iota)?

Furthermore, might this account for the origins of the variant? We know that scribes sometimes got different portions of manuscripts from different sources (possibly on a temporary loan), and then just put them all together as they wrote out their manuscript. This is why e.g., *Codex Freerianus* (W 032, 5th century) is Byzantine Text in Matthew and Luke 8:13-24:53 and not in the rest of the Gospels, or why *Codex Alexandrinus* (A 02, 5th century) is Byzantine Text in its (incomplete) Gospels, but not from Acts on. I.e., did such a vowel change first occur here at Matt. 7:9,10 (and / or John 11:22), and then a scribe got a portion of a manuscript with this vowel change from this source, and some other portion(s) from another source, and when they were put together in the final redaction, it was not clear that at this point of Matt. 7:9,10 (and / or John 11:22) the manuscript had come from at least one source making this vowel change? Was the consequence of this that the “*ei*” suffix of Matt. 7:9,10 was then misinterpreted as an indicative active future verb? We cannot be sure of this matter, but we can be sure that one of the Byzantine Text’s jewels, Lectionary 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*), here helps us to better understand *what might have happened*.

At Matt. 7:12, Scrivener’s text reads “*osa an* (whatsoever),” as does both Hodges & Farstad’s (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont’s (2005) majority texts. But these von Soden (1913) based majority texts are not reliable on the issue of optional letters, and it is noteworthy that the optional “*e*” (epsilon) is found in the reading, “*osa ean*” of W 032, Sigma 042, N 022, and Lectionary 1968. We cannot be sure what the MBT reading is in such instances, but the matter is of no consequence. The optional “*e*” is also added before the *an* in the NU Text.

At Matt. 7:13, the TR’s “*eiselthete* (imperative active second aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *eiserchomai*),” is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968); and becomes, as in the two leading Alexandrian texts, the NU Text’s “*eiselthate* (imperative active first aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *eiserchomai*)” i.e., “enter ye in” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H). At Matt. 7:22, the TR’s “*propheteusamen* (‘did we ... prophesy,’ indicative active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from *propheteuo*),” in the words, “did we not prophesy,” or “have we not prophesied,” (AV) is MBT (e.g., Sigma 042). This becomes in a minority Byzantine reading “*epropheteusamen* (‘did we ... prophesy,’ indicative active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from *propheteuo*)” (W 032); also found in the two leading Alexandrian Texts, and hence the NU Text *et al.* Whether or not the optional “*e*” is on the aorist verb, it reads the same e.g., in the ASV, “did we not prophesy.”

At Matt. 7:25, the TR’s “*prosepeson* (‘they beat upon,’ indicative active second aorist,

⁷⁸ Lectionary 2378, p. 62a.

3rd person plural verb, from *prospipto*)” is MBT (e.g., E 07, M 021, & S 028); but following the two leading Alexandrian texts, this becomes the NU Text’s “*prosepesan* (‘they beat upon,’ indicative active first aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *prospipto*),” i.e., “beat upon” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H). Another minority Byzantine reading at Matt. 7:25 is “*prosekopsan* (‘beat upon,’ indicative active first aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *proskopto*)” (probably introduced from verse 27) (Lectionary 1968).

At Matt. 7:28, the TR’s “*sunetelesen* (‘had ended,’ AV, indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *sunteleo*),” is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968); and following the two leading Alexandrian texts becomes the NU Text’s “*etelesen* (‘had ended,’ or ‘had finished,’ ASV, indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *teleo*),” The Greek *sunteleo* is from *sun* indicating a *union* (“with” or “together”), and *teleo* meaning to *end*. Either way, the meaning here is *he had ended* or *he had finished*.

In Matt. 7:5, the TR’s word order, “*ten* (‘the,’ word 1) *dokon* (‘beam,’ word 2) *ek* (‘out of,’ word 3,) *tou* (‘the,’ word 4) *opsthal mou* (‘eye,’ word 5) *sou* (‘of thee’ i.e., ‘thine own,’ AV, word 6),” is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968); but following the two leading Alexandrian texts is changed in the NU Text to word order 3,4,5,1,2. In Matt. 7:24,26, (twice) “*ten* (‘the,’ word 1) *oikian* (‘house,’ word 2) *autou* (‘of him,’ word 3)” i.e., “his house” (AV), is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968⁷⁹); but following the two leading Alexandrian texts is changed in the NU Text to word order 3,1,2.

In Matt. 7:16, the TR’s “*staphulen* (‘grapes,’ accusative singular, first declension feminine noun, from *staphule*),” is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968); but following the two leading Alexandrian texts is changed in the NU Text *et al* to, “*staphulas* (‘grapes,’ accusative plural, first declension feminine noun, from *staphule*),” But since *staphule* refers to a *bunch of grapes*, the translation is the same, “grapes” (AV & ASV).

At Matt. 7:20, “*apage* (Wherefore)” or “*apa ge* (Wherefore)” is MBT. E.g., this is written in continuous script in W 032 and Lectionary 1968. In unraveling the continuous script,

⁷⁹ At Matt. 7:26 Lectionary 1968 literally reads, “*ten oiki autou*”. In the cursive script of this Lectionary, the “n” (nu) looks something like a “μ” (mu), although lacks the bar on the right side of a mu. The “a” (alpha) is joined in running writing to the “u” (upsilon). Evidently, at Matt. 7:26, (but not at Matt. 7:24), the scribe tripped over the similar, though not identical looking, “an” suffix of “*oikian* (house)” and “au” prefix of “*autou* (of him),” thereby here omitting by a confused ellipsis the “an” of “*oikian* (house).” But the meaning of the manuscript is still sufficiently clear to me to say that Lectionary 1968 here supports the MBT.

this becomes in Hodges & Farstad and Pierpont & Robinson, two words, “*apa ge* (Wherefore),” and in Scrivener’s Text, one word, “*apage* (Wherefore).” Who is “correct”? Also in two words is the NU Text. At Matt. 7:21 the TR’s “*en* (in) *ouranois* (heaven)” is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968). But following the two leading Alexandrian texts, the NU Text adds *tois* (“the”) in front of the final “*ouranois* (heaven),” but this is not translated into English, so that either way the rendering is “in heaven” (TR & AV; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 7:18 (twice) the TR’s “*poiein* (‘to bring forth’ or ‘to bear,’ active present infinitive from *poieō*),” is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968). But on the first occasion in Codex Vaticanus, and on the second occasion in Codex Sinaiticus, this is changed to “*enegkein* (‘to bring forth’ or ‘to bear,’ active second aorist infinitive from *pherō*⁸⁰).” This led to a double adoption of “*enegkein*” in Tischendorf’s 8th edition and Nestle’s 21st edition, whereas it was adopted the first time but not the second time in W-H; and not followed at all in the contemporary NU Text although the variant is referred to in the UBS 3rd Corrected edition (1983). But both words may be rendered the same, and thus at Matt. 7:18 on both occasions “*poiein*” (TR), and on the first occasion, “*enegkein*” (W-H) and the second occasion, “*poiein*” (W-H), may be here translated, “bring forth” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

N.B., MATT. 7 IS THE LAST CHAPTER WHERE I AM COMPREHENSIVELY SHOWING THE ISSUE OF OPTIONAL LETTERS (see comments *supra*). In the concluding three chapters of this Appendix these will not receive the more comprehensive treatment found in Matt. 1-7. In general we do not know what the MBT reading is for them, and so the diversity is more an issue of diversity among printed texts.

Matthew 8.

At Matt. 8:4a the MBT reading is “*alla*” (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). (See Appendix 2, Matt. 8:4a). At Matt. 8:4a, Scrivener reads “*all*’ (but),” reflecting his stylistic practice of dropping the final “a” (alpha) vowel of *alla* before a vowel (here the next word is “*upage*” / “go thou”). So too the NU Text reads *alla*. These are stylistic issues and do not affect the translation.

At Matt. 8:4b, the TR’s “*prosenegke* (compound word, ‘*pros*’ + ‘*enegke*,’ imperative active second aorist, 2nd person singular verb, from *prospherō*⁸¹),” is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 2378; and with the variant spelling, “*prosenegkai*,” Lectionary 1968⁸²). This is changed in

⁸⁰ Some verbs, of which *pherō* is an example, lack a cognate present form and are commonly used in a second (“strong”) aorist form, even though for grammatical purposes such as a lexicon they are placed under a present form of the same meaning. They are often assimilated to first (“weak”) aorist endings. Compare “*enegkon*” (2nd aorist) under “*pherō*” in Whittaker’s *New Testament Greek Grammar* (SCM, London, England, UK, 1969, 1975,) p. 42; with “*enegka*” (1st aorist) under “*pherō*” in Mounce’s *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT*, p. 469.

⁸¹ Greek *prospherō* is a compound word, *pros* (towards) + *pherō* (bear) i.e., to bear towards etc. . On *pherō* in both Matt. 8:4b readings, see footnote on Matt. 7:18, *supra*.

⁸² On the interchangeability of “e” and “ai” suffixes, see Commentary Vol. 2 at Matt. 16:8b, “Preliminary Textual Discussion,” “The First Matter.” Cf. Matt. 9:2a,5b,5c; 11:5 *infra*.

Codex Vaticanus and hence the NU Text *et al* to, “*prosenegkon* (compound word, ‘*pros*’ + ‘*enegkon*,’ imperative active first aorist, 2nd person singular verb, from *prospherō*.)” Either way, Matt. 8:4b means “offer thou,” and is rendered, “offer” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 8:5 the TR’s “*Eiselthonti* (‘when was entered,’ dative singular, active aorist masculine participle, from *eiserchomai*, a compound word, *eis* / into + *erchomai* / come, go, enter, etc.)” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & N 022). A minority Byzantine reading is “*Elthonti* (‘when was entered,’ dative singular, active aorist masculine participle, from *erchomai*, come, go, enter, etc.) (Lectionary 2378). Yet another minority Byzantine reading (e.g., Minuscule 21 & Lectionary 1968); also found in the NU Text *et al* following the two leading Alexandrian texts, changes this to “*Eiselthontos* (genitive singular, active aorist masculine participle, from *eiserchomai*.)” But the reading remains, “when ... was entered” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

For “centurion,” the Greek has a first declension masculine noun form, *ekatontarches-ou o*, and a second declension masculine noun form, *ekatontarchos-ou o*. They are synonymous in meaning. Thus Matt. 8:13 reads “unto the centurion,” as either a significant minority Byzantine reading found in Scrivener’s Text⁸³, “*τῷ εκατονάρχῳ* (masculine singular dative second declension noun, from *ekatontarchos*)” (e.g., U 030, 9th century & Lectionary 1968), or as the MBT reading “*τῷ εκατοντάρχει* (masculine singular dative first declension noun, from *ekatontarches*)” (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022, & Lectionary 2378⁸⁴). Elsewhere Matthean Greek uses only the second declension noun, for we read in Matt. 8:5,8; 27:54 (MBT & Scrivener) “*εκατοντάρχος* (‘centurion,’ masculine singular nominative second declension noun, from *ekatontarchos*.)”

Notably two of these other three references (Matt. 8:5,8) are in close proximity to Matt. 8:13, and are part of the same discourse of Matt. 8:5-13. These factors make it stylistically incongruous to use the first declension noun, and so to bring textual tranquillity to this textual disturbance of the MBT, we must adopt the minority Byzantine reading “*τῷ εκατονάρχῳ* (the centurion),” here at Matt. 8:13. The incorrect reading is found in Erasmus’s 1516 edition. But upon later realizing his error, this was corrected to the TR’s reading in Erasmus’s 1522 edition. The TR’s reading is also manifested in the Greek NTs of e.g., Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633).

The incorrect reading here at Matt. 8:13, *τῷ εκατοντάρχει*,” is followed in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005).

⁸³ This minority Byzantine reading has the support of von Soden’s Kr group, which is *c.* 20% of his K group; or in more specific terms, *c.* 25% of the Gospel manuscripts in his K group. Though given the generalist nature of von Soden’s groups both of these figures may be up to about 10% lower i.e., *c.* 18-20% or *c.* 22.5-25% respectively.

⁸⁴ The eta (H) of this lectionary here looks something like an epsilon joined to a right-bar i.e., something like “ε-|.” This is unusual for Lectionary 2378, and so it looks as though the scribe first accidentally wrote epsilon (ε), and then realizing his error, stylized this into an eta (H).

This incorrect reading is also found in the two leading Alexandrian Texts and hence the NU Text *et al.* We thus find that neo-Alexandrians and Majority Text Burgonites here unite to come at the Received Text, declaring with violence in their eyes, “At Matt. 8:13 we here come against the *Textus Receptus* with a 6 inch dagger!” To which the neo-Byzantines pulling out a 1 yard long sword of the TR⁸⁵, sarcastically reply, “You call *that* a dagger!” The neo-Alexandrians and Burgonites look at each other and turn pale. They know they have no chance. They turn and run. The *Textus Receptus* stands unscathed. *Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum!* “The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever!”

At Matt. 8:28, the TR’s “*elthonti* (‘when was come,’ masculine singular dative, active aorist participle, from *erchomai*) auto (‘he,’ dative from *autos-e-o*)” i.e., “when he was come” (AV), is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042). It is also supported in the similar reading, “*elthonti* (when was come) to (‘the,’ dative definite article, redundant in translation) *iu* (‘Jesus,’ abbreviated from *Iesou*⁸⁶), i.e., “when Jesus was come” (Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), which being at the beginning of a reading (Matt. 8:28-9:1) in both Lectionaries 2378 & 1968, has the name “*iu* (Jesus)” added in due to Lectionary stylizing. Following Rome Vaticanus, this is changed in the NU Text *et al* to “*elthontos* (‘when was come,’ masculine singular genitive, active aorist participle, from *erchomai*) autou (‘he,’ genitive from *autos-e-o*).” But either way, the reading is still, “when he was come” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 8:34, the TR’s “*sunantesin* (‘meet,’ feminine accusative singular noun, from *sunantesis-eos, e*),” is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968); and is changed in the NU Text *et al* following the two leading Alexandrian texts to, “*upantesin* (‘meet,’ feminine accusative singular noun, from *upantesis / hupantesis-eos, e*).” Either way, the translation remains “meet” in, “came out to meet Jesus” (AV & ASV).

At Matt. 8:27, the TR’s word order, “*upakouousin* (word 1, ‘obey’) auto (word 2, dative ‘him’),” is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968); and also appears in this word order in a minority Byzantine reading putting word 2 in the genitive, “*upakouousin autou*” (Lectionary 2378). The NU Text *et al* following the two leading Alexandrian texts, changes the TR’s word order 2,1.

At Matt. 8:22, the TR’s “But Jesus said (*eipen*, indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular, from *lego*) unto him” (AV) is MBT (Lectionary 1968). But a minority Byzantine reading (Lectionary 2378); also found in the NU Text *et al*, in following the two leading Alexandrian texts changes this to, “But Jesus saith (*legei*, indicative active present, 3rd person singular, from *lego*) unto him” (ASV & NU Text *et al*). Though not the same in the Greek, both may be rendered in English as “said” (AV & TR; ESV & NU Text). Was this a deliberate “stylistic improvement” by an Alexandrian scribe? Or was there a paper loss from *eipen*, in which only the second “e” survived, and a scribe, looking at something like ::::E:::, then guessed *legei* as the reconstruction “from context”?

⁸⁵ 6 inches is *c.* 15 cm and 1 yard is *c.* 1 metre.

⁸⁶ Because Jesus’ name is transliterated from the Hebrew or Aramaic, it has a quasi second declension noun form in which the genitive “*ou*” suffix is used for vocative, genitive, and dative; but the definite article here tells us that this is in the dative.

Matthew 9.

The TR reads “thy sins be forgiven (*apheontai*, ‘they are forgiven,’ passive indicative perfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *aphiemi*)” (Matt. 9:2a, AV), or “your [singular] sins are forgiven (*apheontai*)” (NKJV). Likewise at Matt. 9:5a, the TR reads, “sins be forgiven (*apheontai*)” (AV) or “sins are forgiven (*apheontai*)” (NKJV). This is the MBT (e.g., with variant spelling “*aphaiontai*”⁸⁷ at Matt. 9:2a, and variant spelling “*apheonte*”⁸⁸ at Matt. 9:5a in Lectionary 2378; & MBT spellings in Lectionary 1968) at Matt. 9:2a,5a, and with no good textual argument against it, it is undoubtedly correct. Following Westcott-Hort, the NU Text reads at Matt. 9:2a,5a, “thy sins are forgiven (*aphientai*)” (ASV), a reading found in e.g., London Sinaiticus. It is also found as “thy sins are forgiven (*aphiontai*)” in e.g., Rome Vaticanus. Possibly the readings found in these two leading Alexandrian texts, *aphientai* = *aphiontai* (‘they are forgiven,’ present indicative active, 3rd person plural verb, from *aphiemi*), were “reconstructed” by different scribes, after the middle letters “*eo*” of *apheontai* were gone due to a paper loss or fade. Or given the issue of revowelings to a local dialect evident in Lectionary 2378, *supra*, possibly a scribe seeking to “correct” some changed vowelings of a manuscript back to their original form, misunderstood the meaning of the local dialect’s changed vowelings, and so “reconstructed” them incorrectly as present indicative active verbs.

All three readings may be translated, “thy sins are forgiven.” Even though as a way to reduce the variants discussed, I have generally not discussed such variants where the English rendering is the same, this policy may be criticized for the obvious reason that even where the English translation is the same, the Greek may have a different shade of meaning. Such a criticism is certainly apt here. With the TR’s “*apheontai* (they are forgiven),” the perfect tense shows both the completeness of the action of forgiving as well as the continuing result of such forgiveness. With the variant, “*aphientai*” / “*aphiontai* (they are forgiven),” the present tense shows that that are *at that present time* already forgiven.

⁸⁷ I.e., at Matt. 9:2a, Lectionary 2378 here first interchanges “*e*” for “*ai*” (cf. Lectionary 1968 at Matt. 8:4b, *supra*); and then interchanges “*o*” for “*o*.” See next footnote.

⁸⁸ I.e., at Matt. 9:5a, Lectionary 2378 here first interchanges “*o*” for “*o*,” and then interchanges “*e*” for “*ai*”. See previous footnote. The fact that Lectionary 2378 has two quite different spellings and vowelings for the same word just 3 verses apart in the same reading (Matt. 9:1-8), highlights some of the complexities and difficulties that may occur in understanding a given scribe’s writing style.

It is possible that the Alexandrian texts were “reconstructions” following paper fades of parts of the letter. But given this curious diversity found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, it is certainly possible, though by no means certain, that these were manifestations of the Alexandrian scribes’ penchant to make “stylistic improvements” of the text. Of course, we cannot be sure about this e.g., it is possible these were “reconstructions” seeking to reach the “original” form in manuscripts with altered vowelings to a local dialect, as referred to in Lectionary 2378, *supra*. We only know for sure that the variant is not original.

Reflecting crucial Biblical teaching, the *Athanasian Creed* says Christ “suffered for our salvation;” the *Apostles’ Creed* says Christ, “suffered,” “was crucified, dead, and buried;” and the *Nicene Creed* says, “for us men, and for our salvation,” the “Son of God” “came down from heaven,” “was crucified,” “suffered and was buried.” Both the *Apostles’* and *Nicene Creeds* refer to, “the forgiveness (remission) of sins,” for those who “believe” “in” “Jesus Christ” as “Lord” (Rom. 4:6-8,25; 5:6,8,9; 8:33,34; 10:8-10). The *Apostles’*, *Athanasian*, and *Nicene Creeds*, all refer to the intercessory role of Christ who “sitteth on the right hand of the Father.” St. Paul says, “It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us” (Rom. 8:34); and St John says, “if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins” (I John 2:1,2). This “forgiveness of sins” (*Apostles’ Creed*) is an integral element of the Biblical teaching of “*sola fide*” (Latin, “faith alone,” Rom. 1:17; Philp. 3:8,9) and “*sola gratia*” (Latin, “grace alone,” Eph. 2:8,9) (*Reformation Motto*) (Rom. 4:4-8).

Though discussion of such matters is generally, though by no means always, beyond the scope of this commentary, due to the centrality of the forgiveness of sins to the Christian Gospel, I make the following short point with regard to Matt. 9:2a,5. The TR’s “*apheontai* (they are forgiven),” perfect tense shows the sins have been, and continue to be, forgiven. Forgiveness once granted after genuine repentance, is not thereafter conditional. It is absolute. If God has forgiven our sins, he will remember them no more. He will never rescind his forgiveness. (Isa. 44:25,26.)

At Matt. 9:5c, the TR’s “*egeirai* (‘to raise up,’ or ‘to rise up,’ infinitive active aorist, from *egeiro*)” is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 2378); whereas the NU Text *et al*, following the Alexandrian Text London Sinaiticus and Western Text D 05, reads “*egeire* (literally, ‘arise thou,’ imperative active present, from *egeiro*).” Either way, the translation is “Arise” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H). Notably, Lectionary 1968 reads, “*egeire*.” Is this simply another example of the interchange between “*ai*” and “*e*”, so that in fact Lectionary 1968 is supporting the MBT? (Cf. Matt. 8:4b; 9:2a,5b *supra*, 11:5, *infra*). Or is this an example of Lectionary 1968 following the minority Byzantine reading, “*egeire*” (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022, G 011, & 2)? Once again I ask, is the issue of revowelling for local dialects, here evident in the issue of the possible interchange between “*ai*” and “*e*”, the real origins of this variant i.e., was the infinitive active aorist, “*egeirai*,” mistakenly taken to be an imperative active present, “*egeire*,” because of a copyist’s reliance upon such a local dialect’s revowelled manuscript as his source?

At Matt. 9:5c Scrivener reads “*egeirai* (to raise up) as does the majority texts of both Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). But whereas Hodges & Farstad consider the text is here seriously divided with the reading, “*egeire* (arise thou),” Robinson & Pierpont make no reference to this variant. Yet the majority text of Burgon & Miller (1899) here dismisses the MBT reading (*egeirai*) in favour of the variant (*egeire*). Von Soden (1913) says

the TR's reading here is supported inside his K group by the subgroups Kx and Kr. Combined these two groups constitute c. 68-72% of K group (see commentary Vol. 2, at Matt. 20:15c), and thus the MBT. Burgon & Miller here erred in using a limited manuscript count with too many corrupt texts in it. Though they used more manuscripts than some 16th century neo-Byzantines, they lacked their God given skills for selecting the right manuscripts to work from when the count is so low. E.g., they here say of their all too limited manuscript count at Matt. 8:4b, that their decision in favour of the variant has the support of such manuscripts as *Codex Vaticanus* (B 03, Alexandrian Text), *Codex Sinaiticus* (Ⲙ 01, Alexandrian Text), *Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus* (C 04, mixed text type), and *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis* (D 05, Western Text). Understandably, both Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont, here started looking for "the EXIT doors" to try and distance themselves from their leader, whom the Burgonites sometimes call, "the magnificent" one, but who on all accounts, here made "a magnificent mess" of Matt. 9:5c.

