

**A TEXTUAL COMMENTARY  
ON THE  
GREEK RECEIVED TEXT  
OF THE NEW TESTAMENT**

Being the Greek Text used in the

AUTHORIZED VERSION

also known as the

KING JAMES VERSION

also known as the

AUTHORIZED (KING JAMES) VERSION

also known as the

KING JAMES BIBLE

also known as the

SAINT JAMES VERSION

by

**Gavin Basil McGrath  
B.A., LL.B. (Sydney University),  
Dip. Ed. (University of Western Sydney),  
Dip. Bib. Studies (Moore Theological College).**

Formerly of  
St. Paul's College, Sydney University.

**Textual Commentary, Volume: 2**

**St. Matthew's Gospel  
Chapters 15-20.**

*Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum*

“The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever” (I Peter 1:25).

McGrath, Gavin (Gavin Basil), b. 1960.

*A Textual Commentary on the Greek Received Text of the  
New Testament, Volume 2 (Matthew 15-20), 2009.*

Available on the internet <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com> .

Published & Printed in Sydney, New South Wales.

Copyright © 2009 by Gavin Basil McGrath.

P.O. Box 834, Nowra, N.S.W., 2541, Australia.

Dedication Sermon, preached at Mangrove Mountain Union Church, Mangrove  
Mountain, N.S.W., 2250, Australia, on Thursday 5 November, 2009.

Oral recorded form presently available at <http://www.sermonaudio.com/kingjamesbible> .

This copy of Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20) incorporates corrigenda changes from Appendix 6 of the Revised Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) © 2010 by Gavin Basil McGrath, Appendix 6 of Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) © 2011 by Gavin Basil McGrath; Appendix 6 of Volume 4 (Matt. 26-28) © 2012 by Gavin Basil McGrath; Appendix 6 of Volume 5 (Mark 1-3) © 2015 by Gavin Basil McGrath; and Appendix 6 of Volume 6 (Mark 4 & 5) © 2016 by Gavin Basil McGrath.

Printed by Officeworks in Parramatta, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, 2009.

**Dedicated to Almighty God,  
on Papists' Conspiracy Day  
(also known as Bonfire Day or Gunpowder Treason Day),  
at Mangrove Mountain Union Church,  
Thursday 5 November, 2009.**

**Remembering & giving special thanks to God on this holy day, for the  
protection of Protestantism in the British Isles against the  
Gunpowder Treason Plot of 5 November 1605, by Papists conspiring  
to destroy Protestantism and reintroduce the bondage of Popery by  
blowing up the Protestant King, James I, the Supreme Governor of the  
Anglican Church, together with the Protestant Parliament.**

**And also thanking God on this day for the coming of William III of Orange to the  
British Isles on 5 November 1688 in order to end the Papists' conspiracy to put a  
Papist on the throne; arriving after James II's failed to fulfill his duties of office as  
Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church, since by his Popish actions in violation  
of  
the Protestant 39 Articles he had in substance, though not in form, *de jure* abdicated  
from the legally Protestant throne; and then after the coming of William III,  
as declared by Parliament in 1689, James II *de facto* abdicated by deserting his  
post when fleeing London & discarding the Great Seal into the River Thames.**

*Good Christian reader, I pray thee,  
remember the Protestant Marian martyrs & all Protestant confessors & martyrs  
who have been persecuted by, or been killed by, Papal Rome.  
NO POPERY!*

“Remember, remember the fifth of November,

“The gunpowder treason and plot,  
“I know of no reason why the gunpowder treason,  
“Should ever be forgot . . . .”

Opening words of a traditional *Bonfire Day* ditty.

## TABLE of CONTENTS (\* indicates important reading before using commentary)

## PREFACE

\* **More Common Abbreviations.**

\* **Transliterations of Greek letters into English letters.**

*Selections potentially relevant to Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20) from  
Sydney University Greek Lectionaries 2378 & 1968.*

*Scripture Citations of Bishop Gregory the Great in Matt. 15-20.*

\* **Rating the TR's textual readings A to E.**

\* **Old Papists & New Papists: The Clementine Vulgate & Neo-Vulgate.**

\* **Elzevir's 1624 Textual Apparatus.**

**Byzantine Text Bonus for Commentary: Two Sydney University Greek Lectionaries!**

**A) Sydney University: It's got "the name;" \* B) Sam Angus of Sydney University: the big heretic; \* C) "Bonjour" to the Two Greek Lectionaries kept at Sydney University. D) Some general matters with respect to the two Sydney University Lectionaries.**

\* **Robinson & Pierpont's (1991) new edition Byzantine Textform (2005).**

\* **Determining the representative Byzantine Text.**

\* **"Riding the great white stallion" that is "stabled" at von Soden's "Ohio ranch."**

*Here again, Gone again, versions.*

*Dedication: The Anglican Calendar.*

- 1) *The Monastic Noviate;*
- 2) *The Monastic legacy;*
- 3) *The Antichrist visits my hometown of Sydney, Australia (2008).*
- 4) *The Succession of William III of Orange.*
- 5) *John Calvin's Nativity: 500th anniversary in 2009.*
- 6) *Broad Protestant support for Gunpowder Treason Day:*
  - a) *Anglican Protestantism;* b) *Puritan Protestantism.*
- 7) **Papists' Conspiracy Day (5 Nov.).**
  - a) **Bonfire Day at Lewes, England: 5 November 2008.**
  - b) **Gunpowder Treason Day: 5 November.**

## TEXTUAL COMMENTARY Matt. 15-20.

*Appendices to St. Matthew's Gospel Matt. 15-20.*

*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. 1) General; 2) Consideration of Spelling variants: a) Optional Letters in Scrivener's Text, and b) Special case study on treis. Appendix 3: Minor variants between the NU Text and Textus Receptus (or another relevant text and the TR) not affecting, or not necessarily affecting,*

*the English translation. Appendix 4: Matt. 15-20 (some more notable variants). Appendix 5: Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E. Appendix 6: Dedication Sermon (Mangrove Mountain Union Church, 5 Nov. 2009).*

\* *More Common Abbreviations*

- Allen's *Latin Grammar* Allen, J.B., *An Elementary Latin Grammar*, 1874, 1898 4th edition corrected, 1930, reprint 1962, Clarendon Press, Oxford, England, UK.
- AV *The Authorized (King James) Version*, 1611. Being the version revised by His Majesty, King James' special command (KJV), and being the Authorized Version (AV), that is, the only version authorized to be read in Anglican *Church of England Churches* by the *Act of Uniformity*, 1662.
- ASV *American Standard Version*, 1901 (also known as the *American Revised Version*). Being a revision of the Revised Version (1881-5).
- ESV *English Standard Version*, being a revision of the Revised Standard Version (1952 & 1971). Scripture quotations are from *The Holy Bible, English Standard Version*, copyright © 2001 by Crossway Bible, a publishing ministry of Good News Publishers. Used by permission. All rights reserved.
- Green's Textual Apparatus Pierpont, W.G. (of Robinson & Pierpont, *infra*), in: Green, J., *The Interlinear Bible*, Hendrickson, Massachusetts, USA, 2nd edition 1986, pp. 967-974.
- Hodges & Farstad Hodges, Z. & Farstad, A., *The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text*, Thomas Nelson, Nashville, Tennessee, USA, 1982, 2nd edition, 1985;
- JB Jerusalem Bible, [Roman Catholic] Imprimatur: Cardinal Heenan, Westminster, 4 July 1966; Darton, Longman, & Todd, London, 1966.
- Liddell & Scott or Liddell & Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon* Henry Liddell and Robert Scott's *A Greek-English Lexicon* 1843, Clarendon Press, Oxford, England, UK, new ninth edition, 1940, with Supplement, 1996.
- Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971

- & Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 2nd ed., 1994. Metzger, B.M., *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, first edition 1971 (A companion to the UBS Greek NT, 3rd ed.), second edition 1994 (A companion to the UBS Greek NT, 4th revised edition), United Bible Societies, Bibelgesellschaft / German Bible Society, Stuttgart, Germany.
- Migne (pronounced, "Marnya") John-Paul Migne's (1800-1875) *Patrologiae Curses Completus*, Series Graeca (Greek Writers Series), and Series Latina (Latin Writers Series).
- Moffatt Bible or Moffatt *The Moffatt Translation of the Bible*, 1926, Revised edition, 1935, by James Moffatt.
- Moulton's *Grammar of NT Greek* James H. Moulton's *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* Vol. 1, 1906, 3rd ed. 1908; Vol. 2, J.H. Moulton & W.F. Howard, 1919-29; Vol. 3, N. Turner, 1963; Vol. 4, N. Turner, 1976; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK.
- Mounce's *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT* Mounce, W.D., *The Analytical Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*, Zondervan (Harper-Collins), Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA, 1993.
- NASB *New American Standard Bible*, being a revision of the American Standard Version (1901). First edition, 1960-1971, second edition, 1977, third edition, 1995 (also known as the *New American Standard Version*). Scripture taken from the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD BIBLE (R), Copyright ©1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995 by the Lockman Foundation. Used by permission.
- NIV *New International Version*, 1st edition, 1978, first published in Great Britain in 1979; 2nd edition, 1984. Scripture taken from The HOLY BIBLE, NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION. Copyright 1973, 1978, 1984 by International Bible Society. Used by permission of Zondervan. All rights reserved.
- NJB New Jerusalem Bible, [Roman Catholic] Imprimatur: Cardinal Hume, Westminster, 18 June 1985; Darton, Longman, & Todd, London, 1985.

- NKJV *New King James Version.* [Being a Burgonite (Majority Text) revision of the Authorized (King James) Version of 1611.] Scripture taken from the New King James Version. Copyright © 1979,1980,1982 by Thomas Nelson, Inc. Used by Permission. All rights reserved.
- NRSV *New Revised Standard Version,* being a revision of the Revised Standard Version (1952 & 1971). The Scripture quotations contained herein are from the New Revised Standard Version Bible, copyright © 1989, by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., and are used by Permission. All rights reserved.
- NU Text The text found in “N” i.e., Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) & “U” i.e., United Bible Societies’ (UBS) 4th revised edition (1993).
- NU Text *et al* The NU Text as well as the text in Tischendorf’s *Novum Testamentum Graece* (8th edition, 1869-72); Westcott & Hort’s Greek NT (1881); Nestle’s 21st edition (1952); the UBS 3rd (1975) & 3rd corrected (1983) editions.
- Robinson & Pierpont Robinson, M.A., & Pierpont, W.G., *The New Testament ... According to the Byzantine / Majority Textform*, Original Word Publishers, Atlanta, Georgia, USA, 1991 (for Matt. 1-19); Robinson, M.A., & Pierpont, W.G., *The New Testament in the ... the Byzantine Textform*, Chilton Book Publishers, Southborough, Massachusetts, USA, 2005 (for Preface & Matt. 20 onwards; unless otherwise stated).
- RSV *Revised Standard Version,* being a revision of the American Standard Version. 1st edition 1946 & 1952, Collins, Great Britain, UK; 2nd edition, 1971, Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Oxford University Press, 1977.
- RV *Revised Version,* 1881-1885 (also known as the *English Revised Version*). [Being a neo-Alexandrian revision of the Authorized (King James) Version of 1611.]

- Septuagint or  
LXX Brenton, L.C.L. (Editor & English translator), *The Septuagint With Apocrypha: Greek and English*, Samuel Bagster & Sons, London, UK, 1851; Reprint: Hendrickson, USA, 1986, fifth printing, 1995. Unless otherwise stated, all Septuagint quotes in either Greek or English are from this edition.
- TEV *Today's English Version* (or *Good News Bible*), 1961, 1971, 4th edition, 1976. British usage text first published 1976. The British & Foreign Bible Society, London, UK, 1976.
- TR *Textus Receptus* (Latin, Received Text). TR of NT generally, though not always, as found in Frederick H.A. Scrivener's, *The New Testament in the Original Greek* 1894 & 1902; Reprinted by the Trinitarian Bible Society, London, England, UK.
- TCNT *The Twentieth Century New Testament, A Translation into Modern English Made from ... Westcott & Hort's Text ...*, 1898-1901, Revised Edition 1904, The Sunday School Union, London, UK, & Fleming H. Revell Co., New York & Chicago, USA.
- Wallace's  
*Greek Grammar* Daniel Wallace's *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 1996, Galaxie Software, Garland, Texas, USA.
- Wheelock's *Latin Grammar* or  
Wheelock's *Latin* Frederick Wheelock's *Latin Grammar* 1956 (1st ed., Barnes & Noble, New York, USA), Revised by Richard LaFleur, as Wheelock's *Latin* (6th edition, revised, Harper-Collins, New York, USA, 2005).
- Young's *Greek* Richard Young's *Intermediate New Testament Greek* 1994, Broadman & Holman, Nashville, Tennessee, USA.