At Matt. 9:6, the TR's, Tischendorf's 8th edition, and NU Text's, "*egertheis* ('having risen' / 'rising up,' i.e., 'Arise,' nominative singular, aorist passive participle, from *egeiro*)," is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and with no good textual argument against it is clearly correct. The Alexandrian text's, Rome Vaticanus, reads "*egeire*" ('Arise thou!' / 'Arise!', imperative active present, 2nd person singular, from *egeiro*), and this was adopted in W-H and Nestle's 21st edition (both giving the TR's reading as a footnote alternative). Both may be translated, "Arise" (AV & ASV).

At Matt. 9:18, the reading, "*archon* ('ruler,' word 1) *eis* ('one' / 'certain one,' word 2) *elthon* ('coming,' word 3, nominative singular, aorist active participle, from *erchomai*)," i.e., "there came a certain ruler" (AV), is MBT (e.g., K 017, S 028, & V 031); and e.g., old Latin Version d (5th century) reads Latin, "*unus* (a / certain one) *princeps* (prince / ruler) *veniens* (coming)." With no good textual argument against it we cannot doubt this is the correct reading. This MBT reading is found in both the TR and NU Text.

Nevertheless, five variants are of some interest to note. A minority Byzantine variant reads, "*archon* (ruler) *tis* (a certain) *proselthon* ('coming unto' / 'approaching,' nominative singular, aorist active participle, from *proserchomai*)" (*Variant 1*), i.e., "there came a certain ruler" (Lectionary 1968). Another minority Byzantine variant reads, "*archon* (ruler) *tis* (a certain) *proselthe* ('he was come to,' 'he had come to,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *proserchomai*) *to* (-) *ic* (= *Iesou*, 'Jesus'⁸⁹)" (*Variant 2*), i.e., "when a certain ruler was come to Jesus" (Lectionary 2378). But *Variant 2* is found at the beginning of a Lectionary reading (Matt. 9:18-26) and thus some rearrangement of the text, so as to include the name of "Jesus," appears to have occurred as a consequence of Lectionary style. Thus *Variant 2* was quite probably a scribal Lectionary modification of a *Variant 1* text.

The main variant found in W-H and Nestle's 21st edition (which both give the TR's reading as a footnote alternative), "*archon* (ruler) [*eis*] (one / certain one) *proselthon* ('coming unto' / 'approaching')" (*Variant 3*), may also be translated, "there came a certain ruler." On this occasion, I think the NU Text Committee was right to conclude that this variant came about as a "scribal modification made in the interest of clarifying for the reader the correct interpretation of"

⁸⁹ On the dative, "*to Iesou*," see footnote at Matt. 8:28, *supra*.

the continuous script “*EICELTHQN*” (*eiselthon*) found in e.g., Byzantine Codices W 032, Sigma 042, and N 022; “which” as the NU Text Committee further points out, “can be read *eis elthon*” (TR), or “*eiselthon*” (‘coming’ / ‘coming into,’ nominative singular, aorist active participle, from *eiserchomai*) (*Variant 4*), as in e.g., Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent) (Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 25). *Variant 4* was followed in Tischendorf’s 8th edition, which reads, “*archon* (a ruler) *eiselthon* (coming in)” i.e., “a ruler came in.” *Variant 5*, followed by Stephanus (1551) and Beza (1598) lacks the TR’s “*eis*,” but its “*archon* (a ruler) *elthon* (coming),” may also be translated the same as the TR if the TR’s “*eis*” is translated as the indefinite article, “a” i.e., “there came a ruler.”

Here at Matt. 9:18 there a difference in meaning between the TR’s “*archon* (ruler) *eis* (one / certain one) *elthon* (‘coming,’ nominative singular, aorist active participle, from *erchomai*),” i.e., “there came a certain ruler” (AV), and the *Variant 4* union of words 2 & 3 to form “*archon* (a ruler) *eiselthon* (coming in)” i.e., “a ruler came in.” Von Soden says the separate Word 2 is supported by the K group other than about one-fifth of K group (mainly the Kr subgroup; see commentary Vol. 2, at Matt. 20:15c); and that the separate Word 3 is supported by all of K group other than less than half a dozen manuscripts. Even taking into account the generalist nature of von Soden groups for which one must allow an error bar of up to *c.* 10%, it is clear that the TR’s reading as found in Scrivener’s Text is the MBT and is followed in both Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005).

The TR is clearly the AV’s reading at Matt. 9:18. However, while both the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899) and Hodges & Farstad (1985) here follow the MBT, both claim that they are doing so in antithesis to the TR which they both claim reads simply, “*elthon* (coming)” (*Variant 4*) rather than “*eis* (one / certain one) *elthon* (coming)” (Scrivener’s Text & AV). On the one hand, it is true that “*eis* (one / certain one)” was omitted by Erasmus (five editions, 1516-1535), Aldus (1518), Colinaeus (1534), Stephanus (four editions, 1546-1551), Plantin’s Polyglot (1572), Beza (five editions, 1560-1598), and Elzevir (1633). But on the other hand, the TR’s reading is found in the Complutensian NT (1514), and this reading, “there came a certain ruler” (Tyndale 1526 & Geneva Bible 1560), is clearly found in the AV also. Hence on this occasion, I would say that Burgon & Miller (1899) and Hodges & Farstad (1985) have simply discovered the true TR, which was clearly known to a number of neo-Byzantine Bible translators in the 16th and 17th centuries, found in the Complutensian NT (1514), and wisely adopted by Scrivener (1894 & 1902) as the TR underpinning the AV.

At Matt. 9:19, the English reading, “followed,” in the words, “and followed him” (AV), is the TR’s “*ekolouthesen* (‘he followed,’ indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular, from *akoloutheo*).” The TR is supported by the MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968, abbreviating this as “*ekolouthes*” with a flamboyant “*n*” written above the “*s*,” that looks something like, <~), St. Basil & St. Chrysostom; and with no good textual argument against it is correct. It is also followed in the NU Text (e.g., Rome Vaticanus). This English reading, is the same in *Variant 1*, “*ekolouthei* (‘he was following,’ indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular, from *akoloutheo*)” which is a minority Byzantine reading (Minuscule 21, 12th century). *Variant 1* is also found in e.g., London Sinaiticus, but the terminology is still, “and followed him” (ASV), in this variant followed in Tischendorf’s 8th edition, W-H, and Nestle’s 21st edition (although they all give the TR’s reading in a footnote).

However, *Variant 2*, “*ekolouthesan* (‘they followed,’ indicative active aorist, 3rd person

plural verb, from *akolouthēō*,” is a minority Byzantine reading also found here at Matt. 9:19. This is found in E 07 (8th century) and M 021 (9th century). Normally I would not discuss such an obtuse and clearly incorrect variant. But this matter takes on an unusual significance here because of the Lectionary 2378 reading here at Matt. 9:19. Lectionary 2378 simply reads “*ēkolouthē*” at the end of a line. A darkish mark appears on my positive form microfilm photocopy (black printing on white background), and a similar lack of clarity also exists in my negative form microfilm photocopy (white printing on black background) of this Lectionary.

Hence I inspected the original at Sydney University. But I found the vellum page 29b (and its opposite side p. 30a) to be so worn at this general point as to be translucent. Unless at some point in the future the original reading is found to be detectable by someone using an electronic scanning device not in my possession, this thus raises what for me are unanswerable questions. Was there originally either a continuation of this line, or an abbreviation something like Lectionary 1968, so that the original reading was the “*ēkolouthēsen* (he followed)” (TR & MBT)? Or was there originally either a continuation of this line, or an abbreviation in the same type of style as Lectionary 1968, so that the original reading was “*ēkolouthēsan* (‘they followed’)” (*Variant 2*)? Thus while the presence of the eta (e / literally “H” in this Lectionary) at the end of this word clearly rules out the possibility that Lectionary 2378 originally followed *Variant 1*, “*ēkolouthēi* (he was following);” on the presently available data we cannot be sure if Lectionary 2378 originally followed the MBT & TR reading, “*ēkolouthēsen* (he followed),” or the minority Byzantine reading, *Variant 2*, “*ēkolouthēsan* (they followed).”

Showing the usage of different optional letters in Matt. 9:2 Scrivener’s “*eipe* (‘said,’ literally ‘he said,’ indicative active aorist, from *legō*)” (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968); becomes the NU Text’s “*eipen*.” In Matt. 9:3 the TR’s “*eipon* (‘they said,’ indicative active second aorist, 3rd person plural, from *legō*),” is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968); and following Codex Vaticanus becomes the NU Text’s “*eipan* (‘they said,’ indicative active first aorist, 3rd person plural, from the verb, *legō*).”

At Matt. 9:11a, the TR’s “*eipon* (‘they said,’ indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *legō*)” is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968). But a minority Byzantine reading (W 032 & Lectionary 2378); also found in the NU Text *et al* following the two leading Alexandrian texts, changes this to “*elegon* (‘they began to say,’ indicative active imperfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *legō*).” Either way, the translation is “they said” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 9:9, the TR’s “*Matthaion*” is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968); but the NU Text *et al* following the two leading Alexandrian texts, changes this to “*Maththaion*.” Either way, the translation is “Matthew” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H). At Matt. 9:27, the translation is still “David” (AV & ASV) from “*Dabid*” (Scrivener and H & F) or “*Dauid*” (R & P; and NU Text), or “*Daueid*” (W-H). Such diversity may represent differences of style as missing letters are added after the name was abbreviated as “*Dad*” (with a bar over the top of these letters) (e.g., in both instances with a bar only over the “a,” Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). And indeed the data from our manuscript source book of von Soden (1913) is such that we do not generally know which spelling would be in a majority of those manuscripts that vowel this beyond “DAD (ΔΑΔ),” or whether indeed a majority of manuscripts even go beyond this “DAD (ΔΑΔ).” At Matt. 9:12,13b (twice) the translation is “but” from “*all*” (Scrivener, stylistically doing so before the vowel of the following words, Matt. 9:12, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968; & Matt. 9:13b, G 011, K 017, & V 031) or “*alla*” (Matt. 9:12, W 032; & Matt. 9:13b, W 032, Lectionaries 2378 &

1968).

At Matt. 9:17b, the TR's "*apolountai* ('they perish,' or 'they will perish,' indicative middle future, 3rd person plural verb, from *apollumi*)" is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & N 022); but the NU Text *et al* following the two leading Alexandrian texts, changes this to "*apolluntai* ('they perish,' indicative middle present, 3rd person plural verb, from *apollumi*)." But either way the translation is still "perish" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 9:30a, the TR's "*aneochthesan* (indicative passive aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *anoigo*)" is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968); but the NU Text, W-H, & Nestle's 21st ed. all following Rome Vaticanus changes the aorist prefix to read, *eneochthesan*" (indicative passive aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *anoigo*). Either way the translation is still "were opened" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 9:30b, the TR's "*enebrimesato* ('he straitly charged,' indicative middle aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *embrimaomai*)" is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968); but in the NU Text *et al* following the two leading Alexandrian texts, this changes to, "*enebrimethe* ('he straitly charged,' indicative passive aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *embrimaomai*)." Either way the translation is still "straitly charged them" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H) or "sternly warned them" (NKJV & TR; ESV & NU Text).

At Matt. 9:11b "*diati*" (Scrivener) or "*dia ti*" (R & P; H & F), is MBT, and found written in the continuous script of e.g., Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). Demonstrating possible differences of interpretation when words are spaced out after having been in a continuous script, at Matt. 9:11b the translation is "Why?" from "*diati*" (Scrivener, 1 word) and "*dia ti*" (NU Text, 2 words). Or at Matt. 9:17a, the continuous script "*eidemege*" (W 032) is translated "else" from "*ei de mege*" (Scrivener, and R & P, 3 words) or "*ei de me ge*" (H & F, and NU Text, 4 words).

At Matt. 9:36, the TR's "*osei*" is MBT (e.g., W 032), although a sizeable minority Byzantine reading is "*os*" (e.g., Sigma 042 & N 022). Either way the translation is still "as" in the words, "as sheep." The NU Text also reads "*osei*."

Matthew 10.

At Matt. 10:14, after "*exerchomenoi* ('going' / 'departing out,' masculine plural nominative, middle present participle)" (MBT & TR), unlike the MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968), the NU Text *et al* following the two leading Alexandrian texts, adds after this, "*exo*" (out / outside). This however should not affect the English translation, "When ye depart out of that house" (AV & TR), or "as you go forth out of that house" (ASV & W-H). The root Greek "*exerchomai*" means to "go forth" or "depart out" etc. . This makes the "*exo* (out / outside)" of the Alexandrian Text's *Rome Vaticanus* and *London Sinaiticus* redundant. This fact was clearly lost on the inferior quality scribes of the Alexandrian School, who while more commonly subtracting from the text of Scripture, at times also added to it. They evidently thought themselves to be "very smart" by adding in these redundant words as a "stylistic improvement." Possibly they did so because as "a reconstruction" because there was a stylistic paper space after "*exerchomenoi*;" though of course this is speculative.

At Matt. 10:3 the TR's "*Mathaios* (Matthew)" is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968); but in the NU Text following Codex Vaticanus, this changes to "*Maththaios* (Matthew)." At Matt. 10:13, the TR's "*elthetō* ("let ... come," imperative active second aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *erchomai*)," is MBT (e.g., P 024, 6th century; E 07, 8th century; & F 09, 9th century); although a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & N022), also found in the NU Text *et al* following Codex Sinaiticus, changes this to "*elthatō* ("let ... come," imperative active first aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *erchomai*)."

At Matt. 10:15, the TR's "*Gomorrōn*" is MBT e.g., (E 07, K 017, & S 028), and further supported in the variant spelling of "*Gomorrōn*" (Lectionary 1968). Amidst such variants as "*Gomorōn*" (W 032) and "*Gommoras*" (Sigma 042 & N 022), the meaning remains, "Gomorrhā;" that city which, together with Sodom, was known for the homosexual preference of most of its inhabitants (Gen. 18:20,21; 19:5-11), for which reason God destroyed it (Jude 7).

At Matt. 10:19, the TR's "*paradidōsin* ('they deliver up,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *paradidōmi*; the plural neuter subject, 'the Gentiles' / '*tois ethnesin*' may take singular verbs cf. Matt. 6:32, *supra*)" is MBT (e.g., K 017, M 021, & U 030); but a minority Byzantine reading (E 07), also found in the NU Text *et al* following the two leading Alexandrian texts, changes this to "*paradōsin* ('they deliver up,' subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *paradidōmi*)." Either way, the reading is still, "they deliver ... up" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H). The TR is supported by the MBT, and with no good textual argument against it is certainly correct. The subjunctive mood of the NU Text *et al* indicates *possibility*, thus giving the matter a degree of uncertainty absent in the TR. Thus while the English translation is the same in the AV from the TR and in the ASV from W-H, the Greek conveys different shades of meaning in the TR and NU Text *et al*. We are thus reminded yet again, that just because the translation into English may be same form the TR as the NU Text, the NU Text may still conceal a further level of error, only discoverable in the Greek.

At Matt. 10:19, yet another minority Byzantine reading (W 032, Sigma 042, N 022; Lectionary 2378, & Lectionary 1968 at its Matt. 10:16-20 reading), rightly not followed by translators, is "*paradōsousin* ('they will / shall deliver up,' indicative active future, 3rd person plural verb, from *paradidōmi*)."

Furthermore, here at Matt. 10:19, Lectionary 1968 (at its Matt. 10:17-31 reading), jumps in the text from this word at verse 19, "*paradidōsin* (they deliver up)," to "*diokōsin* ('they persecute,' subjunctive active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *dioko*)," at verse 23. The commonality in the "*d*" (delta) and "*ōsin*" ending of verse 19's "*paradidōsin* (they deliver up)" (TR) or possibly "*paradōsousin* ('they shall deliver up, Lectionary 1968's reading of this verse at its Matt. 10:16-20 reading), evidently accounts for some kind of confusion in the scribe's mind with the "*d*" and "*ōsin*" ending of verse 23's "*diokōsin* (they persecute)." This is quite a sizeable amount of text to lose in textual transmission, and it can only be conjectured that the scribe was in some way distracted, or returned after a break, and remembering in his head, "I'm up to the '*d*' (delta) and '*ōsin*' ending," and the approximate place he was up to on the manuscript he was copying from, spotted the verse 23 "*diokōsin* (they persecute)" and kept writing. Given the further omission at Matt. 10:25-28, *infra*, I think the evidence points to the scribe being either quite ill, very tired, or under repeated external distraction of an unusual type when he wrote out this passage (Matt. 10:17-31).

Some might tend to question, “How?,” a generally competent scribe such as that of Lectionary 1968 could make such mistakes, but with the evidence clearly before us here at Matt. 10:19,23, we cannot doubt this reality. *And of course, if it happened here, it may well have happened elsewhere in different manuscripts at different passages, and so Lectionary 1968 here more widely testifies to a process that is a one-way track to a shorter text.* Therefore, let the reader “BEWARE: OF NEO-ALEXANDRIAN CLAIMS THAT THE SHORTER TEXT IS THE BETTER TEXT.”

At Matt. 10:25b there is a major three way split in the Byzantine manuscripts, together with a fourth small minority Byzantine reading in e.g., N 022; and a major two-way split in the main Alexandrian manuscripts. The reading here is (1) “*ekalesan* (indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *kaleō*)” (Scrivener’s Text & e.g., Byzantine’s Minuscule 2, 12th century), or (2) “*apekalesan*” (indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *apokaleō* = *apo* + *kaleō*) (e.g., Byzantine’s U 030, 9th century), (3) “*epekalesan* (indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *epikaleō* = *epi* + *kaleō*)” (e.g., Byzantine’s W 032, 5th century; Alexandrian’s Rome Vaticanus & NU Text), or (4) “*epekalesanto*” (indicative middle aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *epikaleō* = *epi* + *kaleō*) (Byzantine’s Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century & N 022, 6th century; & Alexandrian’s London Sinaiticus), all meaning, “they have called.”

In elucidation on Matt. 10:25b, I note that Robinson & Pierpont (2005) give only “*ekalesan*” as their MBT reading with no alternative. By contrast, Hodges & Farstad (1985) show a three-way major split between these readings (referring to “*epekalesanto*,” but not as part of the three-way serious manuscript divide), and put “*epekalesan*” in their main text. Going to the common majority text source of von Soden (and without further subdividing groups into Gospel and non-Gospel manuscripts since this is not necessary for broad-brush figures with regard to the Gospels), and using only von Soden’s K group of which more than 90% of which is Byzantine text yields the following result. In broad-brush overview (1) “*ekalesan*” is followed by von Soden’s Kx group of c. 515 manuscripts; (2) “*apekalesan*” is followed by von Soden’s Kr group of c. 210 manuscripts; and (3) “*epekalesan*” is followed by von Soden’s K1 & Ki groups which jointly contains 60 manuscripts. This approximate 510:210:60 respective split for (1) “*ekalesan*” (Kx), (2) “*apekalesan*” (Kr), (3) “*epekalesan*” (K1 & Ki), within the K group is thus in percentage terms per 100 manuscripts in the respective approximate order of 65:27:8. This simultaneously explains why Robinson & Pierpont gave no alternative reading whereas Hodges & Farstad refer to a major three-way split. But on these figures, Hodges & Farstad have clearly erred in putting (3) “*epekalesanto*” in their main text.

More generally, St. Matthew does not use *apokaleō* the root word for (2) “*apekalesan*,” and only rarely uses *epikaleō* (Matt. 10:3, “surname,” *epikletheis*, masculine singular nominative, passive aorist participle) the root word for (3) “*epekalesan*.” However, St. Matthew has a much more general usage of *kaleō* the root word for (1) “*ekalesan*,” e.g., in Matt. 1:21; 2:23; 5:9,19; 9:13; 20:8; 21:13; 22:3,43,45. And in particular, we find he elsewhere uses the indicative active aorist 3rd person form of *kaleō*, albeit in the singular (Matt. 1:25; 4:21; 25:14) rather than the plural (Matt. 10:25) form i.e., “*ekalesen* (indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *kaleō*). Given both this linguistic commonality of *kaleō* in Matthean Greek relative to both *apokaleō* and *epikaleō*; coupled with the fact that within the split of Byzantine manuscripts the percentage reading of (1) “*ekalesan*” to (2) “*apekalesan*” to (3) “*epekalesan*” is about 65% to 27% to 8% respectively, means that I would regard the reading “*ekalesan*” at Matt. 10:25b in Scrivener’s Text to be the TR.

Burgon & Miller (1899) claim that the minority reading, (3) “*epekalesan*,” with *c.* 8% support, is in fact the majority text reading, and so should replace the TR’s “*ekalesan*.” They are certainly wrong to do so, and this shows the dangers of a too small sample with corrupted texts in it e.g., Burgon & Miller’s count includes in its support *Codex Vaticanus* (B 03, Alexandrian Text) and *Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus* (C 04, mixed text type).

Hodges & Farstad say their methodology is that when “choosing a text reading from among Mpt [Majority Part i.e., a ‘seriously divided’ text] variations, a strong preference was normally accorded to the reading of the Kx where this group was essentially united.” That is the case here, but Kx unites in favour of (1) “*ekalesan*.” While they say “occasionally a transcriptional consideration outweighs even a preponderance of contradictory testimony from Kx,” that would not be the case here. They make the general qualification that “all decisions about Mpt readers are provisional and tentative. That the text may very well be improved with different choices in many cases is readily admitted by the editors⁹⁰.” Certainly this would be a case in point where “the text may well be improved upon” as a majority text by adopting in the main text (1) “*ekalesan*,” as done by Robinson & Pierpont.