*\* Transliterations of Greek letters into English letters.*

A line under the eta i.e., “e,” means a long “e.” This is the e sound of “Green” in Jay Green Sr., or the e sound of “Beza” in Theodore Beza, or the e sound of “Received” in Received Text, or the sound of the first e of “Receptus” in Textus Receptus. This line distinguishes it from the epsilon i.e., “e,” which is a short “e.” This is the e sound of “Nestle” in Nestle-Aland, or the e sound of “Westcott” in Westcott & Hort, or the e sound of the first e of “Clementine” in Clementine Vulgate, or the e sound of “Text” in Received Text, or the e sound of “Textus” and the second e of “Receptus,” in Textus Receptus. Likewise, the absence of a line under the omicron means a short “o.” This is the o sound of “Constantine” and “von” in Constantine von Tischendorf, or the o sound of the first o in “Robinson” and the “o” in “Pierpont” of Robinson & Pierpont, or the o sound of “Hodges” in Hodges & Farstad. This distinguishes it from omega which is an o with a line under it i.e., “o,” which is a long “o.” This is the o sound of “Soden” in von Soden, or the o sound of “Jerome” in Saint Jerome’s Vulgate.

English letters used for the Greek alphabet.

Alpha	A α =	A a	Omicron	O o =	O o
Beta	B β =	B b	Pi	Π π =	P p
Gamma	Γ γ =	G g	Rho	Ρ ρ =	R r
Delta	Δ δ =	D d			(sometimes P)
Epsilon	E ε =	E e	Sigma and	Σ σ	
Zeta	Z ζ =	Z z	final sigma	ς	C or S c or s
Eta	H η =	H / <u>E</u> <u>e</u>	Tau	Τ τ =	T t
Theta	Θ / θ θ =	Th th	Upsilon	Υ υ =	Y u / y
Iota	I ι =	I i	Phi	Φ φ =	Ph ph
Kappa	K κ =	K k	Chi	Χ χ =	Ch ch
Lambda	Λ λ =	L l			(as in Christ)
Mu	M μ =	M m	Psi	Ψ ψ =	Ps ps
Nu	N ν =	N n	Omega	Ω ω =	<u>O</u> <u>o</u>
Xi	Ξ / ξ ξ =	X x			

(pronounced z  
as in xenelasia)

**Lectionary readings potentially relevant to Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20) from  
Sydney University (Latin, Sidneiensi Universitatis)  
Greek Lectionaries 2378 & 1968.**

**GREEK LECTIONARY 2378  
(11th century, Sidneiensi Universitatis)  
A Gospel (Evangelion) Lectionary**

<i>St. Matthew</i>	<i>Pages</i>	<i>St. Matthew</i>	<i>Pages</i>	
<b>15</b>	21-28	53b-54a	<b>16</b> ("Luke" <i>sic</i> ): 13-19	116b
<b>17</b>	1-9 14-23	118a-118b 33b-34	<b>17&amp;18</b> 17:24-18:3	33a-33b
<b>18</b>	10-20 23-35	25a-25b 34b-35a	<b>19</b> 3-12 16-26 (See <b>10&amp;19</b> , Vol. 1, for): 27-30	34a-34b 35b-36a 26a-26b
<b>20</b>	1-16 29-34	111b-112a 35a-35b		

**GREEK LECTIONARY 1968  
(1544 A.D., Sidneiensi Universitatis)  
A Gospel (Evangelion) & Apostolos (Acts – Jude) Lectionary  
for the Saturdays & Sundays of the year,  
together with annual festival days.**

<i>St. Matthew</i>	<i>Pages</i>	<i>St. Matthew</i>	<i>Pages</i>	
<b>15</b>	21-28 (2)	73(2)b-74a 107a-107b	<b>16</b> 13-19	319b-320a
<b>17</b>	1-9 14-23	328a-329a 57a-57b	<b>17-18</b> 17:24-18:3	56a-56b
<b>18</b>	10-17,19-20 23-35	36a-37a 59b-60a	<b>19</b> 3-12 16-26	58a-58b 61b-62a
<b>20</b>	1-16 29-34	301a-302a 60b-61a		



### Scripture Citations of Bishop Gregory the Great in Matt. 15-20.

St. Gregory is traditionally celebrated as one of the four great ancient and early mediaeval church doctors of the Western Church.

The “apostles’ doctrine” (Acts 2:42) is of “one” “church” (Eph. 5:31,32), that is “*kath*’ (throughout) *oles* (‘all,’ from ‘*olos / holos*’)” (Acts 9:31) i.e., catholic (Greek *katholikos* = *katholou* = *kath*’ + ‘*olos*), thus constituting one catholic and apostolic church. However, this mystical one church thereafter contains lesser church divisions, whether by racial groupings (Rom. 16:4; Jas. 1:1), by geographical areas (I Cor. 16:1; Rev. 1:4), or by local city churches (I Cor. 1:2; I Thess. 1:1).

The *Church of England* is a Western Church, and her Protestant *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) accordingly includes on the Calendar as black letter days the traditional four ancient and early mediaeval doctors of the Western Church, St. Ambrose of Milan (4 April), St. Augustine (28 Aug.), St. Jerome (30 Sept.), and St. Gregory the Great (12 March). Such is this latter doctor’s standing in the Western Church, that by convention, if one refers simply to “Gregory” or “St. Gregory,” without any other identifying comments then the reference is to St. Gregory the Great. (By contrast, a dissertation that is clearly on e.g., St. Gregory Nazianzus might *in that qualified context* sometimes use “St. Gregory” for Gregory Nazianzus; or a dissertation on a later Bishop of Rome, such as Gregory II, Gregory III etc., might *in that qualified context* sometimes use “Gregory” for one of these later figures; or reference to a “Gregory number,” being qualified by “number” refers to Caspar Gregory.)

A special feature of this textual commentary, not found in other textual apparatuses, are citations from St. Gregory. I find it staggering that while apparatuses such as Nestle-Aland and UBS will include citations from the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Primasius of *North Africa* (d. after 567); or both Tischendorf and UBS will include citations from the early mediaeval church Greek writer, John Damascus of *West Asia* (d. before 754); yet none of them have citations from the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great of *Western Europe* (d. 604), who is one of the four ancient and early mediaeval church doctors of the Western Church. On the one hand, I am in the first instance a son of the “one catholic and apostolic Church” (*Nicene Creed*) that knows no geographical boundaries of “east” and “west,” but is *universal* or *catholic* (Rev. 12:17). But in the second instance, in a more localized sense, I am a son of the Western Church. And as a son of the Western Church, I protest against this omission of St. Gregory!

Thus other textual apparatuses cite only the four great ancient doctors of the Eastern Church, St. John Chrysostom (d. 407), St. Athanasius (d. 373), St. Gregory Nazianzus (d. c. 390), and St. Basil the Great (d. 379); and three of the four great ancient and early mediaeval doctors of the Western Church, St. Ambrose (d. 397), St. Jerome (d. 420), and St. Augustine (d. 430). Why then do they omit reference to the fourth great doctor of the Western Church, St. Gregory the Great (d. 604)? In fairness to these textual apparatuses, it must be said that Bishop Gregory has been badly misrepresented by the Roman Catholic Church; and possibly this factor made them reluctant to cite him.

Let us consider two instances of this, the first with regard to “Gregory’s Office” (Church Service); the second with regard to the claim that Gregory was a “Pope.”

Concerning the first matter, the reader ought not to accept the veracity of the kind of thing that one finds in the Office (Service) under the name of “Gregory” in Migne’s Volume 78 (Paris, 1849), since it in fact contains alterations. Thus the King James Version’s prefatory address, “The Translators to the Reader” (Scrivener’s 1873 Cambridge Paragraph Bible, reprint in Trinitarian Bible Society’s *Classic Reference Bible*), refers to its “change” and “altering” in later mediaeval times. They say, “The service book supposed to be made by S. Ambrose (*Officium Ambrosianum* [Latin, ‘Ambrose’s Office’] was a great while in special use and request: but Pope Adrian [Pope: 772-795], calling a Council with the aid of Charles the Emperor [King of Franks, 768-814; Emperor of ‘Holy Roman Empire, 800-814], abolished it, yea burnt it, and commanded the service book of Saint Gregory universally to be used. Well, *Officium Gregorianum* [Latin, ‘Gregory’s Office’] gets by this means to be in credit; but doth it continue without change or altering? No, the very Roman service was of two fashions; the new fashion, and the old, the one used in one Church, and the other in another; as is to be seen in *Pamelius* a Romanist his Preface before *Micrologus*. The same *Pamelius* reporteth out of *Radulphus de Rivo*, that about the year of our Lord 1277 Pope Nicolas the Third [Pope: 1277-1280] removed out of the *Churches of Rome* the more ancient books (of service) and brought into use the Missals of the [Franciscan] Friars Minorites, and commanded them to be observed there; insomuch that about an hundred years after, when ... Radulphus happened to be at Rome, he found all the books to be ... of the new stamp.”

Thus the AV translators of 1611 here warn us of a nefarious web of Franciscan monkish “change” and “altering” to the *Officium Gregorianum*. This order has historically worked with the Jesuits to promote Popery and subvert the glorious truth of the Gospel found in Protestantism. Prominent Franciscans include the convicted Nazi war criminal, “Blessed” Cardinal Stepinatz (d. 1960, two years before the expiration of his prison sentence, having been released from prison in 1951 after serving 6 years of his 16 year sentence, and then serving the rest of his sentence under house-arrest at Krasic), who was “beatified” by Pope John-Paul II (Pope 1978-2005) in 1998. The Franciscan Order was established by Francis of Assisi (d. 1226), who was “canonized” less than two years after his death in 1228. He was a “stigmatic” and in fairness to the Papists, we cannot doubt or deny their claim that the stigmatic phenomenon of skin scars can only be reasonably explained as the exhibition of supernatural power. But given its unBiblical connection with works righteousness (Gal. 1:9; 2:16; 3:11) and Popery, we must further conclude that its supernatural source is not God, but the Devil. And little wonder, for St. Paul says the Pope’s “coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders” (II Thess. 2:9).

Therefore, with the King James Version translators somber warning still ringing in our ears of such “change” and “altering” of the *Officium Gregorianum* being brought about through the monkish assistance of Popish Franciscans, I hope the reader will understand that for my purposes of Gregorian Bible citations, I shall generally omit

reference to Migne's Volume 78, which is the volume containing the relevant writings attributed to "Gregory." Not that this will be a great loss anyway, for this Volume 78 contains far fewer references to Scripture than the other Migne Gregorian Volumes 75 to 77 & 79, all of which were first published by Migne at Paris, France, in 1849.

Another way the Roman Church has very badly misrepresented Bishop Gregory, has been the way it falsely claims that godly and pious Bishops of Rome such as St. Silvester (d. 335) and St. Gregory (d. 604) were "Popes." (Alas, it has been joined in this anachronism by many shallow-minded secularist historians also.) Indeed they make this false claim right back to the holy Apostle, St. Peter, whom they falsely depict as "*the* Bishop of Rome" holding "*the* Bishopric of Rome," and also being "Pope." This sometimes includes fraudulent and anachronistic artistic depictions of e.g., Peter, Silvester, or Gregory, wearing a Papal tiara. Therefore, as a good Protestant, I wish to make the following clarification, lest my introduction of citations by Bishop Gregory the Great be misinterpreted.

Since the Western Roman Emperors were "taken out of the way" (II Thess. 2:7) with the fall of Rome and the Western Roman Empire in 476 A.D., the Bishop of Rome, being "Patriarch of the West," was then "revealed" "in the temple of God" (II Thess. 2:3,4), that is, the church (I Cor. 3:16; Eph. 2:21). He was found to be "shewing himself that he is God" (II Thess. 2:4) in the form of a vice-God; for the Greek "*Antichristos* (Antichrist)" (I John 2:18) means "in the place of Christ" and this perfectly equates the Latin papal title "*Vicarius Christi* (Vicar of Christ)." While *some* bad Bishops of Rome made claims to a *universal primacy* in the church, this was just "hot air."

In 533 A.D., the Bishop of Rome who had expanded his powers to become a governing primate in four of the five Patriarchates (Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Rome), (this still excluded governing power in more distant Western areas such as the British Isles,) was said in a letter, *not a legal enactment*, attached to Justinian's Code, to be "head of all the holy churches." This had no legal force, and was *an honorary titular primacy* of the Emperor, with no expanded jurisdictional power e.g., over the independent Patriarchate of Constantinople. Being nothing more than an exercise of the emperor's discretionary prerogative for the purposes of a titular priority; it lasted only till the death of Justinian in 565. But to the extent that the Bishops of Rome from 533 to 565 (John II, 533-535; Agapitus, 535-6; Silverius, 536-7; Vigilius, 537-555; Pelagius I, 556-561; and John III, 561-574, during the first part of his bishopric till 565), were given such a titular honour as "head of all the ... churches," they nevertheless were both a prophetic type of what was then the still future Office of Antichrist, and they also played an integral role as stepping stones to the ultimate formation of the Office of Papacy and Office of Antichrist in 607. Thus referring to this period of 533 to 565, Holy Daniel says two of "three" "horns" i.e., the Vandals (c. 533) and Ostrogoths (c. 556), were "plucked up;" even though the "little horn" had to wait till the formation of the Papacy in 607, before the third horn of the Lombards (c. 752) was "plucked up" (Dan. 7:8), and being subdued by Pepin's Frankish armies acting on the Pope's request in 754-756, the Papacy then got the first of its Papal States in 756.