Did Hodges & Farstad (1985) here put (3) “*epekalesan*” rather than (1) “*ekalesan*” in the main text, simply as a “provisional and tentative” decision that they did not give enough consideration to, and which, if they returned to in a future edition, they would therefore probably correct by putting (1) “*ekalesan*” in the main text? Or did Hodges & Farstad (1985) here follow Burgon & Miller (1899) in their main text for reasons of a “textual trademark”?

Here at Matt. 10:25b and Matt. 10:25c, we find that in Lectionary 1968, the text jumps by ellipsis from the “*autou* (his)” of “his lord” to the “*autou* (his)” of “his household” at the end of the verse, thus omitting a sizable half verse i.e., the words, “If they have called the master of the house Beelzebul, how much more shall they call them of his household?” See my comments on Lectionary 1968 at Matt. 10:19, *supra*.

At Matt. 10:19, *supra*, some reference has already been made to the very bad textual transmission of Lectionary 1968 in the Matt. 10:17-31 reading. But at Matt. 10:25-28, “the plot thickens” even further. We find that at verse 25a, the scribe first jumps by ellipsis on the “*autou* (his)” of “his lord,” down to the “*autou* (his)” of “his household” at the end of verse 25. The scribe then wrote the “*me* (not) *oun* (therefore)” at the beginning of verse 26, and then jumped by ellipsis from the “*phobethete* (fear)” of verse 26 to the “*phobeisthe* (fear)” of verse 28, and kept writing on the rest of verse 28. As previously stated at Matt. 10:19, I consider the staggeringly high level of ellipsis error to be so great in this Matt. 10:17-31 reading of Lectionary 1968, that I think we must stipulate that the scribe was either quite ill, very tired, or under repeated external distraction of an unusual type when he wrote out this passage. Be that as it may, it is still clear from context that Lectionary 1968 follows the MBT reading, “*phobeisthe*” (first occurrence) and MBT reading “*phobethete*” (2nd occurrence) here at Matt. 10:28a. (While it might be *just possible* to argue that this was a deliberate jump from verse 25 to 28 i.e., a Lectionary selection, taking into account both the earlier jump from verse 19 to verse 23; and the fact that the “*oun* /

⁹⁰ Hodges & Farstad, pp. xxi & xxii.

therefore” is best explained as being from verse 26 in another ellipsis jump; I think the proposition of a third ellipsis jump is, on the available data, the most probable explanation.)

At Matt. 10:28a, the TR’s first occurrence of “*phobethete* (subjunctive passive aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *phobeomai*)” is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., Sigma 042, N 022, Y 034, Omega 045, S 028, 28, Origen, Eusebius, Apostolic Constitutions). Hence the MBT reading, “*phobeisthe*,” is followed in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). While the reading of the MBT (e.g., W 032 & Lectionary 1968), “*phobeisthe* (imperative middle present, 2nd person plural verb, from *phobeomai*)” at Matt. 10:28a is *prima facie* within the parameters of Matthean Greek (see the TR’s & MBT’s *phobeisthe* at Matt. 14:27; 17:7; 28:5,10); here at Matt. 10:28 it clangs on the ears as bad Greek at this first occurrence in Matt. 10:28. That is because it is part of a couplet in which Christ uses a stylistic parallel, “And fear (“*phobethete*,” minority Byzantine reading, or “*phobeisthe*” MBT) not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul,” with “but rather fear (*phobethete*, TR & MBT e.g., Lectionary 1968) him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.” It is also part of a wider context in which Christ says, “Fear (*phobethete*, TR & MBT e.g., W 032 with variant localized spelling, “*phobethetai*”) them not” (Matt. 10:26), and “Fear (*phobethete*, TR & MBT e.g., Lectionary 1968) ye not” (Matt. 10:30). In this instance, the wider context of Matt. 10:26,30 would not, of itself, be conclusive. But when coupled with the immediate context of the poetical couplet of Matt. 10:28, the textual problem with the MBT is clear.

The middle voice of the MBT reading is a deponent i.e., it has an active meaning. Thus the MBT’s “*phobeisthe* (fear)” in, “And fear not them” etc., is an imperative mood indicating intention; in active voice, indicating the subject experiences the action of the verb, in the present tense. This is stylistically put in poetical parallelism with the precisely opposite alternative, namely, the MBT’s “*phobethete*” in “but rather fear him” etc., which is a subjunctive mood indicating a possibility; in passive voice, in which the subject is acted upon or receives the action of the verb; in an aorist tense which takes a snapshot of the action. Understood as the two halves of poetical parallelism that it clearly derives from Hebraic (or Aramaic) thinking, putting together the MBT’s “And fear (*phobeisthe*) not them which kill” etc. with the MBT’s parallel, “but rather fear (*phobethete*) him” etc., is like putting together chalk and cheese. But which one is right and which one is wrong? At this point, the wider parameters of Matt. 10:26,30 tells us that stylistically, Christ is more generally using contrasts that employ “*phobethete*,” and so the second occurrence i.e., the “*phobethete*” of Matt. 10:28 is therefore the correct reading, and the first occurrence, i.e., the “*phobeisthe*” is the proverbial “sore thumb” sticking out, that can only be healed by adopting the minority Byzantine reading, “*phobethete*.”

Thus Scrivener’s Text, which here at Matt. 10:28 twice uses “*phobethete*” is surely correct and the TR. In doing so, he is simply following a reading found in e.g., Erasmus’s 1516 & 1522 editions, Stephanus 1550, Beza 1598, and Elzevir 1633. At Matt. 10:28 the TR’s “*phobethete*” is twice changed in the NU Text following the two leading Alexandrian Texts. The Alexandrian School were evidently good enough scribes to realize the two readings had to be the same; but not good enough scribes to realize that that wider context of Matt. 10:26,30 here tells us which of the two alternatives to take. The neo-Alexandrians like Tischendorf, Aland, and Metzger, who follow in their footsteps are the same i.e., intermediate quality. What about Westcott and Hort, who adopted “*phobethete*” on the first occasion in Matt. 10:28a, and then “*phobeisthe*” on the second occasion? ... Well, ... let’s just say they were something less than

intermediate quality. But let us also thank God for the top class neo-Byzantines of the 16th and 17th centuries such as e.g., Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, and Elzevir who here followed the TR.

Seemingly in order to convey its highly improbable W-H Greek reading (so bad, that even most other neo-Alexandrians have distanced themselves from it), at Matt. 10:28 the ASV makes an English linguistic distinction between “be ... afraid (*phobethete*)” and “fear (*phobeisthe*),” i.e., “And *be* not *afraid* of them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather *fear* him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell” (ASV). But there is no necessary difference in English translation between the TR & NU Text *et al* texts. I.e., at Matt. 10:28, the TR’s “*phobethete*” (twice), or W-H’s “*phobethete*” followed by “*phobeisthe*,” or the NU Text’s “*phobeisthe*” (twice) may be translated the same into English as “fear.” E.g., the NU Text based ESV reads, “And do no fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul. Rather fear him who can destroy both soul and body in hell” (ESV).

But good Christian reader, *Don’t judge a book (like the ESV) by its cover*. For those who by the grace of God know what is happening in the underpinning Greek, there is a veritable tornado driving, ocean storm generated, tidal wave disaster going on underneath the English translation in the neo-Alexandrian Greek texts. Let us thank God for the gentle tranquillity of the apographs of the Received Text which preserve the Spirit breathed autographs and which underpin our Authorized Versions both here at Matt. 10:28 and elsewhere.

So too at Matt. 10:31, the TR’s “*phobethete*” is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968); but in the NU Text *et al* following the two leading Alexandrian texts, this changes to “*phobeisthe*” (NU Text). Either way, the English reading remains, “fear ye.”

At Matt. 10:23 the TR’s definite article “*tou* (the)” before “*Israel* (Israel)” is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968 which abbreviates “*Israel*” to “*iel*” with a line over the eta); and following the Alexandrian text’s London Sinaiticus, Tischendorf’s 8th ed. and the NU text also has the definite article. But it is omitted in Rome Vaticanus, and so the definite article is placed in square brackets and made optional in W-H and Nestle’s 21st ed. . But either way, the reading remains, “of Israel” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 10:28, the MBT is fairly evenly divided as to whether or not to include the definite articles, “*ten*” before the second “*psuchen*” and “*to*” before the following “*soma*” (e.g., W 032 & Lectionary 1968), or to exclude both definite articles (e.g., Sigma 042). But it does not matter, since if present, it is best left untranslated in “*kai* (both) *ten* (-) *psuchen* (soul) *kai* (and) *to* (-) *soma* (body).” Thus while absent in both Scrivener’s Text and the NU Text *et al*; and present in the main texts of both R & P and H & F, both of which show their majority texts divided over its inclusion or omission; in fact it makes no difference to English translation.

At Matt. 10:32,33 (twice), the TR’s “*ouranois* (heaven),” is MBT (e.g., abbreviating this to “*ounois*” with a line over the “*oi*” in Lectionary 2378, & abbreviating this to “*ounois*” with a line over the “*un*” in Lectionary 1968). The TR is also here followed by Codex Sinaiticus. But a minority Byzantine reading (Omega 045), also found in the NU Text *et al* following Codex Vaticanus, adds before this the definite article, “*tois* (the).” Tischendorf’s 8th ed. unsurprisingly follows his preferred Alexandrian text of *Codex Sinaiticus*, and so for the wrong reason, gets the right reading. By contrast, W-H unsurprisingly follow their preferred Alexandrian text of *Codex Vaticanus*, and so the definite article is added in W-H, as it also is in Nestle’s 21st ed., and placed

in square brackets in the NU Text. But either way, the rendering (twice) is still “heaven” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 10:33, the TR’s order of the words, “*auton* (him) *kago* (I also)” is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968). But a minority Byzantine reading (W 032 & Lectionary 2378), also found in the NU Text *et al* following the two leading Alexandrian texts, reverses the word order without affecting the meaning. At Matt. 10:41, (twice) the TR’s syncopated form, “*lepsetai* (indicative middle future, 3rd person singular verb, from *lambano*)” is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings); and remains the same with the minority Byzantine spelling variant, “*leipsetai*” (Lectionary 2378); or the minority Byzantine spelling variant “*lempsetai*” (W 032), also found in the two leading Alexandrian texts and followed (twice) in the NU Text *et al* i.e., (twice) “shall receive.” (Cf. Matt. 19:29d, Appendix 3, Vol. 2, Matt. 15-20.)

At Matt. 10:42, the TR’s “*os ean*” is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 2378; & Lectionary 1968, spelt “*os ean*” in the Matt. 10:32-11:1 reading, and spelt “*os ean*” in the Matt. 10:37-11:1 reading). This is spelt, “*os an*” in Rome Vaticanus and so followed in W-H and the NU Text. But either way, the meaning is still, “whosoever” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

End of Matt. 1-10 (in detail).

I hope the issues discussed in this Appendix of Matt. 1-10 help the reader to better understand some of the matters involved in discussion of text types. While I will continue to discuss a *selection* of textual variants when I think it appropriate to do so; I will not generally be doing so to the same extent, *supra*, hereafter, *infra*.

Matt. 11-14 (some more notable variants).

At Matt. 11:5, the TR’s “*egeirontai* (indicative passive present, 3rd person plural verb, from *egeiro*)” in “*nekroi* (the dead) *egeirontai* (are raised up)” is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 2378). But in a minority Byzantine reading (N 022) this is revowelled to “*egironte*,” and this is followed in Codex Sinaiticus; and Codex Vaticanus reads “*egeironte*.” The reading thus highlights both the “*ei*” or “*i*” vowelling issue (cf. “*treis*” / “*tris*” at “Consideration of Optional Letters in Scrivener’s Text of St. Matthew’s Gospel,” in Appendix 2 of Vol. 2, Matt. 15-20); and again highlights the issue of a local dialect interchange between “*ai*” and “*e*” (see Matt. 8:4b; 9:2a,5b, *supra*). But the standard spelling of “*egeirontai*” has been followed in the NU Text *et al*.

At Matt. 11:21, the TR’s “*Bethsaida*” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022) and found in the texts of the Complutensians (1514) and Scrivener (1894 & 1902); whereas a minority Byzantine reading is “*Bethsaidan*” (e.g., E 08, 8th century & F 09, 9th century) and found in the texts of Erasmus (five editions, 1516-1535), Aldus (1518), Colinaeus (1534), Stephanus (four editions, 1546-1551), Plantin’s Polyglot (1572), and Beza (five editions, 1560-1598). There is no good textual argument against the MBT which is thus correct. “*Bethsaidan*” is also found in Codex Vaticanus & W-H. Either way, the translation is “Bethsaida” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H). The majority texts of both Burgon & Miller (1899) and Hodges & Farstad (1985) here follow the correct MBT reading, “*Bethsaida*,” but make the incorrect claim that the “TR” follows the minority reading, “*Bethsaidan*.” In fact, e.g., Burgon & Miller have simply here discovered the true TR, known long before them to e.g., the Complutensians.

At Matt. 12:3, though there is sizeable division in the Byzantine texts, the TR's "*ote* (when) *epeinasen* ('he hungered,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *peinao*) *autos* (he)" is still MBT (e.g., Sigma 042); and it is also found in some old Latin Versions. But a strong minority Byzantine reading omits "*autos* ('he' / 'himself')" (e.g., W 032 & N 022); which is further omitted in the NU Text *et al* following the two leading Alexandrian texts. But since "*autos* (he)" is redundant in English translation, either way, the English reading is the same i.e., "when he was an hungered" (AV & TR) or "when he was hungry" (ASV & W-H).

Here at Matt. 12:3, Burgon & Miller (1899) indicate that the text is split between these two readings, and Hodges & Farstad (1985) likewise indicate the text is "seriously divided" between their main text reading of "*autos* (he)" and its omission in a footnote reading. By contrast, Robinson & Pierpont (2005) follow the TR's "*autos* (he)" and do not indicate any manuscript split worth mentioning inside the Byzantine Text. Going to the source for both Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont, von Soden (1913) says the TR's reading is followed in his K group of c. 1,000 manuscripts, of which more than 90% are Byzantine Text, by the Kx and Kr subgroups. Combined these two groups constitute c. 68-72% of K group (see commentary Vol. 2, at Matt. 20:15c), and thus the MBT. In more precise terms, this would be c. 63%-70% support⁹¹. With the MBT reading enjoying "about two-thirds support," this explains why on the one hand, Hodges & Farstad say the text is "seriously divided," and why on the other hand, Robinson & Pierpont do not think the matter is worth mentioning.

As discussed in the main commentary, at Matt. 12:4, the TR with the support of the MBT, Eusebius, and Chrysostom, reads "*ous* (which)" after "*ephagen* ('he ate') (TR) or "*ephagon* (they ate)" (NU Text). Additionally, a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032); also found in the NU Text *et al* following Codex Vaticanus which possibly reflects a paper fade or loss, reads "*o* (which)," rather than the reading of the MBT (e.g., Sigma 042 & N 022) "*ous* (which)," with no effect on English translation.

At Matt. 12:13 Hodges & Farstad's majority text considers the text here is "seriously divided"⁹², but Robinson & Pierpont's majority text puts "*apokatestathe*" in the main text with no footnote alternative; whereas Burgon & Miller (1899) follow the reading, "*apekatestathe*," and in doing so specifically reject "the Textus Receptus" reading of "*apokatestathe*"⁹³. Von Soden says "*apokatestathe*" has the support of Kx and in a limited sample of the Kr group, 9 out

⁹¹ Von Soden's K group contains c. 950 Byzantine manuscripts (of which c. 35 manuscripts are Byzantine only in specific parts). Von Soden's Kx subgroup contains c. 500 Byzantine manuscripts (of which c. 20 manuscripts are Byzantine only in specific parts); and his Kr subgroup contains c. 168 Byzantine manuscripts (of which c. 4 are Byzantine only in specific parts). Therefore out of von Soden's c. 915 completely Byzantine manuscripts, *prima facie* c. 644 (480 + 164) or c. 70% support the TR's reading. Factoring in an error bar of up to c. 10% for von Soden's generalist methodology means at least c. 63%-70% support the TR's reading. A more detailed count would require going to just Gospel manuscripts, but this is enough to give "the big picture" of "about two-thirds support" for the MBT reading.

⁹² Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xxi & 36.

⁹³ Burgon & Miller (1899), pp. vii & 92.

of 14 Kr manuscripts counted. The Kr group has 211 manuscripts, and so in the wider Kg group of 983 manuscripts. $983 - 212 \text{ Kr manuscripts} + 14 \text{ counted Kr manuscripts} = 785 \text{ K group manuscripts}$. In this, $513 \text{ Kx manuscripts} + 9 \text{ Kr manuscripts} = 522$ out of 785 = *c.* 66% or two-thirds of the manuscripts. Thus on this occasion I would agree with Robinson & Pierpont that “*apokatestathe*” is the MBT, and with no good textual argument against it, correct.

At Matt. 12:13 the TR’s, “*apokatestathe* (declined from the aorist form *apokatestathen*; indicative passive aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *apokathistemi* = *apo* + *kathistemi*)” is MBT (e.g., K 017, Y 034, & Pi 041; Scrivener’s Text). However, a variant, “*apekatestathe*” (declined from the aorist form *apekatestathen*; indicative passive aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *apokathistemi* = *apo* + *kathistemi*) is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & N 022). The variant is also found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way the rendering will still be, “it was restored” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 12:17, the TR’s “*opos* (that)” (AV) is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968); but in the NU Text *et al* following the two leading Alexandrian texts, this changes to “*ina*.” Either way, the meaning is “that” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H). The “*ina*” can be traced to Origen, and was possibly “reconstructed from context” following a paper fade / loss; though in such instances, with Origen, one can never rule out a deliberate “stylistic improvement.”

At Matt. 12:28, Scrivener’s Text reads, “*ego* (‘I,’ word 1) *en* (‘by,’ word 2) *Pneumati* (‘Spirit,’ word 3) *Theou* (‘of God,’ word 4) *ekballo* (‘I cast out,’ indicative active present, 1st person singular verb, from *ekballo*).” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in e.g., W 032 (abbreviating word 2 to “*PN*” / “*TINI*” and word 3 to “*THY*” / “*ΘY*” in both instances with a line on top). The word order of Scrivener’s Text is earlier found in Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633). By contrast, the MBT (e.g., Sigma 042) reads word order, 2,3,4,1. The MBT is followed in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), who here say this majority reading should replace the “Textus Receptus” reading of word order 1,2,3,4⁹⁴; Robinson & Pierpont (2005), who show no Byzantine text alternative; and Hodges & Farstad (1985), who show the “TR” as a minority reading followed by the “Mr” group i.e., von Soden’s Kr group.

Von Soden Kr group has *c.* 189 completely Byzantine manuscripts in the wider K group of *c.* 914 manuscripts that are exclusively Byzantine. This means that the minority Byzantine text reading of Scrivener’s Text is supported by *c.* 20% or about one-fifth of manuscripts. Hence this is a significant minority Byzantine reading.

In Matthean Greek, St. Matthew sometimes puts the pronoun, “*ego* (I),” before a 1st person singular verb, and sandwiches this pronoun and singular verb around nouns, such as occurs in the minority Byzantine reading (Matt. 8:9; 12:27; 20:15; cf. 3:14). But he also puts the pronoun “*ego* (I),” next to the singular verb, which are thus grammatically segregated together from the nouns in overall word order, such as occurs in the MBT reading (Matt. 3:11; 10:16; 11:10; 20:22; 22:32; 23:34; 24:5; 25:27; 26:22,25). Thus *prima facie* either reading would be possible inside Matthean Greek, and *prima facie* the MBT reading is the more expected form.

⁹⁴ Burgon & Miller (1899), pp. vii & 94.

But to this one must make an important qualification. St. Matthew is a past master of Hebrew or Aramaic poetical parallelism (e.g., see commentary at Matt. 11:17b). Here we first read in Matt. 12:27 (MBT & TR), “*Kai* (And) *ei* (if) *ego* (I) *en* (by) *Beelzeboul* (Beelzebub) *ekballo* (I cast out) *ta* (-) *daimonia* (devils);” and this then forms an antithetical Hebraic or Aramaic poetical parallel with Matt. 12:28, which in the MBT reads, “*ei* (if) *de* (but) *en* (by) *Pneumati* (Spirit) *Theou* (of God) *ego* (I) *ekballo* (I cast out) *ta* (-) *daimonia* (devils).” The textual problem with the MBT is now glaringly apparent. The Matthean Greek master of the poetical parallelism would not have written this! Rather, he would have said in harmony with the minority Byzantine reading, “*ei* (if) *de* (but) *ego* (I) *en* (by) *Pneumati* (Spirit) *Theou* (of God) *ekballo* (I cast out) *ta* (-) *daimonia* (devils).” LET THE TEXT OF ERASMUS, STEPHANUS, BEZA, AND ELZEVIR, as found in Scrivener, STAND! IT IS THE *TEXTUS RECEPTUS!* (Cf., Matt. 12:32, *supra*.)

At Matt 12:36 the TR’s reading “*lalesosin* (‘speak,’ AV, subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person plural, from *laleo*),” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022; Lectionaries 2378 & 1968; & Origen). There is no good textual argument against it and thus it must stand. The aorist views the action as a whole; and the subjunctive indicates possibility. It may be translated, “But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak (*lalesosin*), they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment” (AV). But in the NU Text *et al* following the two leading Alexandrian texts, this changes to “*lalesousin* (indicative active future, 3rd person plural, from *laleo*).” It may be translated, “And I say unto you, that every idle word that men shall speak (*lalesousin*), they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment” (ASV). The English may be the same, but the reader seeking to more carefully study the underpinning Greek will on such occasions, be misled by the NU Text *et al*.

At Matt. 12:40, the TR’s “*outos* (so) *estai* (shall) *o* (the) *Yios* (Son) *tou* (of) *anthropon* (man)” is MBT (e.g., G 011, V 031, X 033; & old Latin f & q). There is no good textual argument against the MBT which is thus correct. The TR is here followed by the NU Text *et al*. But a sizeable number of Byzantine manuscripts (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042), together with e.g., the leading Western Text, D 05, add “*kai* (also),” after “*estai* (‘he shall’ or ‘he will,’ future tense),” i.e., “so also (*kai*) shall the Son of man.” Were this variant adopted in the NU Text *et al*, or taken seriously by any English translators, I would have included it in the main commentary.

Though not affecting translation since the “*de* (and / but)” may be deemed redundant in English translation (AV), at Matt. 12:46 the TR’s “*eti* (while) *de* (-)” and “*En* (-) *de* (-)” at Matt. 13:1; are both MBT (e.g., W 032), and on both occasions the NU Text is pruned down to remove the “*de*” following Rome Vaticanus and London Sinaiticus.