Nevertheless, for all of that, upon the death of the Emperor Justinian, this *honorary titular primacy* of 533 to 565 ceased, and so the Bishopric of Rome from 565 in fact then reverted back under John III to its pre 533 status. It remained so up till 607 (John III, 561-574, during the second part of his bishopric from 565; Benedict I, 575-579; Pelagius II, 570-590; Gregory, 590-604; & Sabinian, 604-606). Indeed, during this 565 to 607 period, such claims of a “universal” primacy were specifically repudiated by an incumbent Bishop of Rome, Bishop Gregory the Great (Bishop of Rome 590-604). For “Christ is the head of the church” universal (Eph. 5:23,32), and universal “Bishop” (I Peter 2:7,25).

But in time the claims came again, and this time were given *legal force*, as by decree of Phocas the Emperor in Constantinople, the Bishop of Rome, Boniface III, was made “universal bishop,” and so at last the Bishop of Rome gained a governing primacy over the hitherto independent Patriarchate of Constantinople (which he held for *c.* 450 years till 1054); and from this base, also extended his jurisdiction in the West. Thus when the claim to be “Vicar of Christ” is added to the serious claim of “universal” jurisdiction from 607, the Bishops of Rome blasphemed against the Holy Ghost, who alone has such a universal jurisdiction as Christ’s representative (John 14:26; 15:26; I John 2:27). This is the origin of the Roman Papacy as we know it; although its absolute form came with its gain of temporal power with the first of the Papal States from 756 A.D., and it associated spiritual *and temporal* control of Rome.

Such Papal blasphemy as occurred from 607 onwards is unpardonable (Matt. 12:31,32), and makes the Pope “the son of perdition” (II Thess. 2:3). This gives the Devil the capacity to possess the Popes (II Thess. 2:9); and indeed, sitting in Rome (Rev. 17:9; 18:2), the Devil has personally Devil-possessed every Pope of Rome since 607 (Rev. 12:3,9; 13:1,2; 16:13,14), rather than as per normal, leaving his host of lesser devils to do such things. Unlike God, the Devil is not omnipresent (everywhere at once,) and so must generally work through his host of devils. He organizes everything from Rome (Rev. 17:9; 18:2). Thus in the same way that Isaiah could look “the king of Babylon” (Isa. 14:4) in the eye and address the Devil who possessed him (Isa. 14:12-15), or Ezekiel could look “the king of Tyrus” in the eye and address Lucifer who possessed him (Ezek. 28:12ff); so likewise one can look the every Pope since 607 in the eye, and address the Devil himself.

Thus e.g., on the one hand, the Devil through his legion of unholy angels tempts men to commit such sins as atheism (1st commandment), fornication (7th & 10th commandments), or abortion (6th commandment). But on the other hand, if they look like they want to repent, he is there, with his great deception, the Roman Catholic Church, to say, “I’m so glad you’re now repenting, you know, the Pope has always opposed these things. It’s a very good work you’re now doing.” Thus he presents his false gospel of faith and works, and tries to get them to think that their repentance etc. is a good work meriting favour with God. Hence by either his false gospel of Roman Catholicism (Gal. 1:8,9; 3:11), or by an overt appeal to worldly lusts, he hog-ties them for hell either way. Very few see through the two-pronged deception i.e., they think of the Pope and Devil as opposites.

St. John Chrysostom (d. 407) and St. Jerome (d. 420) both taught that “the temple of God” in which the Antichrist sits, is the church of God (Eph. 2:21; II Thess. 2:4). St. Chrysostom taught that the Antichrist’s rise must come shortly after the fall of the Western Roman Empire, which occurred in 476. St. Gregory the Great (d. 604) was a Bishop of Rome before the formation of the Roman Papacy (Boniface III, Bishop of Rome, 607; First Pope, 607, procured a decree from Phocas making him, “universal bishop”). St. Gregory stated that he was opposed to any claims of a so called “universal bishop,” and he denounced the claim of a bishop to “universal” primacy as the teaching and goal of the “Antichrist.” Therefore the subsequent adoption of this title and claim by the Bishop of Rome from 607, does, on the teaching of the church doctors, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, and St. Gregory, require the conclusion that from the establishment of the Office of Pope in 607, every Bishop of Rome has held nothing less than the Office of Antichrist, foretold in Holy Writ.

The Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) Calendar remembers Bishop Gregory with a black letter day on 12 March. In doing so, it recognizes that like all men, Christ except, no saint (believer) of God is perfect. Thus in the dispute between Bishop Gregory and Bishop Serenus (Bishop of Marseille, France, 596-601), in which Gregory “didst forbide images to be worshipped,” but did not want Serenus to “break them” as he had in his Diocese (Homily 2, Book 2, Part 2), the Homily says of the “two bishops,” “Serenus,” “for idolatry committed to images, brake them and burned them; Gregory, although he thought it tolerable to let them stand, yet he judged it abominable that they should be worshipped ... . But whether Gregory’s opinion or Serenus’ judgment were better herein consider ye, I pray you; for experience by and by confuteth Gregory’s opinion. For ... images being once publicly set up in ... churches, ... simple men and women shortly after fell ... to worshipping them ...” (Homily 2, Book 2, Part 3). Thus Gregory is certainly not regarded as being beyond criticism. Yet for all that, he was a saintly man.

Thus the writings of Bishop Gregory are used like other church writers, i.e., *critically*, for only the Bible is infallible. But this only goes to enhance the fact that these same Homilies of Article 35 in the Anglican *39 Articles* refer to, and endorse St. Gregory’s teaching on the Antichrist. This was stated when the Bishop of Constantinople sought to become “universal bishop,” and Bishop Gregory argued that no human being here on earth is “universal bishop,” and since only the Antichrist will be such a “universal bishop,” it follows that the Bishop of Constantinople was thus a “forerunner of Antichrist.” Hence when the Bishop of Rome, Boniface III later got a decree from the Emperor Phocas, making him “universal bishop,” on St. Gregory’s teachings, the Popes of Rome became the Antichrist.

“As for pride, St. Gregory saith ‘it is the root of all mischief.’ ... First, as touching that” “the Popes” “will be termed *Universal Bishops* and *Heads of all Christian Churches* through the world, we have the judgment of Gregory expressly against them; who writing to Mauritius the Emperor, condemneth John Bishop of Constantinople in that behalf, calling him ... the forerunner of Antichrist” (Book 2, Homily 16, Part 2).

Accordingly this same Article 35 teaches that all the Popes of Rome since 607 have held the Office of Antichrist (Matt. 24:24; II Thess. 2:1-12; I John 2:18; Rev. 13 & 17). Thus Article 35 states, “King Henry the Eighth,” “put away” “superstitious pharisaical sects by Antichrist invented and set up” by, e.g., “Papistical superstitions,” “Councils of Rome,” and “laws of Rome” (Homily 5, Book 1). The “bishop of Rome” “ought” “to be called Antichrist” (Homily 10, Book 1). “‘Many (Matt. 24:5,24) shall come in my name,’ saith Christ,” “all the popes” “are worthily accounted among the number of” “‘false Christs’ (Matt. 24:24)” (Homily 16, Book 2). The “bishop of Rome” is “the Babylonical beast of Rome” (Rev. 13:1-10; 17:5,9) (Homily 21, Book 2).

This type of Anglican Protestant teaching is also reflected in the Dedicatory Preface of the King James Version and prefatory remarks in the “Translators to the Reader,” *supra*. For on the one hand, these Anglican translators refer to Gregory the Great as “Saint Gregory” and defend him against changes made by the Roman Church to the *Officium Gregorianum*, *supra*. And on the other hand, in “A paraphrase upon the Revelation of ... S. John,” King James I said Rev. 13 refers to “the Pope’s arising;” and the Dedicatory Preface to the King James Version refers to how “Your Majesty’s” “writing in defence of the Truth ... hath given such a blow unto that man of sin [II Thess. 2:3], as will not be healed.”

What saith the three great doctors of the Reformation, Martin Luther (d. 1546), John Calvin (d. 1564), and Thomas Cranmer (Marian Martyr, m. 1556)? Luther refers to “when there were still bishops in Rome, before the Pope.” He says, “the Papacy did not exist before Emperor Phocas and Boniface III, and the church in the whole world knew nothing of it. St. Gregory, pious ... bishop of the Roman church, condemned it and would not tolerate it at all” (*Luther’s Works*, Vol. 41, p. 299). And Luther also says, the “Pope ... is the true Antichrist ..., who hath raised himself over and set himself against Christ .... This is called precisely, ‘setting oneself over God and against God,’ as St. Paul saith” (II Thess. 2:4) (Luther’s *Smalcald Articles* 4:9-11, upheld in the Lutheran *Formulae of Concord*, Epitome 3).

In his *Institutes*, Calvin’s most commonly cited writer among the ancient and early mediaeval church writers is the doctor, St. Augustine (over 300 times), and his second most commonly cited writer is the doctor, St. Gregory (over 50 times) (Lester Little’s “Calvin’s Appreciation of Gregory the Great, *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 56, 1962, p. 146). As with the Anglican Homilies, *supra*, Calvin disagrees with Gregory’s view on images (*Institutes* 1:11:5); makes the same qualification that “Gregory” taught “they ought not to be worshipped;” and like Luther describes him as “a pious man” (Calvin’s *Commentary on Jeremiah*, Jer. 10:8). Thus Calvin too looks with general favour on Gregory. John Calvin refers to how “the title of ‘Universal Bishop’ arose ... in the time of Gregory ... . Gregory ... strongly insisted that the appellation is profane; nay, blasphemous; nay, the forerunner of Antichrist.” And of “the vile assassin Phocas” (Byzantine Emperor: 602-610), Calvin says, “At length Phocas, who had slain Maurice, and usurped his place ... conceded to Boniface III ... that Rome should be the head of all the churches.” “Hence have sprung those famous axioms which have the force of oracles throughout the Papacy in the present day ..., that the Pope is the

universal bishop of all churches, and the chief Head of the Church on earth.” Concerning “these ... defenders of the Roman See ... [who] defend the title of ‘Universal Bishop’ while they see it so often anathematised by Gregory,” Calvin then says, “If effect is to be given to his [Gregory’s] testimony, then they [the Romanists], by making their Pontiff ‘universal,’ declare him to be Antichrist. The name of ‘head’ was not more approved. For Gregory thus speaks: ‘... All ... are under one head members of the Church ..., the saints under grace, all perfecting the body of the Lord, are constituted members: none of them ever wished to be styled <universal>’ (Gregory, Book 4, Epistle 83).”

Calvin further says, “We call the Roman Pontiff Antichrist.” “I will briefly show that” “Paul’s words” “can only be understood of the Papacy. Paul says that Antichrist would *sit in the temple of God* (II Thess. 2:4). Hence ... his nature is such, that he abolishes not the name either of Christ or the Church, but rather uses the name of Christ as a pretext, and lurks under the name of Church as under a mask. But ... Paul foretells that defection will come, ... that that seat of abomination will be erected, when a kind of universal defection comes upon the Church, though many members of the Church scattered up and down should continue in the true unity of the faith.” “Neither,” “was” “this calamity ... to terminate in one man.” “Moreover, when the mark by which he distinguishes Antichrist is, that he would rob God of his honour and take it to himself, he gives the leading feature which we ought to follow in searching out Antichrist: especially when pride of this description proceeds to the open devastation of the Church. Seeing then ... the Roman Pontiff has impudently transferred to himself the most peculiar properties of God and Christ, there cannot be a doubt that he is the leader and standard-bearer of an impious and abominable kingdom.” (Calvin’s *Institutes*, 4:7: Sections Introduction; & 4:7:4,17,20,21,25). And in *Calvin’s Commentaries* on I John 2:18 and II Thess. 2, he further declares the Roman Papacy to be the Antichrist.