At Matt. 12:48, the words following “*eipen* ([and] said),” namely, “*to* (unto the [one] = ‘him’) *eiponti* (‘[one] saying’ = ‘that told’) *auto* (him)” are omitted before, “*Tis* (Who) *estin* (is)” etc.. The scribe appears to have become confused in his head with the “*eip*” beginning and “*to*” endings of “*eipen to*” and “*eiponti auto*,” thus omitting by ellipsis the words “*to eiponti auto*.” Once again we are reminded that this type of thing is A ONE WAY TRACK TO A SHORTER TEXT. Though not affecting translation, at Matt. 12:48 the TR’s “*eiponti* (‘[one] saying,’ dative

singular masculine, present active participle, from *epō / eipōn*⁹⁵)” i.e., “him that told” (AV) is MBT (Sigma 042). But with the same meaning, the NU Text reads, “*legonti* (dative singular masculine, present active participle, from *legō*).” Was this “reconstructed from context” after a paper loss / fade, or after an ellipsis loss such as one finds in W 032?

At Matt. 13:1, “*apo* (from)” may be deemed redundant in English translation (AV), since “*exelthon*” means “went out,” and with the genitive “*tes oikias*” meaning “the house,” the translation is, that “day went Jesus out of the house” (AV & ASV). This is so whether following the TR and MBT (e.g., W 032) which includes the “*apo* (from);” or the “*ek* (out)” substituted for “*apo* (from)” in London Sinaiticus, and a footnote alternative in W-H; or the complete omission of “*apo* (from)” in Rome Vaticanus and the NU Text.

Present and aorist infinitives are usually translated the same in English. At Matt. 13:3, the representative Byzantine text is fairly evenly divided between the reading of Scrivener’s Text as an infinitive of purpose “*speirein* (‘to sow,’ present active infinitive, from *speiro*)” (e.g., E 07, V 031, & Gamma 036; Origen & Chrysostom); and “*speirai* (to sow,’ first aorist active infinitive, from *speiro*)” (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042; Origen & Chrysostom)⁹⁶. The reading “*speirein*” of Scrivener’s text is found in e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (16th century); and following the Alexandrian text’s Rome Vaticanus, the NU Text *et al.* By contrast, the reading, “*speirai*” is found in the Alexandrian text’s London Sinaiticus. But either way, the translation will still be, “to sow.”

⁹⁵ At “*eipōn*,” Liddell & Scott say that while *epō* has been used by some for the present tense, the present tense now “in use” is *phemi*, *legō*, or *agoreuō*.

⁹⁶ Inside his K group, von Soden says “*speirai*” is followed in his Kr group, two of his K1 manuscripts; and inside his Kx group by a limited sample of 72 of 166 manuscripts (c. 43%), as opposed to “*speirein*” in his Kx group by 94 of the 166 manuscripts (c. 57%). His Kx is c. 98% Byzantine, i.e., c. 94% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine, and c. 4% are Byzantine only in specific parts; so this means that in his limited sample of the Kx group, c. 68 completely Byzantine manuscripts (94% of 72) follow “*speirai*”; and c. 88 completely Byzantine manuscripts (94% of 94) follow “*speirein*.” Von Soden’s K group contains c. 950 Byzantine manuscripts (of which c. 35 manuscripts are Byzantine only in specific parts). His Kx subgroup contains c. 500 Byzantine manuscripts (of which c. 20 manuscripts are Byzantine only in specific parts). Since von Soden here counted a limited sample of 166, the total K count is therefore not out of c. 915-950 manuscripts, but 334 manuscripts (500 minus 166) less than this i.e., 581 to 616 manuscripts. Von Soden’s Kr subgroup contains c. 168 Byzantine manuscripts (of which c. 4 are Byzantine only in specific parts). Therefore, including the 2 manuscripts from K1, out of von Soden’s c. 581 completely Byzantine manuscripts in his K group count, *prima facie* c. 238 (72 + 164 + 2) follow “*speirai*,” and the remaining 343 follow “*speirein*.” Thus *prima facie* “*speirein*” has the support of 59% of manuscripts; and correspondingly “*speirai*” has the support of c. 41% of manuscripts. Factoring in a c. 10% error bar means at least 53%-59% follow “*speirein*,” i.e., the Byzantine text is fairly evenly divided between these two readings. Thus (bearing in mind the “rubbery” nature of the figures, since the Byzantine to non-Byzantine count in von Soden’s groups includes in it “projections” of those not otherwise classified outside his system, based on the Byzantine to non-Byzantine proportions of those that are classified outside his system i.e., such figures can only be used as a *general* guide), the count is too close to call.

At Matt. 13:4, the translation, “came” in “the fowls came” (AV) or “the birds came” (ASV), will be the same whether following the correct reading of the TR’s “*elthe* (or ‘*elthen*,’ ‘came,’ indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *erchomai*; the plural neuter subject, ‘the fowls’ / ‘*ta peteina*’ may take singular verbs cf. Matt. 6:32, *supra*),” which is MBT (e.g., W 032); or the NU Text’s “*elthonta* (‘coming,’ active second aorist, nominative plural neuter participle, from *erchomai*),” found in Rome Vaticanus and the NU Text. At Matt. 13:7 the TR’s “*aepnixan* (‘choked,’ indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *apopnigo*)” is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042); whereas the NU Text reads “*epnixan* (‘choked,’ indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *pnigo*),” following London Sinaiticus.

The TR’s “Why?” at Matt. 13:10 is found in Scrivener’s Text as “*Diati*” (one word) and also in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72). But the meaning does not change if one follows the reading of “*Dia ti*” (two words) found in Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle’s 21st edition (1952), and the NU Text’s Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993). There is no textual issue at stake here. The matter raises the issue of copyists working from a continuous script back to a script with spaces between words. Though this issue is sometimes unimportant (e.g., Matt. 13:10); at other times, this issue is important (cf. Matt. 9:18, *infra*).

At Matt. 13:11, the TR’s Greek, “*ton ouranon* (‘of heaven,’ literally, ‘of heavens,’ genitive plural masculine noun, from *ouranos*),” in the words, “the kingdom of heaven,” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & N 022). It is further found in the Vulgate as Latin, “*caelorum* (‘of heaven,’ literally, ‘of heavens,’ genitive plural masculine noun, from *caelum*),” and some old Latin Versions (h, f, q, aur, l, Pi, & c). It is also followed in Rome Vaticanus and the NU Text *et al.* However it is omitted by Eusebius and some old Latin Versions (a, k, b, ff2, g1, & ff1). This split in the old Latin Versions relative to a solid MBT Greek reading, reminds us that the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, must be in perpetual submission to the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*.

At Matt. 13:14, the TR’s “*akousete* (‘ye shall hear,’ indicative active future, 2nd person plural verb, from *akouo*) ... *blepsete* (‘ye shall see,’ indicative active future, 2nd person plural verb, from *blepo*),” is MBT (e.g., K 017 & Pi 041). It is also adopted by the NU Text *et al.*, following e.g., Rome Vaticanus (with spelling variant of “*akousate*”). But a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., *blepsetai* W 032 & N 022) is “*akousete* (‘ye shall hear,’ subjunctive active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *akouo*) ... *blepsete* (‘ye shall see,’ subjunctive active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *blepo*)⁹⁷.” (Sigma 042, M 021, U 030, reads “*akousete* ... *blepsete*.”) Though the English is the same, the Greek is certainly different.

⁹⁷ It is uncertain if 3 manuscripts are in von Soden’s K1 group (690, 927 in the Gospels?, & 1646). But of the 40 K1 group manuscripts that are classified outside of von Soden’s system, 37 (92.5%) are exclusively Byzantine, 2 (5%) are Byzantine in specific parts, and 1 (2.5%) are non-Byzantine. Applying these as projections to the 15 manuscripts of K1 otherwise not classified outside of von Soden, means that *c.* 14 are exclusively Byzantine. The exclusively Byzantine count of K1 is thus *c.* 51 (37 + 14) out of 55 K1 manuscripts. Von Soden says that in his K group, “*akousete* ... *blepsete*” is followed by all but two manuscripts in his K1 group i.e., by at least *c.* 49 of his 55 K1 Byzantine manuscripts. Von Soden’s K group contains *c.* 950 Byzantine manuscripts (of which *c.* 35 manuscripts are Byzantine only in specific parts). Therefore this subjunctive aorist reading is followed by *c.* 5% of the Byzantine manuscripts.

At Matt. 13:16, the TR's "*ta ota* ('ears,' neuter plural nominative, definite article and noun respectively, from *to ous*), being a neuter plural subject, takes the TR's singular verb, "*akouei* ('they hear,' not 'it hears,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *akouo*)" (cf. Matt. 6:32, *supra*). This verb is MBT (e.g., W 032). But a minority Byzantine reading (Sigma 042 & N 022); also found in the NU Text following the two leading Alexandrian and leading Western texts, reads, "*akouousin* ('they hear,' indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *akouo*)." But this does not affect English translation.

At Matt. 13:17, the TR's "*eidon* ('they have seen,' indicative active second aorist, 3rd person plural verb, used as an aorist of *oraō*)" is MBT (e.g., W 032). But a minority Byzantine reading, using the variant spelling, "*idos*," is "*idan* ('they have seen,' indicative active first aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *ido*)." This first (or "weak") aorist form, but with the spelling of the MBT's second (or "strong") aorist form, i.e., "*eidan*," is also found in the NU Text following the two leading Alexandrian texts. But they all mean "have ... seen" in the words, "and *have* not *seen*."

At Matt. 13:18, the TR's "*speirontos* ('the sower,' genitive singular masculine, active second aorist participle, from *speiro*)" is MBT (e.g., Sigma 042). But a minority Byzantine reading (W 032); also found in the NU Text following the two leading Alexandrian texts, changes this to "*speirantos* ('the sower,' genitive singular masculine, active first aorist participle, from *speiro*)."

At Matt. 13:23, the TR's "*sunign* ('understandeth,' nominative singular masculine, active present participle, from *sunigni*)" is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & N 022). But in the NU Text *et al* following the two leading Alexandrian texts, Western text, & Origen; this changes to "*sunieis* ('understandeth,' nominative singular masculine, active present athematic participle, from the *mi* compound verb, *sunigni*)." Either way, this may be rendered, "understandeth" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 13:24, the TR's Greek, "*speiranti* ('which sowed,' or 'who sowed,' or 'sowing,' dative singular masculine, active aorist participle, from *speiro*)," is (on Pierpont's generalist figures in *Green's Textual Apparatus*,) followed by c. 6%-20% of Byzantine Texts (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & N 022); supported by St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate's, "*qui* (who) *seminavit* ('sowed,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *semino*);" and followed by the Complutensian NT (16th century), Colinaeus (16th century), and TR. It is also found in the NU Text *et al*. But Greek, "*speironti* ('which sowed,' or 'who sowed,' 'sowing,' dative singular, present active participle, from *speiro*)," is MBT (e.g., E 07, K 017, & S 028); followed as Latin, "*seminanti* ('which sowed,' or 'who sowed,' 'sowing,' dative singular, present active participle, from *semino*)" in old Latin Versions k, d, & h; and followed by e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (16th century), and Beza (16th century). The use in Matt. 13:25 of the historic (constative) aorist⁹⁸, "his enemy came (indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *erchomai*) and sowed (indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *epispeiro*) tares," creates a textual tension with the present active reading of the MBT at Matt. 13:24. As evidently realized by the Spanish Complutensians and Frenchman, Simon de Colines (1480-1546) (commonly called, Colinaeus), this is relieved by the active aorist reading of the minority

⁹⁸ Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, p. 557-8; Young's *Greek*, pp. 122-3.

Byzantine reading, which is thus the correct reading.

At Matt. 13:28a the TR's "*eipon* ('they said,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *legō*)," in the words, "The servants said (*eipon*) unto him," is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042). But the NU Text *et al*, following the Alexandrian London Sinaiticus reads, "*legousin* ('they said,' literally, 'they say,' indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *legō*)." Was this a deliberate "stylistic improvement," or was this a "reconstruction" following a paper fade / loss of the shorter *eipon* either at the end of a line, or with stylistic paper spaces before and / or after it? While the ASV insists on a literal and non-grammatical rendering into English of, "And the servants say (*legousin*) unto him," other neo-Alexandrian versions have found it preferable to render it as "said." E.g., the ESV reads, "The servants said to him" (ESV). Thus in practice there is usually no difference in the English translations, although there is, as the ASV recognizes, a difference in the meaning of the underpinning Greek.

At Matt. 13:29 the TR's "*ephe* ('he was saying' = 'he said,' AV, indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *phemi*)" is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & N 022). The NU Text *et al*, following the two leading Alexandrian texts reads, "*phesin* ('he saith' or 'he says,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *phemi*)." While the ASV translates this quite literally as, "he saith" (ASV & W-H), as thus shows that there is in fact a difference in the underpinning Greek between the neo-Alexandrian texts and the TR; in general, neo-Alexandrian versions have not followed the ASV literalness by making this, "he saith" or "he says," but rather have rendered this like e.g., the ESV as "he said." Thus in practice most neo-Alexandrian text versions read the same as the TR, even though there is a difference in the underpinning Greek.

At Matt. 13:30, the TR's "*mechri* (until)," is MBT (e.g., with the optional letter "s" at the end in W 032; & Sigma 042; & Chrysostom). But Chrysostom also cites *Variant 1*, "*eos* (until)." The TR's reading is followed by a later corrector of London Sinaiticus, which originally read *Variant 2*, "*achri* ('until,' a preposition with the genitive, *tou therismou* i.e., 'the harvest')." But *Variant 1* is followed by Rome Vaticanus and the leading Western text, D 05. The TR's reading is followed in Tischendorf's 8th edition. *Variant 1*, is followed in W-H, Nestle's 21st edition, and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition. (All of these have footnotes showing the other readings.) But the translation is the same whether one follows the TR or one of the variants.

At Matt. 13:30, the TR's "*sunagete* ('ye gather,' imperative active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *sunagō*)" is MBT (e.g., Sigma 042 & N 022), and with no good textual argument against it, is correct. However a variant, "*sunagete* ('ye gather,' indicative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *sunagō*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (Y 034, 9th century; & Gamma 036, 10th century). The correct reading is also found in London Sinaiticus, but this incorrect variant is also found in Rome Vaticanus. With the two leading Alexandrian text's split, even though the correct reading is followed in Tischendorf's 8th edition, Nestle's 21st edition, and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition, these all contain footnotes showing the variant; although this order is reversed in Westcott-Hort which places "*sunagete*" in the main text, and gives the TR's reading as a footnote alternative. Though the underpinning Greek is different, either way, the translation is, "but *gather* the wheat into my barn" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt 13:36, the TR's "*phrason* ('declare,' imperative active aorist, 2nd person singular verb, from *phrazō*)" is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042). However a variant reading,

“*diasapheson* (‘declare,’ imperative active aorist, 2nd person singular verb, from *diasapeo*),” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts. Both readings are referred to by Origen, who may well be the originator of the variant. But since both Greek words may be translated, “Declare” or “Explain,” there is no necessary difference in English translation.

At Matt. 13:39 the TR’s definite article, “*tou* (the)” in “the world” (AV) is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042; & Chrysostom). But the NU Text *et al*, follow a variant omitting it found in the two leading Alexandrian texts and leading Western text, and probably originating with Origen. However, context still requires rendering it “the world” (ASV & W-H).

At Matt 13:48b, the TR’s “*aggeia* (‘vessels,’ accusative plural neuter noun, from *aggeion*)” is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968), although sometimes also found with the spelling variant *aggia* (W 032, Sigma 042, & P 024). But a minority Byzantine reading found in N 022, Origen, and Cyril of Alexandria is “*agge* (‘vessels,’ accusative plural neuter noun, from *aggos*).” This latter reading is also found in the NU Text *et al*, following the two leading Alexandrian texts. Either way, the translation is “vessels” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H)⁹⁹.

At Matt. 13:52a, the TR’s “*eipen* (‘he said,’ indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular, from *lego*),” is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Lectionary 1968). It is also followed by the NU Text *et al*. But the Latin Vulgate and most old Latin Versions read, Latin, “*ait* (‘he saith’ or ‘he says,’ indicative active present, 3rd person singular, from *aito*),” and a couple read “*dicit* (‘he saith’ or ‘he says,’ indicative active present, 3rd person singular, from *dico*).” Either way, the English translation is still the same, namely, “said he” (AV & TR) or “he said” (Douay-Rheims & Latin text). So too the leading Western Text D 05, reads “*legei* (‘he saith’ or ‘he says,’ indicative active present, 3rd person singular, from *lego*),” as does the Syriac Pesitto. Notably, Westcott-Hort give “*legei*” as an alternative reading here, and this is thus an instance of where the Western Text and Syriac was influential in their thinking, even though they relegated the reading to a footnote alternative. It thus acts to remind us how these neo-Alexandrians, like Moffatt, operate a primary pincer arm of the Alexandrian Text, and a secondary pincer arm which is especially susceptible to the Western and Syriac texts, even though Westcott-Hort never developed this second pincer arm to anything like the extent that Moffatt did. (Moffatt was really a Semi Neo-Alexandrian; since he did not sufficiently stay inside the parameters of the more normative principles of the Neo-Alexandrians Proper, even though he did a good 90% of the time. I.e., while neo-Alexandrians generally have a major Alexandrian Text pincer arm and a minor non-Alexandrian text pincer arm, their usage of the non-Alexandrian Text pincer arm is at a much lower frequency than is the case with Moffatt.)

At Matt. 13:52b, the TR’s Greek, “*eis* (unto) *ten* (the) *basileian* (‘kingdom,’ singular accusative feminine noun, from *basileia*),” in the words, “Therefore every scribe which is instructed unto the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder” (AV) etc., is MBT (e.g., E 07, F 09, G 011, & Lectionary 1968), and followed by e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522), and Stephanus’s Greek NT (1550). There is no good textual argument against it and so it is the correct reading. Another reading (*Variant 1*), “*en* (unto) *te* (unto the) *basileia* (‘kingdom,’ singular dative feminine noun, from *basileia*)” is found as a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., M

⁹⁹ In Greek, double gamma (gg) is pronounced “ng” e.g., Greek *aggelos* in pronounced “angelos,” and hence our English word, “angel.”

021). Outside the closed class of sources, *Variant 1* is followed by the leading Western Text, D 05, and Minuscles 579 and 700. Yet another reading (*Variant 2*), “*τῆ* (unto the) *basileia* (‘kingdom,’ singular dative feminine noun, from *basileia*)” is found as a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & N 022). Outside the closed class of sources, *Variant 2* is followed by the two leading Alexandrian texts *et al*, and hence is found in the NU Text *et al*.

In the TR’s reading, the combination of the preposition, *eis* with an *accusative*, in this instance produces either *prepositional terminology of reference* i.e., translated as “concerning” or “with respect to” etc., or *prepositional terminology of purpose* i.e., translated as “for” or “unto” (AV) etc.¹⁰⁰. Thus the meaning of Matt. 13:52b (TR) is, “Therefore every scribe which is instructed *about* the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder” etc. (*terminology of reference*), or “Therefore every scribe which is instructed *for* the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder” (*terminology of purpose*).

Variant 1 of Matt. 13:52b, i.e., the combination of the preposition, *en* with a *dative*, in this instance produces *prepositional terminology of reference* i.e., translated as “concerning” or “with respect to” i.e., “Therefore every scribe which is instructed *about* the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder” etc.¹⁰¹.

Variant 2, as a dative (first declension feminine) noun, would *prima facie* be translated as “to,” “unto,” or “for,” which is the common meaning of such a dative. Hence the same basic meaning as the TR based on the AV is found in the ASV based on *Variant 2* of Matt. 13:52b, namely, “Therefore every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder” etc. (ASV cf. RSV, NRSV, & ESV). But the alternative reading could also be a *dative of reference*, thus making the meaning, “Therefore every scribe which is instructed *about* the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder” etc. (*dative of reference*) (cf. NIV)¹⁰².

Moffatt and the NASB, following either *Variant 1* or *Variant 2*, render Matt. 13:52b as a genitive. E.g., Moffatt reads, “every scribe who has become a disciple of the realm of heaven is like a householder” etc. (Moffatt Bible). Were Moffatt and the NASB following *Variant 2*, and thinking this was a *dative of possession*? I.e., “every scribe [which is] instructed [who] *belongs to* the kingdom of heaven” etc? Were Moffatt and the NASB following *Variant 1*, and thinking this was a *dative of content* i.e., regarding being “instructed” as the content? If so, they were possibly influenced by Eph. 5:18, where as with *Variant 1* of Matt. 13:52b, we have the combination of the preposition, *en* with a *dative*, i.e., “but be filled with (*en*) the Spirit (*Pneumati*, singular dative neuter noun, from *Pneuma*)” (Eph. 5:18, AV & Moffatt)¹⁰³. Given that *Variant 1* is followed by the Western Text’s D 05, this may have seemed attractive to Moffatt.

¹⁰⁰ See e.g., Wallace’s *Greek Grammar*, p. 369; Young’s *Greek*, p. 94.

¹⁰¹ See e.g., Wallace’s *Greek Grammar*, p. 372; Young’s *Greek*, p. 96.

¹⁰² See e.g., Wallace’s *Greek Grammar*, pp. 144-6.

¹⁰³ See e.g., Wallace’s *Greek Grammar*, pp. 149-151; 170-1.

In my opinion, to render *Variant 2* of Matt. 13:52b as a *dative of possession* is an improbable possibility, and if this were the intent here, it would more naturally be found in the Greek as a genitive, “*basileas*.” So too, I think the idea that in *Variant 1* the knowledge of being “instructed” as the content in a *dative of content*, is both a strained and improbable meaning. It seems to me that at Matt. 13:52b, both Moffatt and the NASB translators are stretching what *in this context* is the natural meaning of a Greek dative, so as to *erroneously try and give it an elasticity something more akin to the Latin ablative*. That a loose translator like Moffatt would do this is admittedly not surprising; but that the NASB would follow Moffatt’s lead is more surprising, though not without some relatively rarer precedents elsewhere in the NASB.

The more likely renderings of both the TR’s reading and *Variant 2* which entered the NU Text *et al*, are therefore the same. Hence (notwithstanding the unusual diversity of translation found in the Moffatt Bible and NASB,) there is *no necessary* difference in *English translation* between the TR and NU Text at Matt. 13:52b.

The origins of these variants at Matt. 13:52b are speculative. But the meaning of TR’s Greek reading, “*eis (unto) ten (the) basileian (kingdom)*,” in the words, “every scribe which is instructed unto the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder” (AV) etc., is not immediately apparent. The meaning is “about” or “for,” *supra*. Possibly concern with this difficulty led to scribes making a deliberate “stylistic improvement.” I.e., to either *Variant 1*, on this basis that this “is more readily recognizable as *prepositional terminology of reference*” (if so, such a scribe would be no doubt very disappointed with the rendering of Moffatt and the NASB if one or both of them is here following *Variant 1*); or to *Variant 2*, either on the basis that this “is more readily recognizable as meaning “for the kingdom” (if so, such a scribe would be no doubt be very disappointed with the rendering of Moffatt and the NASB if one or both of them is here following *Variant 2*, but very happy with the *Variant 2* rendering of the RSV, NRSV, & ESV); or on the basis that this “is more readily recognizable” as a *dative of reference* meaning, “concerning the kingdom” or “about the kingdom” (if so, such a scribe would be no doubt very disappointed with the rendering of Moffatt and the NASB if one or both of them is here following *Variant 2*, but very happy with the *Variant 2* rendering of the NIV). Thus one may be here witnessing an attempt, over time, of scribes to “more clearly” bring out the meaning of Matt. 13:52b as, either, “every scribe which is instructed *for* the kingdom of heaven” etc., or “every scribe which is instructed *about* the kingdom of heaven” etc. .

Alternatively, these variants may have come about as accidental errors. Possibly *Variant 1* of Matt. 13:52b was a “reconstruction” of the text following a paper loss / fade. If the original “*eis ten basileian*,” had due to paper fades come to look something like, “*e:: te: basileia*,” the loss of the letter “n” (nu) at the end of both “*ten*” and “*basileian*” may have gone undetected; or possibly the latter two words were “reconstructed from something like “*e:: t:: basil:::*”. The remaining “e” (epsilon) of “*eis*” might then have been “reconstructed” as an “*en*,” on the basis that as *prepositional terminology of reference*, the usage here of *en* with a *dative* “makes contextual sense.” Likewise, it is possible that *Variant 2* came about since due to paper fades, the original “*eis ten basileian*,” had come to look something like “*te basileia*,” and these paper fades were not detected on the basis that either as a dative meaning “for,” or as a *dative of reference* meaning “about,” the usage here of a dative declension “makes contextual sense.”

At Matt. 13:55, the TR’s “*ouchi*” is MBT (e.g., written as “*ouch*” in W 032; E 07, & K

017). But a minority Byzantine reading, “*ouch*” (Sigma 042 & N 022); is also found in the NU Text *et al* following the two leading Alexandrian texts. But the translation is the same i.e., “Is not (*ouchi*, a negative adverb of *ouchi*, TR, stronger than *ou*; or *ouch*, a negative adverb of *ou*, NU Text *et al*) his mother called Mary (*Mariam*, TR & NU Text *et al*; or *Maria*, Tischendorf’s 1842 ed.)?” Given that W 032 has an apostrophe after the *ouch* i.e., *ouch’*, is it possible that the confusion arose after *ouchi* (MBT) was first abbreviated to *ouch’* (per W 032), and after either a paper fade, or a careless scribe failed to read the script properly, or a scribe stylistically opposed to apostrophes deliberately left it out, this became *ouch*? Both Swanson and Nestle-Aland’s 27th ed. wrongly show W 032 following the reading, “*ouch*,” and so if they can miss the apostrophe, “’”, could not an ancient scribe do likewise? (Cf. Lectionary 2378 at Matt. 14:19d, *infra*.)

At Matt. 13:57, the TR’s “*te* (-) *patridi* (country) *autou* (of him),” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & N 022; Origen, Basil the Great, and Chrysostom). But a minority Byzantine reading (Z 035, 6th century; S 028, 10th century; & Origen) is, “*te* (-) *idia* (‘one’s own,’ here = ‘his own,’ singular feminine dative adjective, from *idios*) *patridi* (country).” Either way, the rendering is, “in his own country.” Rome Vaticanus simply reads, “*te* (-) *patridi* (country),” as does the NU text *et al*. But supplying the “his own” from the final “*autou* (of him)” after “*oikia* (house),” means the neo-Alexandrian versions are translated the same as if following the TR. The minority Byzantine reading is found in London Sinaiticus; and so W-H have a footnote showing the inclusion of “*idia*” as an alternative reading.

At Matt. 14:3c, the TR’s, “*kai* (‘and,’ word 1) *etheto* (‘he put,’ word 2, indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *tithemi*) *en* (‘in,’ word 3) *phulake* (‘prison,’ word 4),” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & N 022). However, in the two leading Alexandrian texts, followed by the NU Text, the word order is changed to 1,3,4,2, and word 2 is made “*apotheto* (‘he put away,’ word 2, indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *apothemi* = *apo* / away + *tithemi* / put).” These changes do not affect English translation.

At Matt. 14:8, the TR’s “*autes* (‘of her,’ word 1), *Dos* (‘Thou give,’ an imperative verb / ‘Give,’ AV, word 2) *moi* (‘me,’ word 3), *thesin* (‘she says’ / ‘said,’ AV, word 4a),” i.e., “of her ... , said, Give me,” in the verse, “And she, being instructed of her mother, said, Give me here John Baptist’s head in a charger,” is MBT (e.g., Sigma 042). Though changing word 4a to “*eipen* (‘she said,’ word 4b),” and the word order to, 1,4,2,3, the English translation of the Western Text’s, D 05, is still the same. (These two readings were conflated in W 032, with word order 1,4b,2,3,4a.) Tischendorf was attracted by this Western text’s reading (which has further support in the Latin textual tradition,) in his 2nd edition (1842), where in his *Lectioes Variantes* he classified as an inaccurate “variant” the reading of the *Textus Receptus* found in Stephanus’s Greek NT (1550). But in the shifting sands of the unstable non neo-Byzantine texts, which may vary from one edition to the next, Tischendorf then changed his mind, and in his neo-Alexandrian 8th edition (1869-72) favoured the TR’s reading, as indeed did the NU Text *et al*. By contrast, those following the neo-Byzantine TR had the correct reading all the time, and were spared such back and forth vacillations.

At Matt. 14:13a, the TR’s “*kai* (‘and,’ word 1) *akousas* (‘hearing,’ word 2),” is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042); whereas the NU Text changes “*kai*” to “*de*” and makes the word order, 2,1 (following e.g., the two leading Alexandrian texts & leading Western text). But either way, the reading is still the same.

At Matt. 14:13b, the TR's "*pezē*" is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042); whereas Tischendorf's 8th edition reads "*pezoi*" (following London Sinaiticus, of which as its discoverer, he was overly fond). But whether one correctly reads "*pezē* (adverb, with verb, 'they followed' / *ekolouthesan*)" (TR & NU Text); or incorrectly reads, "*pezoi* (adjective, with noun, 'the people' / *oi ochloi*)," the meaning is still, "on foot," in the wider context of, "and when *the people* had heard ... *they followed him on foot* out of the cities."

At Matt. 14:19a the TR's "*keleusas* ('commanding,' masculine singular nominative, active first aorist participle, from *keleuo*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, P 024; Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and with no good textual argument against it, it is correct. However an alternative reading of Origen, "*ekeleusen* ('he commanded,' indicative active first aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *keleuo*)," is followed by London Alexandrinus, and given as a footnote alternative by W-H. It appears to have been taken from the "*ekeleuse / ekeleusen*" of the nearby Matt. 14:9, either as a "stylistic improvement" of "harmonization," or as a "reconstruction" following a paper fade / loss in which a small stylistic space existed before the "*keleusas*" which lost its last two letters. But either way, the English translation here would be the same, "he commanded" (AV).

At Matt. 14:19b, the TR's "*epi* ('on,' preposition *epi* + an accusative) *tous* ('the,' masculine plural accusative, definite article from *o*) *chortous* ('grass,' masculine plural accusative, noun from *chortos*)," is MBT (e.g., P 024, 6th century; Lectionaries 2378 & 1968; & St. Chrysostom), and with no good textual argument against it is correct. But "*epi* ('on,' preposition *epi* + a genitive) *tou* ('the,' masculine singular genitive, definite article from *o*) *chortou* ('grass,' masculine singular genitive, noun from *chortos*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & Origen), also found in the NU Text *et al* following the two leading Alexandrian texts. The Greek *epi* as a spatial proposition, with either an accusative or genitive, may be rendered as e.g., *on* something or someone¹⁰⁴. Since in English "grass" is a singular plural, i.e., one does not sit down "on the grasses," but one sits down "on the grass," it follows that both readings may be translated as, "sit down on the grass" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 14:19d, the TR's "*eulogese* ('he blessed,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *eulogeo*)" is MBT (e.g., Sigma 042; abbreviating as "*eulogē*" with the "s" above the final "e" followed by an apostrophe ""¹⁰⁵, Lectionary 2378; Lectionary 1968; & Origen). However, a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032 & P 024; Origen & Chrysostom) is "*eulogese*," ('he blessed,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *eulogeo*). These are simply different first aorist forms, whether declined as an aorist from *eulogesa* (TR) or *eulogesa* (minority Byzantine reading). The variant form is also followed by the leading Western text, D 05. Though there is no difference in meaning between the two spellings, Tischendorf's 2nd edition (1842) disagreed with Stephanus (1550) for following the MBT reading here. But in the fluctuations that characterize the non neo-Byzantine texts, he later changed his mind, and Tischendorf's neo-Alexandrian 8th edition (1869-72) follows the correct

¹⁰⁴ Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, p. 376; Young's *Greek*, pp 97-8.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. W 032 at Matt. 13:55, *supra*.

reading (albeit for the wrong reasons i.e., the two leading Alexandrian texts here follow the TR). The correct reading is also found in the NU Text *et al*, with subsequent neo-Alexandrians being reluctant to, and understandably embarrassed about the idea of, following Tischendorf's 1842 view.

At Matt. 14:25c, the TR's "*tes* ('the,' feminine singular genitive, definite article from *e*) *thalasses* ('sea,' feminine singular genitive, noun from *thalassa-es*)," is MBT (e.g., Sigma 042; Lectionaries 2378 & 1968; & Eusebius); whereas as minority Byzantine reading (W 032, P 024, & Origen), "*ten* ('the,' feminine singular accusative, definite article from *e*) *thalassan* ('sea,' feminine singular accusative, noun from *thalassa-es*)," is also followed by the two leading Alexandrian Texts and thus the NU Text *et al*. Either way, the translation is, "walking on the sea" (AV & Moffatt Bible) or "walking upon the sea" (ASV). Cf. vs. 26c.

Then at Matt. 14:26c, the TR's "*ten* ('the,' feminine singular accusative, definite article from *e*) *thalassan* ('sea,' feminine singular accusative, noun from *thalassa-es*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032; P 024; Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). However, a minority Byzantine reading (Sigma 042); also found in the NU Text *et al* following the Alexandrian text's Rome Vaticanus & London Sinaiticus, and the Western text's D 05, is "*tes* ('the,' feminine singular genitive, definite article from *e*) *thalasses* ('sea,' feminine singular genitive, noun from *thalassa-es*)." Either way the rendering is, "And when the disciples saw him walking on the sea" (AV & ASV). Cf. vs 25c.

At Matt. 14:26a, the TR's "*kai* ('And,' word 1a) *idontes* ('seeing' = 'when ... saw,' word 2) *auton* ('him,' word 3) *oi* ('the,' word 4) *mathetai* ('disciples,' word 5)," i.e., "And when the disciples saw him" (AV), is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, P 024; with word 1a abbreviated as "*ki*" with an abbreviation grave, "v" over these letters in Lectionary 2378; and with word 3 spelt "*auon*" with an "o" over the omega seemingly indicating 2 possible spellings, and a "t" in the air just before the "n" in Lectionary 1968) and correct. But with word 1 changed from "*kai* ('And,' word 1a)" to "*de* ('And,' word 1b)", this becomes Word order 4,1b,5,2,3, in the NU Text following Rome Vaticanus (Alexandrian text) and D 05 (Western text) in the W-H, Nestle 21st, and NU Text, though the meaning is still the same.

Appendix 4

Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E (Matt. 1-14).

(An asterisk * after the rating in bold print indicates that the TR's reading is something

other than the Majority Byzantine Text e.g., the Majority Byzantine Text might be fairly evenly split between two readings.)

Title: “The Gospel according to Matthew”
 {A}, stylized within reasonable guidelines
 by adding “St.” before “Matthew” in the AV.

Matt. 1:6	{A}	Matt. 1:7,8	{A}	Matt. 1:10	{A}	Matt. 1:11	{A}
Matt. 1:16	{A}	Matt. 1:18	{B}	Matt. 1:22	{A}	Matt. 1:23	{A}
Matt. 1:25	{A}	Matt. 2:11	{B}	Matt. 2:18	{A}	Matt. 3:6	{A}
Matt. 3:7	{A}	Matt. 3:8	{B}*	Matt. 3:10	{A}	Matt. 3:11	{A}*
Matt. 3:12	{A}	Matt. 3:16a	{A}	Matt. 3:16b	{A}	Matt. 3:16c	{B}
Matt. 4:10	{C}*	Matt. 4:12	{A}	Matt. 4:18	{C}*	Matt. 4:23	{A}
Matt. 4:24	{A}	Matt. 5:4,5	{B}	Matt. 5:11a	{C}*	Matt. 5:11b	{A}
Matt. 5:13	{A}	Matt. 5:22	{A}	Matt. 5:25	{A}	Matt. 5:27	{B}*
Matt. 5:30	{A}	Matt. 5:31a	{C}*	Matt. 5:32a	{B}	Matt. 5:32b	{A}
Matt. 5:37	{A}	Matt. 5:39a	{-}	Matt. 5:39b	{C}*	Matt. 5:44a	{B}
Matt. 5:44b	{B}	Matt. 5:47a	{C}*	Matt. 5:47b	{B}	Matt. 5:48a	{A}
Matt. 5:48b	{B}	Matt. 6:1a	{A}	Matt. 6:1b	{B}	Matt. 6:4a	{B}
Matt. 6:4b,6	{B}	Matt. 6:5a	{A}	Matt. 6:5c	{A}	Matt. 6:12	{A}
Matt. 6:13	{B}	Matt. 6:15	{B}	Matt. 6:18	{C}*	Matt. 6:21	{B}
Matt. 6:25	{A}	Matt. 6:33	{A}	Matt. 6:34	{B}	Matt. 7:2	{C}*
Matt. 7:4	{B}*	Matt. 7:9	{B}	Matt. 7:10	{A}		
Matt. 7:13 &							
Matt. 7:14b	{A}	Matt. 7:14a	{B}*	Matt. 7:15	{C}*	Matt. 7:22	{A}
Matt. 7:29	{B}	Matt. 8:2	{A}	Matt. 8:3	{A}	Matt. 8:5	{C}*
Matt. 8:7	{A}	Matt. 8:8a	{C}*	Matt. 8:8b	{A}	Matt. 8:9	{A}
Matt. 8:10	{B}	Matt. 8:12	{B}	Matt. 8:13a	{B}	Matt. 8:13b	{B}
Matt. 8:13c	{B}	Matt. 8:15	{B}*	Matt. 8:18	{A}	Matt. 8:21	{A}
Matt. 8:25a	{C}*	Matt. 8:25b	{A}	Matt. 8:28	{A}	Matt. 8:29	{A}
Matt. 8:31	{B}	Matt. 8:32a	{A}	Matt. 8:32b	{B}	Matt. 9:2b	{A}
Matt. 9:4a	{C}*	Matt. 9:5b	{B}*	Matt. 9:8	{B}	Matt. 9:10	{-}
Matt. 9:12a	{A}	Matt. 9:12b	{A}	Matt. 9:13	{B}	Matt. 9:14	{A}
Matt. 9:22	{B}	Matt. 9:24	{B}	Matt. 9:26	{A}	Matt. 9:27a	{A}
Matt. 9:27b	{A}*	Matt. 9:34	{A}	Matt. 9:35	{B}	Matt. 9:36	{C}*
Matt. 10:3	{A}	Matt. 10:4	{A}	Matt. 10:8	{B}*	Matt. 10:10a	{B}
Matt. 10:10b	{A}	Matt. 10:23	{B}	Matt. 10:25	{A}	Matt. 11:2	{A}
Matt. 11:5	{A}	Matt. 11:8	{A}	Matt. 11:9	{A}	Matt. 11:10	{A}
Matt. 11:15	{A}	Matt. 11:16b	{C}*	Matt. 11:16,17	{B}	Matt. 11:17b	{A}
Matt. 11:19	{A}	Matt. 11:23a	{B}*	Matt. 11:23b	{B}	Matt. 11:24	{A}
Matt. 12:4	{A}	Matt. 12:6	{B}*	Matt. 12:8	{C}*	Matt. 12:10	{B}
Matt. 12:15	{B}	Matt. 12:22	{B}	Matt. 12:24	{A}		
Matt. 12:27	(Discussed at Matt. 12:24)			{A}		Matt. 12:25	{A}
Matt. 12:29	{A}	Matt. 12:31	{A}	Matt. 12:35a	{C}*	Matt. 12:38	{B}
Matt. 12:44	{A}	Matt. 12:47	{A}	Matt. 12:49	{B}	Matt. 13:4	{A}
Matt. 13:9	{A}	Matt. 13:11	{A}	Matt. 13:14	{B}*	Matt. 13:15	{A}*
Matt. 13:16	{A}	Matt. 13:22	{A}	Matt. 13:25	{A}	Matt. 13:28b	{C}*

Matt. 13:33	{A}	Matt. 13:34	{A}	Matt. 13:35a	{A}	Matt. 13:35b	{A}
Matt. 13:36	{B}	Matt. 13:37	{B}	Matt. 13:40	{B}	Matt. 13:43	{B}
Matt. 13:44a	{A}	Matt. 13:44b	{A}	Matt. 13:45	{A}	Matt. 13:46	{B}
Matt. 13:48a	{A}	Matt. 13:51a	{B}	Matt. 13:51b	{B}	Matt. 13:55	{B}
Matt. 14:3a	{A}	Matt. 14:3b	{A}	Matt. 14:3d	{A}	Matt. 14:6	{B}
Matt. 14:9	{A}	Matt. 14:12a	{A}	Matt. 14:12b	{A}	Matt. 14:14a	{A}
Matt. 14:15a	{A}	Matt. 14:15b	{A}	Matt. 14:16	{A}	Matt. 14:19c	{C}*
Matt. 14:22a	{A}	Matt. 14:22b	{B}	Matt. 14:22c	{C}*	Matt. 14:24	{A}
Matt. 14:25a	{B}	Matt. 14:25b	{B}	Matt. 14:26b	{B}	Matt. 14:27	{A}
Matt. 14:29	{A}	Matt. 14:30	{A}	Matt. 14:32	{B}	Matt. 14:33	{A}
Matt. 14:34	{A}	Matt. 14:36	{A}				

Appendix 5: Sermon preached for Dedication of Revised Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14) on 30 January (King Charles I's Day), 2010, at Mangrove Mountain Union Church, Mangrove Mountain (just north of Sydney, near Gosford), New South Wales, Australia. (Oral recorded form presently available at www.sermonaudio.com/kingjamesbible .)

Key Sermon Bible verses: Matt. 22:21, "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." Matt. 24:35, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." I Peter 2:17, "Fear God. Honour the king."

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen. *Let us pray.* "Almighty God, by whose grace and power thy holy martyr King Charles the First triumphed over suffering and was faithful unto death: strengthen us with thy grace, that we may endure reproach and persecution, and faithfully bear witness to the name of Jesus Christ our Lord; who is alive and reigns with thee and the Holy Ghost, one God, now and for ever. Amen¹⁰⁶."

¹⁰⁶ *Charles I's Day* was revived in the C. of E. as a black letter day in 1980, with the option of a church keeping it as a red letter day, that is to say, with a Church service e.g., Mattins or Evensong. For those churches in which that option was exercised, at the same time in 1980, the *Church of England* issued a general Collect for a Martyr. Thus one could have a 1662 prayer book service on that day, in which one applied this General Collect to Charles the First. Of

Let me start by thanking Alex Neil, who is conducting today's service, and who is a Free Presbyterian Elder in the Hawkesbury-Nepean Congregation of western Sydney, in the *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia*, which is derived from the *Free Church of Scotland*. This is a non-denominational Protestant Christian service here at Mangrove Mountain Union Church, although it might also be remarked that my Reformed Anglican sympathies come more to the fore on or near *Charles I's Day*, the 30th of January, than they normally would in a non-denominational service of this kind, although the same would also be true of *Royal Oak Day*, the 29th of May.

This Revised Volume 1 of my textual commentary on Matthew 1-14 is being Dedicated today, on *Charles I's Day*, the 30th of January, 2010, on what is now the 30th anniversary of the revival of *Charles I's Day* in 1980 on the Anglican Calendar in England. Subject to the teaching of such Scriptures as Acts 20:7; Romans 14:5,6; Hebrews 10:25; I maintain that beyond the obligatory Sunday observance, there is a liberty for Anglican Protestants to keep holy days, and for Puritan Protestants not to. With regard to remembering *Charles I's Day*, the rule for Anglican Protestants that I adhere to is, "Some Do. ... Some Don't. ... ALL SHOULD!"

Well last year I was in London, and on *King Charles I's Day 2009* I sang a hymn with hundreds of other people with the accompaniment of the Choir of *King's College*, London University. The hymn, "Royal Charles," was sung by King's Choir to Hastings' tune used for "Rock of Ages, cleft for me." I'll recite to you just two of the verses of this hymn.

Royal Charles, who chose to die,
Rather than the Faith deny,
Forfeiting his kingly pride,
For the sake of Jesu's bride;
Lovingly his praise we sing,
England's martyr, England's King.