And the third great doctor of the Reformation, Thomas Cranmer, also thinks highly of Gregory. For in opposing the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation and consubstantiation, and upholding “the [true] profession of the catholic faith,” he favorably cites a number of church fathers and doctors, including in this list what “St. Gregory writeth” (“The Third Book ...,” *The Work of Thomas Cranmer*, Edited by G.E. Duffield, Sutton Courtney Press, Berkshire, England, 1964, pp. 131-3). Yet in his profession of faith that proceeded his martyrdom by being burnt to death at Oxford in 1556 at the hands of the Romish Queen, Bloody Mary (Regnal Years: 1553-1558); this first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, among other things, recited the *Apostles’ Creed*, and said, “And as for the Pope, I refuse him, as Christ’s enemy and Antichrist, with all his false doctrine” (Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs*).

See then, good Christian reader, how no man, Christ except, is perfect, and that Gregory erred on the issue of images. For though he rightly said they should not be worshipped (Exod. 20:4-6), which thing occurs in Popery; nevertheless, God gave an OT crucifix as an object lesson to us (Num. 21:8,9; John 3:14), so that upon matured reflection we might see how substantial numbers of weaker brethren are drawn into idolatry by images (II Kgs 18:4), and thus the Lord teaches us that we must ban images

altogether (Rom. 14 & I Cor. 8). Therefore Bishop Serenus' judgment is to be preferred over Bishop Gregory's opinion on this issue of images. But see too, good Christian reader, how notwithstanding such imperfections and blemishes in Gregory, nevertheless, in general terms, the three great doctors of the Reformation, all speak favourably of Gregory; and all condemn the Roman Papacy which was formed in 607 under Boniface III as the Office of Antichrist. And this teaching is also found at a Protestant Confessional level in Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*. So with this historic Protestant spirit found in the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* and the teachings of Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer, let us remember with favour St. Gregory. For he was one of the last of the good Bishops of Rome, and referring back to such men, Daniel says the Antichrist who arises from 607, "shall" not "regard the God of his fathers" (Dan. 11:37) i.e., he shall be a religious apostate. Now in saying this, he also bears witness that earlier pious Bishops of Rome both before 533 and between 565 and 607, like e.g., Bishop Gregory, did indeed have "regard" for, and worship, "God" (Dan. 11:37).

The following are Scripture citations from St. Gregory the Great (d. 604). I shall itemize hereunder their citation from Migne's *Patrologiae Curses Completus* (Latin Writers Series) in Volumes 75 to 79 (Paris Editions of 1849); in which the Volume Number is followed by the page number. I have generally followed Migne's citation references; but where I consider a Gregory quotation may be either a Matthean quote or another Gospel quote, the Migne reference is marked with an asterisk, \*, and Gregory is not referred to in the commentary on the basis of such a reference.

Scripture:	Migne reference
Matt. 15:8	79:530*,595*
Matt. 15:14a	77:1121
Matt. 16:13	75:85; 76:400; 79:474
Matt. 16:19a	77:746 (cited by Migne as "Matth. xvi, 8" <i>sic.</i> )
Matt. 16:26	77:86; 79:1192 (cited by Migne as "Matth. xvi, 20" <i>sic.</i> )
Matt. 17:4	79:136
Matt. 17:11c	76:178, 762; 79:1420.
Matt. 18:6	75:762; 77:16,742
Matt. 18:7b	77:742
Matt. 18:15a	77:743 (cited by Migne as "Matth. xvii, 3" <i>sic.</i> ); 77:1326; 79:676
Matt. 18:15b	77:743 (cited by Migne as "Matth. xvii, 3" <i>sic.</i> ); 17:1326
Matt. 19:9	77:1161
Matt. 19:11	77:106; 79:1413
Matt. 19:16	76:1277*-1278* (looks like Luke 18:18)
Matt. 19:20	76:1030
Matt. 19:29b	76:1007
Matt. 19:29c	79:1015
Matt. 20:5a	76:1153
Matt. 20:6a	76:1153
Matt. 20:6b	76:1153
Matt. 20:7	76:1154
Matt. 20:15c	76:1154
Matt. 20:16	76:334,1154
Matt. 20:23b	Component 3 76:749
Matt. 20:26a	77:37
Matt. 20:26b	77:37
Matt. 20:26c	77:37; 79:1215
Matt. 20:27b	77:37,742*; 79:1215
Matt. 20:30a	Component 1 76:98

**\* Rating the TR's textual readings A to E.**

The evaluation of evidence for the King James Versions' Textus Receptus (TR) uses the following rating system.

“A” is the highest level of certainty (75%-100% certainty).

“B” is a middling level of certainty (65%-74% certainty).

“C” is a lower level of certainty (51%-64% certainty).

“D” means evidence for the TR's reading is about equally divided with the alternative reading(s), so that we cannot be entirely certain as to which is the better reading (50% certainty). Such a rating means the TR reading can be neither definitely affirmed as correct, nor definitely rejected as wrong. Therefore the reading is “passable.”

“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.

Though used with relative rarity, finer break-ups may be made in the B and C ranges.

A high level “B” (in the range of 71-74%).

A middling “B” (in the range of 69% +/- 1%).

A low level “B” (in the range of 66% +/- 1%).

A high level “C” (in the range of 63% +/- 1%).

A solid “C” (in the range of 60% +/- 1%).

A middling “C” (in the range of 56% +/- 2%).

A low level “C” (in the range of 52% +/- 1%).

The results are summarized at the end of the volume in Appendix 5: *Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E*. In Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), all but one of the TR's readings have been found to be in the A to C range. One reading, Matt. 19:5b has been found to be in the “D” range, and so while it divides on a 50:50 basis with another reading, like the alternative reading, it is “passable.” Therefore the *Textus Receptus* of the King James Version (1611) requires no changes in Matt. 15-20. Nevertheless, I have itemized in the first appendix some changes that need to be made to Scrivener's Text in order for it to properly reflect the TR of the AV.



*\*Old Papists & New Papists: The Clementine Vulgate & Neo-Vulgate.*

At the point of the Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture (II Tim. 3:16), Latin is not a Biblical language. But at the point of the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture (I Peter 1:25), Latin is a Biblical language. Hence for we Protestants who recognize and uphold the Received Text of Holy Scripture, Latin stands with Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, as one of the Biblical languages of importance to us. This compares and contrasts with the old Latin Papists, who like us, also recognized that Latin is a Biblical language; but unlike us, considered that Latin was the only Biblical language that mattered.