All the way of death he trod,

course, if using the 1662 prayer book one would modify the "you" and "your" of this General Collect to "thee" and "thy." This is what I have done here with this Collect, inserting, "King Charles I" at "N," Collect of a Martyr (p. 844) per "Charles I, King, Martyr, 1649" on the Calendar (p. 18) in *The Alternative Service Book 1980*, Authorized for use in the Church of England in conjunction with the Book of Common Prayer [of 1662], 1980. More generally I do not endorse this 1980 Alternative Service Book, but to the extent that this was a revival of a day endorsed in the 1662 prayer book till 1859, I support this and a small amount of other things in this 1980 book. But overall, this 1980 Alternative Service Book was not a good revision. E.g., I do not support the old Sarum Missal idea, here used in this 1980 Book, of "Common" or "General" Collects of, for instance, a martyr, since in general black letter days have no necessary religious observance attached to them. But I make a one-off exception here on the basis that up until 1859 *Charles I's Day* had its own Office which included Collects, and so this is the first Collect specifically authorized by the C. of E. for usage on *Charles I's Day* in about 120 years. But my preference would be to authorize a Collect (and readings) specifically for *Charles I's Day*.

For the glory of his God,
 And his dying dignity
 Made a bright epiphany;
 Lovingly his praise we sing,
 England's martyr, [pause] England's King [pause].

Now by an old Anglican tradition, the definite article "the" is sometimes left out of "King Charles *the* Martyr's Day," and when so done, it's usually in oral rather than written form. So in a sermon like this, I might say, "For the 360th anniversary of 1649, on *King Charles Martyr's Day* 2009, I hung a red rose at the place of Charles' martyrdom, on the courtyard fence of the Banqueting Hall at Whitehall in London; and then I left London by train to visit King Charles Martyr's Church at Tunbridge Wells, which was consecrated under Charles II in 1678."

I would also wish to preface my remarks about Puritans today with some important qualifications. The first qualification I make is that unlike the Puseyites who are pro-Archbishop Laud and may misuse *Charles I's Day* as an anti-Protestant day to promote Puseyism or semi-Puseyism; Reformed Anglicans are anti-Laud; and I for one put a demarcation line between my support for the King, and my lack of support for Laud.

While we're aware of the fact that there are some who are beyond the pale of either Anglicanism or Scottish derived Presbyterianism who also support us in maintaining loyalty to the Crown under Charles I and Charles II; historically, there haven't been many of such persons in the Puritan churches, but we thank God there has been some, and we hope and pray that their number will grow. Another important qualification I make is that of Christian forgiveness, taught by King Charles the Martyr himself on the scaffold in 1649, when in Christ-like manner he forgave his enemies. Without malice to contemporary Germans, we still remember our World War One and Two war dead on *Armistice Day*, the 11th of November; and likewise, WITHOUT MALICE to contemporary English and Irish derived Puritans in general, and Congregationalists in particular, we still remember our civil war dead on *Charles I's Day*, the 30th of January.

Good brethren, in Matthew 22:21 Jesus says, "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." Firstly I'll discuss these words with reference to King Charles the First; and how Oliver Cromwell, Samuel Rutherford, and other Puritan revolutionary republicans sought to set aside these words of Holy Writ, contrary to the power of God in Matthew 24:35, "*Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.*" And secondly, I will then close this sermon with some discussion on these same words of Jesus with reference to the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture.

The 1662 prayer book Office for *King Charles Martyr's Day* says that it was because of the "provocations of our sins" that in God's "judgment" he "didst suffer ... King Charles ... to be murdered;" and hence we must all "truly repent," and petition the Lord to "pardon us for thy mercies' sake, through the merits of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen." And the Homily entitled, "Against Rebellion," in Article 35 of the Anglican 39 Articles refers in Part 1 to Hosea 13:11 in the context of the reign of King Edward VI who reigned from 1547 to 1553. The Homily says, "'God giveth a prince in his anger,' meaning an evil one, 'and taketh away a prince in his displeasure,' meaning especially when he taketh away a good prince for the sins of the people, as ... he took away our good Josias, King Edward."

And of course, we also see this occurring with King Charles. For God, “in” his “anger,” permitted the bad ruler of Oliver Cromwell, and “in” his “wrath,” “took” “away” the good prince of King Charles *for the sins of the people*. Consider, for example, the sin of violating the 3rd commandment, “Thou shalt not take the Lord’s name in vain,” and the 9th commandment, “Thou shalt not bear false witness;” both of which commandments were seriously violated by those who set aside solemn oaths of allegiance to the king, to ultimately engage in sedition against the Crown, and then further violation of the 6th commandment, “Thou shalt not kill.” We read in Jeremiah 23:10 that “because of” false “swearing the land mourneth.” And it was for such sins that in accordance with Proverbs 29:2, God permitted that “the wicked” republicans “beareth rule,” and “the people mourn.” And well may we mourn for such sins as false swearing and all dishonesty, for we read in Revelation 21:8 that “*all liars*, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone.”

The reigns of Charles I and Charles II were by no means perfect; I am critical of both within certain *reasonable* bounds; and both kings were misadvised by some *bad* political advisors. Our criticism of both Charles I and Charles II includes the fact that like King Solomon they entered mixed marriages, in their particular instances with Roman Catholic wives. So we support the Act of Settlement brought in under King William III which prohibited any future monarch from so marrying a Roman Catholic. *But all that’s not the point*. For as the Homily entitled, “Against Rebellion,” in Article 35 of the Anglican 39 Articles says in Part 2, “yet how evil soever Saul the king was, and out of God’s favour, yet was he obeyed of his subject David.” Brethren, note well the words of II Samuel 1:14-16, said about Saul, a king who clearly left a good deal to be desired; and who even went so far as to ask someone to murder him. “And David said unto him, How wast thou not afraid to stretch forth thine hand to destroy the Lord’s anointed? And David called one of the young men, and said, Go near, and fall upon him. And he smote him that he died. And David said unto him, Thy blood be upon thy head; for thy mouth hath testified against thee, saying, I have slain the Lord’s anointed.”

Both the English Puritan controlled House of Commons and Charles I may be fairly criticized for not working together on a whole range of issues, including the need to discipline Archbishop Laud, and to grant religious freedom to the English and Irish Puritans while still keeping the Anglican Church as the Established *Church of England and Ireland* and the King as her Supreme Governor. But though the Caroline reigns were by no means perfect, they were a lot better than what those blasted English Puritans came up with!

E.g., the Presbyterian Scots were invaded by the armies of Cromwell in 1650 and 1651. But before this the 1650 Caroline Psalter had been produced after Scotland had proclaimed Charles II king and Cromwell had declared England a republic. Thus this 1650 Caroline Psalter expresses an anti-Cromwell sentiment. The nine year invading army of Cromwell greatly disrupted Presbyterian Church worship in Scotland. Singing of Psalms ceased in many places. In 1947 Patrick Millar, who had been appointed by the General Assembly of the *Church of Scotland* to prepare a historical survey of Scottish Psalmody, wrote the book, *Four Centuries of Scottish Psalmody*. Before reading a quote from this book, I should explain that what Millar calls “Brownism” refers to the Congregational Church, and this was the specific Puritan Church Oliver Cromwell was aligned with. Millar says of “the Scottish Psalter” of “1650” that it had a “decline ... greatly accelerated by the invasion of Scotland, from the south of the border, by a pestilent type of Puritanism, inconceivably arrogant and intolerant, which in the name of a supposedly superior piety sought to cast discredit on every form of art used in association with

worship. It was inevitable that music should suffer, as it did desperately, from the blight which this heresy,” “Brownism,” “cast over the whole of the Scottish religion.” So if, my Free Presbyterian brethren who are here today, like Brother Alex who is conducting this service, you like to use the 1650 Caroline Psalter of King Charles II, then *WATCH OUT! Because if Oliver Cromwell’s Puritans come to town, that CAROLINE Psalter will go!* [pause]

And we Anglicans didn’t fare any better either. The English Puritan’s republic had come to power at the point of a gun, and they held onto power at that same point of a gun. They made the Anglican prayer book “illegal” in 1645, as they sought Puritan uniformity of worship. They forbade the keeping of such holy days as Christmas and Easter. Christmas was banned by republican ordinances of 1644, 1647, and 1652; and they even had town cryers going through the streets of England yelling out, “No Christmas! No Christmas!” But subject to Acts 5:29 and Romans 14:5,6, Christmas was still being kept by Anglicans. The Puritans’ anti-Christmas laws resulted in bloody riots; and all of this helped prepare the way for the Restoration of 1660. The Roundheads would surround any church that was celebrating Christmas, and hold those keeping this holy day at the point of a gun.

WATCH OUT! any of you who, like myself keep the great Christian festival of Christmas; *WATCH OUT!* because if Oliver Cromwell’s Puritans come to town, they’ll hold ya’ at the point of a gun; if they find ya’ in a church remembering Christ’s Nativity on 25 December.

WATCH OUT! They’ll hold ya’ at the point of a gun, and if ya’ resist, they might blow ya’ brains out!! [pause]

Well when the anti-Christmas brigade, gun-toting Puritan republicans finally went down in 1660, it was a case of ‘good riddens to bad rubbish’! And today being *King Charles Martyr’s Day*, we’re dancing upon the Puritan republic’s grave. RAH! RAH! RAH! We’re told in Galatians 5:20,21, that those involved in “seditions” and “murders” “shall *not* inherit the kingdom of God,” and in Revelation chapter 20 and verse 8, that “murderers” “shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone.” And so it’s upon the authority of nothing less than God’s holy and infallible Book, that I say of Oliver Cromwell, Samuel Rutherford, and the others of their seditious and murderous republican ilk, *LONG MAY THEY BURN IN HELL!!!* [pause]. For these English Puritan revolutionaries were as faithful to being true and loyal Protestants of the Bible, as they were faithful to being true and loyal subjects of the King! [pause]

The historic Protestant alliance between Reformed Anglicans and Scottish Presbyterians also supported the Establishment of Anglicanism as the *Church of England*, and as a Biblically based judgment, Test Acts against English and Irish Puritans because many of them glorified Cromwell and thus sedition against the Crown, and as a Biblically based manifestation of mercy, religious tolerance to Puritans as fellow Protestants from 1689. We know that during the 18th century a number of more moderate Protestant Puritans met the Test Acts requirements by occasionally taking Communion in a fellow Protestant Anglican Church, so as to be able to hold various government offices. But none of the Papists were prepared to do this, so that by the time of their repeal in the 19th century, the Test Acts were more anti-Papist than anti-Puritan.

The Anglican Protestant, Jonathon Swift, the author of the novel, *Gulliver’s Travels*, was born in Dublin in 1667, and died in Dublin in 1745. He was the Dean of St. Patrick’s *Church of Ireland* Cathedral, Dublin, which is the largest cathedral in Ireland, north or south, and when I

visited Ireland in 2001 I saw above a door in this Cathedral a memorial plaque to Dean Swift¹⁰⁷. Dean, Jonathon Swift preached a *King Charles Martyr's Day* sermon at St. Patrick's Cathedral in 1726. Among other things, he criticized what he called, "the successors of those Puritans, I mean our present Protestant dissenters" "who profess the same principles in religion and government which those Puritan rebels put in practice," under what he called, "the bare name of Protestants;" and in this context, he further criticized what he called the "Puritan zeal" of "that murderous Puritan Parliament"¹⁰⁸.

And the point that I wish to draw from Dean Swift's *King Charles Martyr's Day* sermon in 1726, is that this continued glorification of Oliver Cromwell's and Samuel Rutherford's sedition against the Crown and murder of a king by the mainly English but also Irish Puritans, necessitated the admittedly undesirable, though contextually necessary, Test Acts against the Puritans. And of course, we all know what happened when 50 years later a similar argument of sedition against the Crown for a so called "tyrant" was put to the North American Puritans in 1776 in what became the United States of America. At that time, similar things were said about George III that had been said about Charles I, namely, that he was a "tyrant," and that therefore there was some so called "higher law" that could be used to set aside the Bible's prohibitions on "seditions" and "murders" in Galatians 5:20:21. E.g., they said that taxes were too high, and therefore they didn't have to follow the Biblical teachings of Matthew 22:21 and Romans 13:1-9.

Indeed, I returned to Sydney, Australia, on my fifth trip to London from September 2008 to March 2009, via North America. One of the places I visited was the USA capital, Washington, D.C., and my sightseeing included the USA Congress. This building is on the opposite side of the road to the nearby Library of Congress and Supreme Court House, both of which I also inspected. But inside the Congress, I passed under the big dome they called the "Temple of Liberty," into the original House of Representatives chamber which was vacated in 1857 for a new chamber, and which is now a hall and museum. I there took a photo of a

¹⁰⁷ This sermon is dated Sunday 30 January 1726. Before 1859, if *Charles I's Day* fell on a Sunday, it was transferred to the next day, Monday 31st of January. A major feast day can be remembered from its Eve, although this is not usually done for a day following Sunday because the general rule is that Sunday takes precedence. But on this occasion in 1726, while the Office would have been transferred to the Monday, it seems that from Evensong on the Sunday of 30 January, Dean Swift chose to remember *King Charles I's Day*. Thus Dean Jonathon Swift preached a *King Charles Martyr's Day* sermon at St. Patrick's Cathedral on *Sunday* 30 January, 1726. Even though *King Charles I's Day* was a red letter day with its own Office in the 1666-1800 *Church of Ireland* prayer book, to the best of my knowledge remembering the day when it fell on Monday 31st January from Evensong on the Sunday before would not have been a normative practice. But it is surely one of the paradoxes of Anglican history, that since it was revived, if reference is made to it in an Anglican Church, it may well be on a nearby Sunday if it does not fall on a Sunday; so that Sunday has gone from being a day one does not remember *King Charles I's Day* on, to often being the preferred day to remember *King Charles I's Day* on.

¹⁰⁸ Connolly, S.J., "The Church of Ireland and the Royal Martyr: Regicide and Revolution in Anglican Political Thought c. 1660-c.1745," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 2003, *op. cit.*, pp. 500-502.

ceremonial copy of the *American Declaration of Independence* of 1776 which was ornately framed in a large wooden frame with an eagle on top. Among other things, this Declaration refers to George III as “the present King of Great Britain,” describes him as “a tyrant,” and gives as an example of his “absolute tyranny,” his “imposing taxes on us without our consent.”

Now I’m not saying that the secularists of the 1770s and 1780s American Revolution were identical with the English Puritan revolutionaries of the 1640s and 1650s. But I’m saying their basic idea that through natural law, one can justify a revolution against a so called “tyrant,” was the same basic idea that Rutherford had argued. And so by keeping this idea alive among Puritans glorifying Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford, politicians in what became the United States of America were able to draw on this latent background “tyrant” idea and sentiment among many of the American Puritans for their own purposes in the American War of Independence. Thus anti-Anglican Puritans and anti-Protestant Papists from Boston and elsewhere united against the Anglican Protestant Crown to form the secular republic of the United States of America.

So say what you will, the historical truth is that if one has a context in which Oliver Cromwell and his sedition against the Crown is glorified on Rutherford’s *Lex Rex* type of claims about overthrowing a so called “tyrant,” with ideas that he got from the Jesuit teachings of Suarez, Mariana, and Lessius; it becomes possible to do what the American revolutionaries did, namely, to mobilize that latent Puritan sentiment for another revolution against the Crown. And so taking into account both Dean Jonathon Swift’s comments from the pulpit of St. Patrick’s *Church of Ireland* Cathedral, Dublin, on *King Charles Martyr’s Day* in 1726; and also the events 50 years later in America in 1776; this shows that the Anglicans were justified in very, very, sadly, and very, very, regrettably, having the Test Acts against English and Irish Puritans, *in order to help keep the Crown safe from another revolution.*

Now also in the context of the historic anti-sedition and pro-Caroline Protestant alliance between Reformed Anglicans and Scottish Presbyterians, I would also note that the alliance supported the Establishment of Puritan Presbyterianism as the *Church of Scotland* from 1689, in opposition to the frequently Jacobite *Episcopal Church of Scotland*. By his Popish actions, in substance, though not in form, at law James II had abdicated from the *Protestant* throne. This consisted of e.g., not stating his allegiance to the Protestant 39 Articles as Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church. William III and Mary II were accordingly invited over by some Members of Parliament, and within a reasonable period of time, that is, less than three months, a Convention Parliament met on the established precedent of the Convention Parliament of 1660, and recognized that by his conduct James II had for all practical purposes abdicated by deserting his post when fleeing the capital of London and discarding the Great Seal of the Realm into the River Thames. Under the Establishment Principle of e.g., Isa. 49:23, *the next in line to succeed* had to be a Protestant in order for the monarch to fulfill the legal requirements as Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church. Thus the Convention Parliament then recognized William III of Orange and Mary II as the successors to the throne, and as cousins, both were descendants of Charles I. Thus while the events of 1688 and 1689 are sometimes called, “The Glorious Revolution,” in such instances, the word “Revolution” should be understood to mean “a drastic change” or “great reversal of conditions” such as in the terminology of “The Industrial Revolution;” and should NOT be taken to mean, “the political overthrow of a government by sedition.” Thus any warfare that occurred between them, such as the *Battle of the Boyne* in 1690, was the warfare between a lawful king in *William of Orange* and a pretender to the throne

in the Popish Duke, James II.

Removed from the Calendar in 1859, *King Charles I's Day* was first revived on the Anglican Calendar of Canada in 1962, as a black letter day entitled, "Charles Stuart, King, beheaded 1649." Given that Canada stayed loyal to the Crown at the time of the American Revolution in the 1770s, it was surely appropriate that this royalist land should first revive the day. In March 2009 on return to Australia via North America, as I circumnavigated the globe, I flew with "AIR CANADA" from London to Boston, USA, with a short airport stop at Montreal in Quebec. There was a large red neon sign at the Montreal Airport reading, "WELCOME TO CANADA" Thus I left the old world in England *under the British Crown*, and I entered the new world of the Americas in Canada *under the British Crown*. And let's thank God that Canada stayed loyal to the Crown. And let's thank God, that in 1962 Canada revived *King Charles I's Day* on the Anglican Calendar, about 100 years after it was removed.

King George III's regnal years are 1760 to 1820, and under his reign, Captain Cook discovered Eastern Australia in 1770, and Australia was first settled by the Christian white man in 1788. After the First Fleet arrived on Saturday the 26th of January 1788, with the Evangelical Anglican Chaplain, the Reverend Mr. Richard Johnson, the first day on the Anglican 1662 prayer book Calendar other than a Sunday was *Charles I's Day* four days later on 30 January. George III is *the king who won Australia and the king who lost America*, and he reminds us of the maxim, *Ya' win some, and ya' lose some*. [Pause] So it's surely appropriate that in a land where the Crown was a winner, *Charles I's Day* was revived on the Anglican Calendar in Australia in 1978 as a black letter day entitled, "Charles, King of England (1600-1649)." If one includes the *Australian Antarctic Territory*, Australia and Canada are geographically the world's second and third largest countries respectively¹⁰⁹; both are under the Crown, and both have revived *King Charles I's Day* on their Anglican Calendars. And it was on the 30th anniversary of the revival of *Charles I's Day* in Australia that Volume 1 of this Commentary was dedicated on 30 January 2008. Finally, in 1980 the day was revived on the Anglican Calendar in England as a black letter day with the option of keeping it as a red letter day, entitled, "Charles I, King, Martyr, 1649." And so it is on this, the 30th anniversary of the revival of *King Charles I's Day* in England that the revised Volume 1 of this Commentary is being dedicated today on 30 January 2010.

Now the Anglican Church has two Cathedrals in Dublin, so in addition to St. Patrick's Cathedral there's also Christchurch Cathedral; and I thank God I inspected both of these in 2001.

So I now further refer to a *King Charles Martyr's Day* sermon from Christchurch *Church of Ireland* Cathedral in Dublin, this time one preached in 1716 by Bishop St. George Ashe, Bishop of Clogher, and later Bishop of Londonderry. Bishop Ashe says, "Had Papists therefore only

¹⁰⁹ Russia is *c.* 27 million square km (*c.* 6.6 million square miles); Canada is *c.* 9.97 million sq. km (*c.* 3.85 million sq. miles); China is *c.* 9.6 million sq. km (*c.* 3.7 million sq. miles); and the USA is *c.* 9.5 million sq. km (*c.* 3.68 million sq. miles). Without the AAT Australia is *c.* 7.68 million sq. km (*c.* 2.97 million sq. miles), and so the fifth on this list; but with the AAT Australia is *c.* 13.9 million sq. km (*c.* 5.37 sq. miles), and so the second largest country. The AAT is *c.* 6.2 million sq. km (*c.* 2.4 million sq. miles). Australia has permanent human habitation and settlement in the AAT, and is a signatory to the Antarctic Treaty of 1959 (with a 1991 protocol).

entered into this unnatural rebellion, 'twould have been no surprise: but that Protestants, that men who call themselves members of our Church ... should ever join in so wicked a confederacy, is most melancholy and astonishing¹¹⁰.' Now Bishop Ashe here refers to the Puritan Protestant rebels as, "Protestants ... of our Church," that is, he considered that as fellow Protestants they were of the one church with Anglican Protestants; but during the civil war, this was a Protestant church or house ... divided.

But note also that Bishop Ashe here refers to a "wicked conspiracy" between the Puritan Revolutionaries and what he calls the "Papists" in "this unnatural rebellion" against King Charles I. Before I read his elucidation on this, I should explain Bishop Ashe's reference to "Independents, Levellers, and Fifth-Monarchy men." What were called "Independents" later became known as the Congregationalists, they maintain that church government should be localized to each congregation, and they were very influential under Cromwell's republic, reaching the peak of their power under Cromwell who aligned himself with them. What were called "Levellers" were one of the Puritan republican factions who wanted all power in the House of Commons; and what were called, "Fifth-Monarchy men," were a group that at first were pro-Cromwell and supported the republic, but later in the 1650s they withdrew their support for Cromwell, and within about 10 years they had disappeared in a puff of smoke.

Now in this *King Charles Martyr's Day* sermon, Bishop Ashe says, "my brethren, those *bloody and deceitful men*, the PAPISTS, those most implacable enemies and plotters against our holy Church ever since the Reformation, *were ... guilty ... of the murder of that excellent prince; and*" "Dr. du Moulin" "in his 'Vindication of Protestants' publicly charges it upon them, and undertakes to prove that the whole rebellion to have been raised and fostered by the arts of the Court of Rome: that Jesuits professed themselves Independents, Levellers, and Fifth-Monarchy men, had their agents in all the Committees for the destruction of the Church and King; was ready to name, when called upon by lawful authority, the Romish priest, who, when he saw the fatal stroke given to the King, flourished his sword, and said, '*Now the greatest enemy we had in the world is gone,*' and" continues the Bishop with regard to Canon du Moulin's testimony, "offers to produce the undoubted testimonies of the consultations at Rome and Paris, and elsewhere, wherein it was determined that ... it was necessary to take away the King¹¹¹."

Now Peter du Moulin Jr. was born in 1610 and died in 1684. An immigrant from France, he was a royalist Anglican clergyman who after the Restoration was made a Chaplain to Charles II and a Canon at Canterbury Cathedral, where he lies buried in the crypt. And of course, the large crypt of Canterbury Cathedral was granted to the French Huguenot Protestant immigrants fleeing from Popery in the 16th century. Canon du Moulin was familiar with Jesuitry because his father, a Huguenot French Pastor, Peter du Moulin Sr., wrote a defence of the French Reformed Confession of Faith against its Jesuit detractors, and his father had earlier been made a Canon at Canterbury Cathedral under King James in 1615. Now the book Canon Peter du Moulin Jr. wrote referred to by Bishop Ashe under the short title, 'Vindication of Protestants,'

¹¹⁰ Ashe, St. George, A sermon preached at Christchurch in Dublin, January 30th, 1716, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9 correcting "make away" to "take away," and also modernizing some spelling, and removing some brackets (here and elsewhere when cited in this Sermon).

was first published in London in 1664 and thereafter went through a number of editions. And the interested listener will find further reference to these matters from the 1679 edition endorsed by the then Bishop of London, in the Prefatory section of my Revised Volume 1¹¹²; e.g., reference to the fact that Samuel Rutherford got his basic *Lex Rex* criteria for sedition and murder from the dark Devilish arts of the Jesuits, though he tried to put an outward overt “*Protestant*” *sounding* gloss on the inwardly covert Jesuitical teachings that he learnt while secretly walking on the dark side with Jesuitry. Or the fact that in late 1630s and early 1640s Archbishop Laud had gotten wind of a Popish plot to assassinate the king that was then afoot in the land.

On the basis of Canon du Moulin’s work, it emerges that Jesuits entered England, palmed themselves off as Puritans, joined the Roundhead’s army, and helped to incite sedition amongst the Puritans against King Charles I. Now don’t misunderstand me. I recognize that the independent church government of the Congregational Church has two potentials. On the up-side, the independent nature of such a local church means that if one has a good, solid, sound, Bible-believing Protestant Minister and congregation, they can hold out against a wider apostate church organization, and so they can be a real blessing. Thus one can point to a Congregationalist Minister like Martin Lloyd-Jones of London, who was prepared to hold out against a wider apostasy which he condemned in connection with the *Billy Graham Crusades*, a religiously apostate Evangelist from the USA who gives converts to Papists, religious liberals, and other unorthodox groups. But on the down-side, the independent nature of the local church means that a highly organized, insular group can, especially if the congregation is relatively small, get in and quickly take the thing over. Thus one can point to the fact that during the 19th century, Unitarians who deny the Trinity were able to easily get in, and take over a number of Congregationalist Churches in the United States of America.

Like these later Unitarians, on this particular occasion during the 1640s and 1650s, the Jesuits who were a highly organized insular group found the Congregationalist form of church government was *a weak link in the chain* of Puritan Churches. Now in saying this, I’m not thereby suggesting that all, or even most of the Congregationalist churches of this era were under Jesuit control. But I’m saying on the testimony of Canon du Moulin in a work endorsed by the then Bishop of London, Henry Compton, that *certainly some of them were*; and that’s all the Jesuits needed to have a platform from which palming themselves off as Puritans, they could incite as many Puritans as possible into sedition against the Crown. *And because the Puritan Revolutionaries were SO COCKSURE that an infiltration and takeover of any Puritan Congregationalist Church could never occur, the Congregationalists proved to be soft’n’easy targets for the hard nosed, cold’n’calculating, ruthless, brutally successful, Jesuits.*

Now certainly I’m not suggesting that the English Puritan revolution was run or primarily guided by, the Papist Jesuits. Indeed, quite to the contrary, I would affirm that at its heart the revolutionary republic was English Puritan. Nor am I suggesting that the Congregationalist churches were predominantly Jesuit in membership. Such propositions would in my opinion be a gross overstatement of Popish influence in both the Puritan’s republic and the Congregational Church of the era. *But the Jesuits were there, masquerading as Puritans, frequently in a number of the more easily and quickly controlled Congregationalist Churches that were aligned with*

¹¹² “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” section “(c) i) Charles the First’s Day (30 Jan.), Charles the Second’s Day (29 May), & Papists’ Conspiracy Day (5 Nov.),” subsection “Popish Jesuit involvement in Charles I’s martyrdom;” and also my Dedication Sermon in Appendix 5.

Oliver Cromwell, a man who preferred Congregationalist Churches over other Puritan Churches. So that when the Jesuits palming themselves off as Puritans came-a-hollerin' for Oliver Cromwell and the Roundheads against King Charles and the Cavaliers, the Congregationalists came-a-runnin' to integrate these chameleon Jesuits in! The Jesuits were the republic's "booster rockets." Their organizational skills and indefatigable zeal and enthusiasm for the murder of King Charles, gave the republic that extra bit of BOOST to get on and get the murky job of regicide done. But once the Papists had achieved their end, and Charles had been beheaded; these Jesuit "booster rockets" burnt out; and the republic's forward momentum correspondingly s-l-o-w-e-d d-o-w-n. [pause]

Now we know that the Jesuits don't work for free. But because they're operations are covert, and shrouded in a veil of secrecy, some level of speculation is necessary with respect to the question of "Why, before the English Puritan revolutionaries were in 1660 turned into a dunghill, the Jesuits were prepared to so vigorously work with such an anti-Papist group, against the Anglicans, against the Scottish Presbyterians, and against the King?" Why, for example, did the Popish priest referred to by Canon du Moulin at King Charles' martyrdom, whom I understand to be a certain "Father" Philips, speak the words, "*Now the greatest enemy we had in the world is gone*"? While this matter of what drove the Jesuits is conjectural, besides of course, the fact that they were driven by devils, it seems to me that in addition to the driving force of devils, there were two other reasons in particular that are relevant.

One reason appears to have been that if England had an unpopular Puritan leader like Cromwell, then a military invasion by a Popish country such as France or Spain, orchestrated with the intent of making England Papist, would be more likely to succeed. For while to this day English Puritan derived propaganda depicts Cromwell in popularist terms, it should not be forgotten that this reflects the perception of a very, very, small percentage of people that supported Cromwell, and that more generally, Anglican England *did not look with popularist favour on Cromwell's Congregationalist favouring regime!* They wanted, *No Puritan REPUBLICANISM!!*

But there was also another reason why the Jesuits wanted King Charles out of the way, *and out of the way at all costs!* A reason so important that Jesuits were prepared, as partners-in-crime, to work hand-in-fist with Cromwell's republic in order to remove and kill the King. That reason relates to matters in far way Constantinople, which until 1453 had been the capital of the Byzantine Empire, after which, it was captured and fell to the sword of Islam. Cyril Lucar who died in 1638, was the Greek Orthodox *Patriarch of Constantinople*, the highest ranking position in the Greek Orthodox Church. He converted to Protestantism and desirous of forging links with Protestants to help advance a Protestant Reformation inside the Greek Orthodox Church, made contact with King Charles I, and indeed, in 1628 presented the *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland*, King Charles I, with *Codex Alexandrinus*, a fifth century Greek manuscript which is Byzantine Text in the Gospels.

Now in the following year of 1629, Patriarch Lucar published his Protestant *Confession of Faith*. This had a Lutheran view of the two sacraments of baptism and Communion, but was otherwise Calvinist. Between 1620 and 1638, Lucar was forced to resign some five times at the behest of the *Papist* French and Austrian ambassadors to the Ottoman Empire's Sultan Murad IV; though on each occasion he returned to office with the help of *Protestant* British and Dutch diplomats. Thus we know that King Charles I was working through his embassy in

Constantinople to help Cyril Lucar promote Protestant teachings, in opposition to Papists seeking to get rid of him, and halt the advance of Protestantism amongst the Greeks.

As Cyril Lucar tried to move the Greek Orthodox Church in the Protestant direction, a Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox alliance between the Papist Austrian ambassador, Schwarzenborn, in cahoots with the Pope and Vatican, and the Greek Orthodox Cyril Contari, was formed to stop Lucar. They did this through bribery money gained from the Vatican, and the assistance of a compliant Grand Vizir, Bairam Pasha, who made false insinuations to the Mohammedan Sultan, Murad IV, to the effect that Lucar was working in a military alliance against the Sultan, who then had Cyril Lucar killed. Thus Cyril Lucar is regarded as a Protestant “martyr,” since it is clear that he died in the cause of defending important Protestant truths.

Thus the Papists knew that so long as the Protestant King Charles I was on the throne, he was prepared to give succour and assistance to the Protestant movement inside the Greek Orthodox Church. The Papists, acting through the Jesuits, though minor players in the bigger English Puritan controlled game of the English Puritan revolution, thus came in on the side-lines to cheer, and to support, and to help the English Puritan revolutionaries in mobilizing support for the revolution among the gullible and naïve masses of English Puritans, who were thus hoodwinked into supporting Cromwell against the King.

And as a postscript to this story on Charles and Lucar, I should mention that the Eastern Orthodox *Synod of Jerusalem* in 1672, was the Eastern Orthodox equivalent to the Roman Catholic *Council of Trent*, in that it halted the advance of Protestantism inside of Eastern Orthodoxy, and specifically denied and rejected the Protestant teachings of Cyril Lucar. *The lives of both Patriarch Cyril Lucar and King Charles I were thus sought by the Papists as the price for their attempts to liberate the Greek Orthodox Church and make it a Protestant Church!*

And so it is with a better understanding of the politics of the era, that we better understand the significance of the work done by Canon du Moulin of Christ Church *Church of England* Cathedral in Canterbury, and the citation of his work by Bishop Ashe in his *King Charles Martyr’s Day* sermon at Christchurch *Church of Ireland* Cathedral in Dublin, when the Bishop refers to how “Jesuits professed themselves” to be Puritans, and why it was that a “Romish priest, ... when he saw the fatal stroke given to the King, flourished his sword, and said, ‘*Now the greatest enemy we had in the world is gone*’.” [pause]

And that my friends, now brings me to the second part of this sermon. Because I want you to know, that Jesuitry is still afoot in the land, and still waging war against the truth. Jesuitry was involved in the attempted murder of King James and his son, Charles, in the Guy Fawkes Gunpowder Plot of 1605; Jesuitry was an accomplice that was involved in the murder of this same son of King James, to wit, King Charles the Martyr, in 1649; and Jesuitry is still involved in seeking to blow up and murder the Received Text of the King James Bible. The “NU Text” is an acronym, spelt, “NU” and pronounced, “new.” The “N” stands for the “Nestle-Aland” text and the “U” for the “United Bible Society’s” Text, the same neo-Alexandrian Greek New Testament text is now found in both. If you look at the title pages of Nestle-Aland’s 26th edition of 1979 and 27th edition of 1993; as well as the title pages of the United Bible Society’s 3rd edition of 1975, 3rd Corrected edition of 1983, and 4th Revised edition of 1993; you’ll find that there are three names among the five NU Text Committee members, and only three names, that have survived over Committee changes. Two of these names are well known. They are the

names of Bruce Metzger and Kurt Aland. These two are the show-ponies of the contemporary NU Text Committee.

Metzger and Aland are the boys who take the lime-light. But lurking in the dark shadows of their lime-light, you'll find another name, that of Carlo Martini. You'll note that after the name of Carlo Martini one does NOT find the initials, "S.J." signifying that he's a Jesuit, *for that would give the game away!* And nor do we find, for example, on the contemporary NU Text title pages of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition and the United Bible Society's 4th revised edition, any reference to the fact that this Jesuit is indeed, *a Popish Cardinal*. The initials, "S.J." are absent from Cardinal Martini's name. But let me say that for those of us who have studied the intricate, devious, and crafty *modus operandi* of the Popish Jesuits evident in various Jesuit plots, such concealment techniques come as NO SURPRISE. Indeed, quite frankly it's the very sort of thing that we've come to expect from Jesuitry! The Jesuits are a slippery'n'slimy, greasy'n'grimy, tricky group to deal with, they're a bad crowd! They're a very, very, bad crowd indeed! And that the Jesuits are accomplices in the creation of the contemporary neo-Alexandrian NU Text, should send alarm bells ringing throughout Protestant churches.

Good brethren, if we accept the words of Christ in Matt. 22:21, "Render ... unto God the things that are God's," then we must recognize the power of God in the Divine Preservation of Holy Writ, and this is surely one sense of the meaning of Christ's words in Matt 24:35, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."

We find that at the point of the Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture, there were three tongues selected by the Holy Ghost: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek; but we find that at the point of the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture, there were four languages selected by the Holy Ghost, Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, *and Latin*. And for the purposes of the New Testament Received Text, there are just two Biblical languages, Greek and Latin. That's because for the promise to have effect of I Peter 1:25, "the Word of the Lord endureth forever," it's necessary that there was a general accessibility to a closed class of sources over time and through time, so that the same Received Text could be composed at any time after the New Testament autographs were written.

And the manuscripts that had such accessibility over time and through time, were those of the Byzantine Greek, the Latin, and the Greek and Latin Church writers. And in this context I would also note that this Revised Volume 1 of my textual commentaries on Matthew 1-14 that we're dedicating today, includes in it some refinements and corrections. These improvements include citations from two Greek Lectionaries held at Sydney University, one from the 11th century and one from the mid 16th century; and as a son of the Western Church, I'm pleased to also say citations from the Western Church Doctor, St. Gregory the Great, as found in Migne; and none of these Greek or Latin sources have previously been collated for citation in a textual commentary.

Well okay, we've got the closed class of three sources for the New Testament, the Byzantine Greek, the Latin, and the church writers, both ancient and mediaeval, although with a special emphasis on the ancient and early mediaeval writers; but what are we gonna' do with 'em? Well God provides all that's needed for what the *Apostles' and Nicene Creeds* call the "catholic" "church," that is, the universal church of Ephesians 5:32. And so he provides neo-Byzantine textual analysts, like Beza and the Elzevirs; though we know he doesn't select very many for this task. Before the 16th and 17th centuries, the text was composed on a text by text needs basis, but from the 16th century on the entire New Testament Received Text was formally composed.

After a long, sustained, and systematic attack upon the Received Text of Holy Scripture, and upon petition of Almighty God by many Christian brethren of the holy Protestant faith for relief and assistance, in the early 21st century, for the first time in over 300 years, it pleased Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, one God in a perfect Trinity, to call for a neo-Byzantine textual analyst to come forth for major work in defending the *Textus Receptus*. By special command of His Divine Majesty, the Lord Jehovah, I was called to do this work. In doing so, the Lord sent out his call to an old Sydney University Regiment man; one who is the son of an army officer; one who as a modern day Cavalier fights for the honour of King Charles; one who as a Christian soldier fights for the honour of the King of Kings, King Christ; calling me into front-line battle for the Received Text and the King James Bible. And when the question of Isaiah 6:8 was put to me by the Trinitarian God, “Whom shall *I* send, and who will go for *us*?,” then by his grace an old style religiously conservative, Reformed, Protestant, Anglican, Royalist, Cavalier, replied as did the Old Testament prophet, Isaiah, in Isaiah 6:8, “Here am I, send me.”

I ask for your prayers.

I ask for your support.

The sermon will now end with two prayers, one for the dedication of this Revised Volume 1 of my commentary on Matt. 1-14; the other a Collect for *King Charles Martyr’s Day* taken from the Anglican Caroline Book of Common Prayer, 1662, to which I shall add the title, “the Queen of Australia.” This Collect reminds us that while the primary focus of *Charles I’s Day* is the martyrdom of Charles I in 1649; the secondary remembrance of this day are the events of God’s protection over Charles II hiding in the royal oak at Boscobel in 1651, the tyranny of the republic during the interregnum, and the thankful Restoration under Charles II in 1660, the 350th anniversary of which we are celebrating this year in 2010. After the final prayer, my Free Presbyterian brother in Christ, Elder Alex Neil will conclude the service, which will include the singing of Psalm 95:6-11 from the Presbyterian Caroline Psalter of 1650.

Let us pray.

“Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who hast purchased to thyself a universal Church by the precious blood of thy dear Son; who in ascending up far above all heavens, gave gifts to his one monogamous bride, the universal church; and among these gifts, made some teachers, and among these teachers, made some textual analysts for the work of preserving thy infallible book in its Received Text; look with mercy upon the labours of this revised volume 1 of Matthew 1 to 14, and all other textual commentaries in this series. I hereby offer up to thee, O Lord, this Revised Volume 1, seeking pardon from thee for any blemishes or imperfections which due to the frailty of my fallen human nature may be in this or any other textual commentary of mine, and asking thee to still bless it unto thy name, for the general good that is in it. Give grace, O Lord, to myself and all those who are called to any office in thy catholic church. So replenish all who are called to any office in thy universal church with the truth of thy doctrine and innocency of life, that we may faithfully serve thee to the glory of the great name, and benefit of thy holy church. And this we ask heavenly Father, through the power thy Holy Spirit who sanctifies us, and through the blood of our only mediator, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

“O Lord, our heavenly Father, who didst not punish us as our sins deserved, but hast in

the midst of judgment remembered mercy; we acknowledge it thine especial favour, that, though for our many and great provocations, thou didst suffer thine anointed blessed King Charles the First, (as on this day) to fall into the hands of violent and bloodthirsty men, and barbarously to be murdered by them, yet thou didst not leave us for ever, as sheep without a shepherd; but by thy gracious providence didst miraculously preserve the undoubted heir of his Crowns, our then gracious Sovereign King, Charles the Second, from his bloody enemies, hiding him under the shadow of thy wings, until their tyranny was overpast; and didst bring him back, in thy good appointed time, to sit upon the throne of his father; and together with the Royal Family didst restore to us our ancient Government in Church and State. For these thy great and unspeakable mercies we render to thee our most humble and unfeigned thanks; beseeching thee, still to continue thy gracious protection over the whole royal family, and to grant to our gracious sovereign, the Queen of Australia, Queen Elizabeth the Second, a long and happy reign over us: so we that are thy people will give thee thanks for ever, and will alway[s] be shewing forth thy praise from generation to generation; through Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour. *Amen.*”

Appendix 6: Corrigenda to Former Volume

Corrigenda to Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20). The following corrigenda changes are integrated into present internet copies of Volume 2, but will need to be made to earlier printed copies of Vol. 2. Pagination and footnote numbering corresponds with printed library copies.

This Corrigenda divides into two parts. Corrigenda Part 1 is general; but Corrigenda Part 2 is specific to the general removal of references to “Griesbach’s ed., 1796 & 1806.” Thus when going through Corrigenda Part 2 one is always looking for the same type of thing. The symbol “>” means “becomes” or “goes to.”

Corrigenda Part 1.

At Preface p. xvii, “**Rating the TR’s textual variants A to E*”;

1) At 1st sentence add “King James Versions” before “Textus Receptus” so this now reads, “The evaluation of evidence for the King James Versions’ Textus Receptus (TR) uses the following rating system.”

2) The rating for “E” should read:

“E” means a reading in the KJV’s underpinning text is wrong (0-49% likelihood) and does not represent the true TR. I.e., an alternative reading should be adopted. This is

the only KJV textual fail grade.

Change “Matt. 20:15b” to “Matt. 20:15c” at Preface pp. xxvii, lxxiv, lxxxv (twice), xcv; p. 453 (ftn 139 at Matt. 20:26a); & p. 459 (ftn 145 at Matt. 20:26c;27b).

At Preface pp. xviii-ix, “Greisbach” > “Griesbach” (thrice).

At Preface pp. xxvi (para 1) & xxxiii (para 4), “1649-1650” > “1649-1650/1”.

At Preface p. xxviii, footnote 26, “Menziess departure” > “Menziess’ departure”.

At Preface p. lviii, para 3 before “seventh century” add “sixth or” i.e., “sixth or seventh century”.

At Preface p. lxxxv, para 4, “c. 85” > “c. 94%”

At Preface p. lxxxvi, para 2, “55 places” > “53 places,” and “in 42” > “in 40”; para 3, “44 out of 55” > “42 out of 53”. In ftn. 176, remove ftn 23) and renumber ftns 24) to 48) as “23” to “47”; and old ftn 35 now reads: “34) + Matt. 12:42 twice (H & F ftns. 2 & 3) but not counted in the 53 readings as like Matt. 1:6 (H & F ftn. 1, ‘TR’), B & M are non-committal on what is the TR’s reading;”.

At Preface p. lxxxvii, para 1, the sentence “There are some matters” etc., > “There are some other matters e.g., different word order.” And at associated ctn. 181 add at end, “48) + Matt. 10:25b (R & P follow TR).” “47” before “Robinson & Pierpont” > “45”, “46” before “Hodges & Farstad” > “45”, and “55” before “readings” > “53”. At para 2, “47” before “Robinson & Pierpont” > “45”, “47” before “Hodges & Farstad” > “46”, and “55” before “readings” > “53”. At para 3, “48” before “Robinson & Pierpont” > “46”, “47” before “Hodges & Farstad” > “46”, and “55” before “readings” > “53”. At para 4, “five” > “four” (twice), and remove “9:17.” In ftn. 182, “Matt. 11:16b” > “Matt. 11:16c”. In ftn. 179, add at end, “Cf. Matt. 5:48b.” In ftn. 183, “Matt. 5:39” > “Matt. 5:39b”. In ftn. 184, remove “51” on “Matt. 9:17a” entirely. Renumber “53” to “55” as “52” to “54”; and “52) + Matt. 9:5b” > “52 + Matt. 9:5c”.

At Preface p. lxxxviii, para 2, sentence 2 now reads, “Specifically, in Matt. 1-14 their majority texts agree with changes to the Received Text found in Burgon & Miller in c. 94% (50/53 times, Hodges & Farstad) or c. 94% (50/53 times, Robinson & Pierpont) of instances i.e., c. 95% overall for both.”

At Preface p. ci, para 2 “55 changes” > “53 changes” and “more than 85%” becomes “c. 94%”.

At Preface p. cxlv, para 1, remove “713 (14th century; von Soden’s ε 351 in his Iσ group),”.

At Preface p. clvi, line 3, “183 manuscripts” should read “182 manuscripts”; and in footnote 366, remove “713”.

At Preface p. xcvi, para 7, 3rd sentence, remove “the” before “Erasmus,” and put “[the]” before “Complutensian Polyglot”.

At Preface p. cxlix para 3, remove “983 (Byzantine outside of Revelation),” and at p. cli para 1 change “sample is 1048” to “sample is 1047” and change “56” to “55”.

At Preface p. ccxxxi, para 3, line 4 & also in the footnote 593 of this same page, “the 1660 Act” > “the 1661 Act”.

At Preface p. cxxxvii, para 4, “270” before “also classified” > “269”; p. clv, para 5, “270” before “manuscripts” > “269”; p. clvi, “270” before “I group” > “269”, “210” before “manuscripts of c. 78%” > “209”, “27” before “manuscripts or 10%” > “26 or c. 10%”; and in fn. 367 remove “983 (Byzantine outside of Revelation),”.

At pp. 25 & 73; change “the (the)” to “(the)” at: Matt. 15:6d, p. 25, 1st para; Matt. 15:30b, p. 73, para 3.

At p. 203, para 2, “Mat. 12:5” > “Matt. 12:5”.

At p. 346, Matt. 19:14, after “Clement of Alexandria (d. before 215)” add “where stylistic and contextual factors do not permit complete certainty.”

At p. 360, last para, remove “713 (Wisbech, Cambridgeshire, England, 14th century),”.

At p. 445, Matt. 20:23a, the first paragraph, from, “Another reading, *Variant 2b*,” to “*Variant 2b* is found in old Latin Versions a” now reads:

Another reading, *Variant 2b*, also follows *Variant 1* but omits the “And (Greek, *Kai*; Latin, *Et*),” i.e., “Jesus saith unto them.” This may be reconstructed in the Greek from the Latin. *Variant 2b* is found in old Latin Versions a

At Appendix, p. i, “*Appendix 5: Dedication Sermon (5 November 2010)*” > “*Appendix 5: Dedication Sermon (5 November 2009)*”

At Appendix p. i, change square brackets to semi-circle brackets for Appendix 2 at “(or another possible reading)”

At Appendix p. xxi, footnote 36 now reads:

See Kittel’s *Theological Dictionary of the NT* (Eerdmans, Michigan, USA, 1969-1977) at “*treis*.”

At Appendix p. xxxvi, “Burgonite’s” > “Burgonites”.

At Appendix p. li, Appendix 5 (Sermon), para starting, “Let me start,” 2nd sentence “an” becomes “a”, thus reading, “This is a non-denominational Protestant Christian service” etc. (and was so read in its oral form).

At Appendix p. liii, last para, “formerly” > “formally”.

Corrigenda Part 2: REMOVAL OF REFERENCES TO GRIESBACH'S EDITION. The following corporate amendments are done in conjunction with removing references to “Griesbach’s ed., 1796 & 1806;” and thus to “Elzevir (17th century; Griesbach’s ed., 1796 & 1806),” *passim*. This requires changes to pp. ix, xxvi-xxvii, 59, 144, 146-7, 160, 235, 274, 284, 317, 405, 441, and Appendix pp. ii, iv, v, vi, vii, ix, x, xi, xii, xiii, xiv, xv, xvi, xvii, xix, xxx, xxxiv, xxxvi, as follows:

At Preface, p. ix, para 3, sentence starting in line 6 now reads (retaining footnote 6 at end), “In his second critical edition of the Greek NT (1842) he criticized the neo-Byzantine Stephanus (1550) for omitting “*oun* (then).”

At Preface pp. xxvi-xxvii, last para of p. xxvi & 1st para of p. xxvii, now reads:

While Scholz’s work is regrettably selective e.g., having used his work primarily from Matt. 20 onwards, I have already found that he makes no reference to the variations at Matt. 20:2 or Matt. 20:4, and gives inadequate information on Matt. 20:5b (see Appendix 1, Vol. 2, on Matt. 20:2,4,5b), I still regard it as a “useful find” which I discovered in England at the British Library in London (Sept. 08 – March 09), and then upon my return to Australia, procured from Moore Theological College in Sydney. I shall also be using an edition of Stephanus’s 1550 Greek text produced by Scrivener (1877) that I learnt of from my research at the Library of King’s College, London University (where I held a 3 month library pass for Jan.-March 09). The reader will note my usage of Scholz’s work primarily from Matt. 20 onwards e.g., in Appendix 1, at Matt. 20:3, I refer to the reading of “Stephanus’s Text (1550), Beza’s Text (1598), and Elzevir’s Text (1633),” with information I draw from Scholz (1894). Scholz’s work was e.g., also one of the texts,

etc. as before except at the end the reference is to “Matt. 10:15c” i.e., ending the paragraph with the words, “I consulted for the main commentary at Matt. 20:15c.” And after “Scrivener (1877)” footnote 23 now reads “Scrivener, F.H.A., *H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ* Novum Testamentum Textus Stephanici A.D. 1550, Deighton, Bell, & Co. Cambridge, and Whittaker & Co., London, 1877.”

At p. 59 at Matt. 15:25, sentence starting, “Hence ‘*prosekunei* (she worshipped)’ is” etc., > “Hence ‘*prosekunei* (she worshipped)’ is found in e.g., Stephanus’s Greek NT (1550).”

At p. 144, at Matt 16:20a, remove the final sentence of para 3, “This is the Greek reading found in the 17th century text of Elzevir.”

At p. 146 (last para) and p. 147 (1st para), at Matt. 16:20a, now read:

This then raises a pointed question. If the representative Byzantine Greek reading, “*diesteilato* (he charged),” has no good textual argument against it, and indeed a good textual argument in its favour, why then did Origen “correct” the text to the reading he did, *supra*, and Griesbach adopt it, *infra*? Though we cannot be certain, it would seem to me likely that they did so because while St. Matthew uses “*epetimesen* (he rebuked’ or ‘he charged’),” on a number of occasions (Matt. 8:26; 12:16; 16:22; 17:18;

19:13; 20:31), this usage at Matt. 16:20a is the only time he uses *diastello*. Hence they presumably concluded that *diastello* was not Matthean Greek and so brought in from elsewhere in the NT, following a paper fade / loss.

This however is certainly not correct. In the Book of Hebrews, there is only one reference to *diastello* (Heb. 12:20). Are we to likewise remove it? Absolutely not! Though not common Matthean terminology, the context of Matt. 16:20 makes it appropriate here (and e.g., at Heb. 12:20). Seemingly a deliberate “correction” of the text, first Origen, *supra* and then Griesbach, *infra*, failed to give due consideration to this important issue of the Matthean context at Matt. 16:20, and its associated contextual aptness relative to the wider NT Greek usage of *diastello*. Rather, they seem to have simply considered the more common usage of “*epetimesen*” in Matthean Greek, and probably thought it was brought in from Marcan Greek. Since Adam’s fall, none of us, Christ except, has ever been perfect, and so unlike Christ we all mistakes. E.g., the great 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantines produced revised editions of their NT texts making refinements and corrections. By contrast, both the scope and frequency of the textual errors we find with Origen are *far too common* for us to have any comparable sympathy with him. As for Griesbach, see below.

Then at the associated pp. 147-8, following, “However, the incorrect reading, ‘charged he (*epetimesen*),’ is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century)” add the following two paragraphs:

As noted in the Preface to this Volume (see “*Old Papists & New Papists: The Clementine Vulgate & Neo-Vulgate”), Tischendorf owed much to Griesbach. Writing long before Tischendorf’s work, the Anglican clergyman, Frederick Nolan said in 1815, “... To the manuscripts of the Alexandrine class ... the highest rank is ascribed by ... Griesbach; the authority of a few of these outweighing in his estimation that of a multitude of the Byzantine. ... To the authority of Origen he however ascribes a paramount weight ...; he [Griesbach] has thus formed his Corrected Text of the New Testament” as opposed to “the Received Text.” Frederick Nolan rightly concludes, “in his predilection for the Alexandrine Text, which he [Griesbach] conceives he has discovered in the works of Origen, I am far from acquiescing” (Nolan’ *An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate or Received Text of the New Testament*, London, 1815).

In their more modern form, Griesbach (d. 1812) helped start religiously liberal ideas denying Divine Inspiration by e.g., claiming St. Mark’s Gospel was derived from St. Matthew’s and St. Luke’s Gospels (though later religious liberals have jumped the other way and claimed St. Mark’s Gospel was the first one). He also denied Divine Preservation. Griesbach the “grease-back” was a slippery’n’slimy character who attacked God’s Word by trying to introduce its conceptualization through anti-supernaturalist categories of thought. As seen by his adoption of the minority reading here at Matt. 16:20a, which is typical of his more general “skills” (or rather, lack thereof,) of a “textual analyst,” he was very much the intellectual inferior of any competent textual analyst, such as those which composed the Received Text. However, his godless paradigm appealed to the lusts of the secularists and other ungodly, so that in time the

seeds of destruction that he helped to sow were more fully evident in the work of Tischendorf who is the father of the Neo-Alexandrian School as we basically know it. *“Grease-back” is one of the “grease monkeys” of the Neo-Alexandrian School. We want none of his “monkey-business” monkeying around with the text of Scripture!*

and the associated p. 148, para 4 ends the same after “It seems” but now reads:

The erroneous variant, “*epetimesen*,” which probably originated with Origen, and which *prima facie* may seem to be consonant with Matthean Greek, has claimed a number of later victims, including such generally bad textual scribes as the Alexandrian text scribe of Rome Vaticanus, and Western text scribe of D 05; together with such generally bad neo-Alexandrian textual analysts as Westcott & Hort or Nestle. It seems that here at Matt. 16:20a, Origen constructed a carefully spring-loaded and well greased trap door, which if a man, like Griesbach stands on, opens under his weight, and he falls into the pit of error. Next to that trap-door at Matt. 16:20a, we need to clearly erect a sign and write on it these words, “WARNING: Origen was here. SCRIBES & TEXTUAL ANALYSTS: BEWARE!!!”

At p. 160 at Matt. 16:26, para 3, from “Tischendorf’s 2nd edition” now reads:

Tischendorf’s 2nd edition (1842) specifically criticizes Stephanus (1550) for following the reading “*opheleitai* (‘is ... profited,’ present tense)” (Lectiones Variantes, p. 5), although we cannot doubt that in this matter Stephanus was right and Tischendorf was wrong.

At p. 235 at Matt. 18:6, last para now reads, “With the same meaning as *Reading 1a*, *Reading 1b* is found in Scrivener’s Text which follows, for instance, the Greek texts of Erasmus (1516), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633). *Reading 1b*, Greek,” etc. .

At p. 274 at Matt. 18:19a, para 3 now reads:

Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) shows *Variant 2* as the majority reading among his selected texts (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; L, Codex Leicestrensis; H, Harleian., 5598, British Museum; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ’s College, Cambridge, F. i. 8); although he shows the TR’s reading with minority support (Gospel manuscript: P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18). The TR’s reading was followed by Erasmus’s Greek NT (1516 & 1522), Stephanus’s Greek NT (1550) *et al.* We cannot doubt that on this occasion, Desiderius Erasmus and Robertus Stephanus had a first class grip on the Greek. We thank God that the King James Version translators also had this appreciation, and so followed the Received Text’s reading here at Matt. 18:19a.

At p. 284 at Matt. 18:26, first para, last sentence now reads:

Indeed, Tischendorf’s support was so strong for the reading of the Western Text here at Matt. 18:26a, that he not only criticized the Received Text reading of

Stephanus (1550) for not including it in his 2nd edition (1842), but even after his “discovery” of *Codex Sinaiticus* he retained this addition in his 8th edition (1869-72).

At p. 317, at Matt. 19:5b, the first sentence of para 6 now reads, “Like Scrivener’s Text, the reading is absent in Stephanus’s Greek NT (1550) as it was earlier in Erasmus’s Greek NT (1516 & 1522).”

At p. 405, at Matt. 20:15c, the final two sentences of para 2 now read:

Nevertheless, Aldus (1518) adopted the minority reading of “ε (or),” as did also Beza’s later editions (1565, 1582, 1589, 1598). Whatever was the logic of Aldus and Beza for adopting this minority Byzantine reading here at Matt. 20:15c, they were certainly wrong to do so, and the King James translators of 1611 rightly followed the majority Byzantine reading of e.g., Erasmus and Stephanus here.

At p. 441 at Matt. 20:23, para 4, 4th sentence starting, “Hence it was understandably,” now reads, “Hence it was understandably adopted by that past master of the Neo-Byzantine School, Erasmus of Rotterdam, in e.g., his 1516 & 1522 editions, and also thereafter followed by other great neo-Byzantines e.g., Stephanus (1550).”

At p. 467 at Matt. 20:26c & Matt. 20:27b, para 4, first sentence now reads:

On the one hand, the TR’s reading containing the correct Component 1 (Matt. 20:26c) and Component 2 (Matt. 20:27b), i.e., “*est* (*‘let him be,’ present tense*)” (twice), received the support of the great 16th and 17th century Neo-Byzantine School textual analysts, being found, for instance, in the Greek New Testaments of Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550).

At Matt. 15:39a, Appendix p. ii, final para, 2nd sentence now reads:

At John 21:3, following the Greek text of e.g., Stephanus (1550), Scrivener’s text reads, “They went forth, and *got up into (anebesan eis)* a ship.”

At Matt. 15:39a, Appendix p. iv, para 2, last sentence now reads:

Therefore in my opinion, this reading of “*enebe eis* (he got into),” found in Stephanus (1550), is to be preferred over the reading, “*anebe* (he got up into).”

At Matt. 15:39a, Appendix p. iv, para 4, omit, “(or at least some of us, since Elzevir took a different view,)”

At Matt. 17:9a, Appendix p. iv, para 5, 2nd sentence now reads:

But the preposition, *ek*, with a genitive, may also be rendered, “from,” and the MBT (e.g., W 032, 5th century & Lectionary 1968, 1544 A.D.,) reads, “*ek* (from) *tou* (*‘the,’ neuter singular genitive, definite article from to*) *orous* (*‘mountain,’ neuter singular genitive noun, from oros*).”

At Matt. 17:9a, Appendix p. v, para 1, last sentence, replace “Elzevir” with “the MBT”; and para 2, last sentence, replace “Elzevir” with “the MBT”.

At Matt. 17:14b, Appendix p. v, para 3, 1st sentence now reads:

AT MATT. 17:14b, *THE* reading of Scrivener’s Text, following e.g., Stephanus (1550) “*gonupeton* (‘kneeling down to,’ masculine singular nominative, present active participle, from *gonupeteo*) *auto* (‘unto him,’ masculine singular dative, 3rd person pronoun, from *autos*),” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 2378 (11th century), Minuscule 2 (12th century), and Origen.

At Matt. 17:27b, Appendix p. vi, para 2, 2nd last sentence now reads, “It was followed by e.g., Stephanus (1550).” And at Appendix p. vii, footnote 13 now reads:

See Commentary Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), “Primary & Secondary Rules of Neo-Byzantine Textual Analysis” in the “Introduction” to the Appendices; and also the first Appendix. Cf. Matt. 18:1 where the MBT rightly followed by Stephanus and Scrivener reads, “*ora* (time),” whereas a minority Byzantine reading (Minuscule 24, 11th century) which probably originated with Origen (who uses both readings), reads, “*mera* (‘day’ or ‘time’).” Was the mediaeval scribe of Minuscule 24 adopting this reading as a textual “trademark”? Or is another explanation to be preferred?

At Matt. 17:27b, Appendix p. vii, para 4 now reads:

Of the eight gospel manuscripts specifically referred to in Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624), four supported the representative Byzantine reading, “*anabainonta* (coming up)” (Gospel manuscripts: v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum; P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ’s College, Cambridge, F. i. 8); and Elzevir says one did not (Gospel manuscript: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17). Thus Elzevir in 1624 had a similar type of conclusion as Hodges & Farstad in 1985 when they put “*anabainonta*” in the main text, with a footnote stating that the majority text was divided, with a greater part supporting this reading, and a lesser part supporting the variant, “*anabanta*.” The variant was early adopted by Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and followed by e.g., Stephanus (1550). Why?

At Matt. 18:28b, Appendix p. ix, para 2, omit, “Yet Elzevir’s text reads ‘*o ti*’” and also footnote 19 in its entirety. Then the second sentence of this paragraph now reads, “But it is clear that the reading of Scrivener’s Text was a popular reading among the 16th and 17th century Greek NT text composers e.g., Erasmus’s 1516 text reads ‘*o ti*’.” & at this point a new footnote 19 now reads, “This same reading was retained in Erasmus’s 1522 edition; and is also found at Matt. 18:28b in Stephanus’s 1550 edition.”

At Matt. 18:31b, Appendix p. ix, para 4, now starts, “*AT MATT. 18:31b*, *FOLLOWING* the Greek text of e.g., Stephanus (1550), Scrivener’s text reads,” etc. .

At Matt. 18:31b, Appendix pp. ix-x, in what is last para of p. ix and first para of p. x, the

first sentence now reads, “The adoption of the minority Byzantine reading here at Matt. 18:31b, looks like a typical ‘trademark’ usage of the minority Byzantine reading by, for instance, Stephanus (1550), which is later reflected in Scrivener.” & the last sentence now ends, “and so its original usage in 1516 was later dropped by Erasmus as a textual ‘trademark,’ although the idea of so using it evidently also appealed to, for instance, the later Stephanus.”

At Matt. 19:9a, Appendix p. xi, para 2, now starts, “AT MATT. 19:9a, SCRIVENER’S Text, following e.g., Stephanus (1550), reads,” etc. .

At Matt. 19:26, Appendix p. xii, para 3, 1st sentence now reads, “Stephanus (1550) includes the ‘*esti*,’ whereas the MBT does not, *infra*.” And para 5 now reads, “Did the AV translators agree with the representative Byzantine reading or the minority Byzantine reading of Stephanus’s text?”

At Matt. 19:26, Appendix p. xiii, para 1, now reads:

Therefore any argument based on the absence of italics for the AV’s “are” at Matt. 19:26 is not conclusive. That is because the AV translators sometimes used italics for a supplied verb, “to be,” and sometimes did not. Thus the issue of whether or not at Matt. 19:26 the AV translators agreed with Erasmus and Stephanus (who includes the “*esti*”) or the MBT (which lacks the *esti*), may be open to some debate because the AV’s rendering of Matt. 19:26 could be based on either Greek text.

At Matt.19:26, Appendix p. xiii, para 4, the first sentence now reads, “Therefore I conclude that here at Matt. 19:26, on this occasion the MBT rather than e.g., Erasmus’s, Stephanus’s, or Scrivener’s text, is in fact the Received Text reading.”

At Matt. 20:2, Appendix p. xiii, para 5, remove the words, “like Elzevir (17th century; Griesbach’s ed., 1796 & 1806),” at para 6 remove the words, “followed by Elzevir’s 17th century Text,” & para 7, 2nd sentence now reads, “On this occasion, I thus prefer the MBT over Erasmus and Stephanus.”

At Matt. 20:3, Appendix p. xiv, para 3, at the 3rd sentence after “as it had been earlier in Stephanus’s Text (1550),” this now reads, “Beza’s Text (1598), and Elzevir’s Text (1633)” and footnote 26 at this point now reads, “See the textual apparatus of Scholz (1894).”

At Matt. 20:4, Appendix p. xv, para 4, remove the words, “and Elzevir’s Text (17th century; Griesbach’s ed., 1796 & 1806)” and para 5, remove the words, “and Elzevir”.

At Matt. 20:5b, Appendix p. xvi, first para, remove “Elzevir’s Text (17th century; Griesbach’s ed., 1796 & 1806)” and replace it with the words, “Erasmus (1516)” with connected footnote 30 now reading, “The minority reading with a double ‘n (nu)’ is found in Erasmus’s 1522 edition. We thus here see a growing development in the trade of the text ‘trademark.’”

At Matt. 20:5b, Appendix p. xvi, para 4 now reads (with the same footnote 31):

Whatever the logic for the origins of the variant here at Matt. 20:5b, there is clearly no good textual argument against the MBT reading. Hence on this occasion I

prefer Erasmus (1516) over Erasmus (1522) and Stephanus (1550). Scrivener's Text should be amended accordingly to follow Erasmus (1516) and the MBT reading.

At Matt. 16:28b, Appendix p. xvii, para 4 now reads:

Alternatively, at Matt. 16:28b, "*ton* (-) ... *estoton* ('standing,' masculine plural genitive, perfect active participle, from *istemi*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century; U 030, 9th century; S 028, 10th century; & Origen).

At Matt. 16:27, Appendix p. xxix, para 5, now reads before continuing with, "The bizarre claim of Metzger," etc., as:

Now the proposition that the TR follows the variant here is really quite silly. Certainly Scrivener did not agree with this curious claim, for his text correctly reads, "*ten praxin*;" and he thus follows such earlier texts as those of Erasmus (1516 & 1522); although the variant was known of in Elzevir's 1624 Textual Apparatus (Gospel manuscript: z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8).

and the associated footnote 46 at the end of the 2nd sentence now reads:

Scrivener's Appendix shows all the texts he used (e.g., Erasmus, Stephanus, & Beza,) for instance, Stephanus's text, agreed with the reading he used, i.e., *praxin*. In addition to finding this in my copies of Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550); I have also personally checked the Complutensian Bible (1514) copy in the NSW State Library (1983-4 reprint, Rome), which likewise clearly reads, "*ten praxin*."

At Matt. 17:2a, Appendix p. xxx, para 2, the last sentence now reads, "It was followed by both Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550)."

At Matt. 18:4, Appendix p. xxxiv, last para, now reads, "At Matt. 18:4, the TR's reading found in Scrivener's Text, following both the Greek texts of Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550), is" etc. .

At Matt. 18:10, Appendix p. xxxvi, para 6, omit the words, "and Elzevir (17th century; Griesbach's ed., 1796 & 1806)"

At Matt. 18:24, Appendix p. xxxvii, para 9, the 2nd sentence now reads:

Tischendorf's 2nd edition (1842) criticized Stephanus (1550) for following the TR's reading; but after Tischendorf "discovered" London Sinaiticus and found it also had the TR's reading here, he did an about-face, and adopted the TR's reading in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72).

At Matt. 19:24c, Appendix p. xliii, para 6, remove the last sentence starting, "Some one and a half centuries" etc., and the last sentence now reads: "And some 100 years before Elzevir (1624) we find that Erasmus (1516) followed the variant, whereas Erasmus (1522) and Stephanus (1550) followed the TR's reading."