The pre-Vatican II Council (1962-5) Latin Papists believed in the Divine Preservation of the Latin textual tradition, but not the Greek (or Hebrew and Aramaic). In broad terms they started with Jerome's Vulgate, but then sometimes moved away from it to other readings inside the Latin textual tradition. However, the precise basis upon which they moved away from the Vulgate varied among them, and hence some disagreement emerged between them as to the best Latin reading of various passages. This is seen in e.g., the differences between Colunga and Turrado's Clementine Vulgate and Merk's revised Clementine Vulgate, or before that, in the differences between the Sixtinam (Sixtine) Vulgate (1590) and Clementine Vulgate (1592). Nevertheless, these Papist Latins believed in one great truth shared by neo-Byzantines of the Greek Received Text, namely, that the Latin texts are inside a closed class of sources Providentially preserved by Almighty God.

By contrast, the post-Vatican II Council neo-Alexandrian Papists have accepted the erroneous views of religiously liberal Protestants. These deny the Divine Preservation of both the Latin and the Greek. An eminent "council father" of the Vatican II Council, the French Archbishop, Marcel Lefebvre (1905-1991), in his *Open Letter* of 1986, said "Vatican II is the French Revolution in the Church." The man came to the council with impeccable Romish credentials, being nominated by the Pope to be a member of the Central Preparatory Commission for the *Vatican II Council*.

In a candid insider's comment on the council, the Archbishop says, "the *Council Fathers felt guilty themselves* at not being in the world and *at not being of the world*" (emphasis mine) (cf. John 17:15,16). Archbishop Lefebvre also says that the "parallel I have drawn between the crisis in the [Roman] Church and the French revolution is not simply a metaphorical one. The influence of the" French Revolution "*philosophes*" or philosophers "of the eighteenth century, and of the upheaval that they produced in the world, has continued down to our times" and they "have injected that poison into the [Roman] Church" in the *Vatican II Council*<sup>1</sup>. The Roman Catholic Archbishop was certainly correct, since the Vatican II Council went so far as to claim French Revolution derived so called "Rights of Man" (or "human rights"), prevail over the very law of God

---

<sup>1</sup> Lefebvre, M., *Open Letter to Confused Catholics*, Angelus Press, USA, 1986, pp. 100,102,105.

itself as found in godly Natural Law and Divine Law<sup>2</sup>. (Rome got furious with the outspoken Archbishop, and excommunicated him in 1988).

Tischendorf modified pre-existing anti-Received Text ideas connected with the Alexandrian text. Thus writing in the year of Tischendorf's birth, 1815, the Anglican clergyman, the Reverend Frederick Nolan, (in what from 1801 to 1870 was the *United Church of England and Ireland*), could say: "... 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. The peculiar readings which he selects from the manuscripts of this class, he confirms ... principally ... from the quotations of the ancient fathers, and the versions made in the primitive ages. 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." "The necessary result of this process,... has been that of shaking the authority of our Authorized Versions, with the [Received Text] foundation on which it is rested." Such are "the innovations of ... Griesbach" that Nolan rightly opposed. With Nolan I must say that, "in his predilection for the Alexandrine Text, which he [Griesbach] conceives he has discovered in the works of Origen, I am far from acquiescing ... ." Thus Nolan rightly defends the Received Text readings of e.g., Mark 16:9ff; John 7:53-8:11; I John 5:7,8<sup>3</sup>.

And so it was that in 1830, the Vicar of Prittlewell, (in the area of Southend-on-Sea in Essex, south-east England,) the Reverend Dr. Frederick Nolan, further said, "The Canon of Scripture being received as the unerring rule of faith, and the ultimate test of controversy: the foundation of all religion must necessarily collapse with the destruction of its integrity. As this object would be effectually attained should the critical system on which ... Griesbach proposed to amend the Received Text, be incautiously admitted; ... the landmarks fixed by the Established [Anglican] Church [of England and Ireland], as a barrier to innovation and error, could not preserve their original position ...<sup>4</sup>."

---

<sup>2</sup> *Vatican Council II, Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents, op. cit.*, p. 742 (Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions, Vatican II, *Nostra Aetate*, 28 October, 1965, section 5); pp. 929-30 (Pastoral Constitution of the Church in the Modern World, Vatican II, *Gaudium et Spes*, 7 December, 1965, section 29). By contrast, see the law of God in e.g., Gen. 6:1-4; 9:25-27; 10:1-11:9; Matt. 15:21-28; Acts 17:26b; 21:17-33; Jas 1:1; I Peter 1:1 (race); Gen. 3:16; Esther 1:22, NASB; I Cor. 11:3-16; 14:34-36; I Tim. 2:8-3:13 (patriarchy).

<sup>3</sup> Nolan, F., *An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate or Received Text of the New Testament*, Printed for F.C. & J. Rivington, St. Paul's Churchyard, London, by R. & R. Gilbert, St. John's Square, London, England, UK, 1815 (British Library shelf mark 691.d.21), pp.5-7, and 35-7 (Mark 16), 37-8 (John 8), 38-41 (I John 5).

<sup>4</sup> Nolan, F., *Supplement to an Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate or Received Text of the New Testament*, Published by Messers. T. & W. Boone of London, 1830, Sold by the Principal Booksellers, Prittlewell: At the private press of the Reverend Dr. Nolan, 1830 (British Library shelf mark 691.d.22), p. iii. Printed by R. & R. Gilbert,

Thus the anti-supernaturalist ideas of Griesbach<sup>5</sup> and Lachmann, were taken up by Constantine Tischendorf and set forth in his first critical edition of the Greek NT (1840). But with Tischendorf's discovery of *Codex Sinaiticus* in 1859, these ideas were tailored to become the Neo-Alexandrian School essentially in the form we now know it, and Tischendorf's Greek NT 8th edition (1869-72) (which it must be said has a very useful textual apparatus), became a classic neo-Alexandrian work. The modifications solidified in Tischendorf's mind after he launched the neo-Alexandrian School are e.g., evident in Matt. 15:33. In his second critical edition of the Greek NT (1842) he criticized the neo-Byzantine Stephanus (1550) for omitting "*oun* (then)."<sup>6</sup> This is found in e.g., the Western Text's D 05, and if inserted, makes the passage read, "... Whence *then* (*oun*) should we have so much bread" etc. . At the time Tischendorf's manuscripts included both the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus (in the Vatican Library since the 15th century, and sufficiently known to Erasmus for him to think poorly of it,) which he dated to the 4th century, and the Western Text's D05 which he dated to the 7th century<sup>7</sup>.

But then he founded the neo-Alexandrian School in the basic form we now know it, after he found London Sinaiticus in 1859. Finding that London Sinaiticus agreed with the Received Text in not adding "*oun* (then)," he so completely backed away from his earlier position, that he gave only a relatively small mention of this variant in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) (reference is also made to it in Nestle-Aland's 27th edition & Swanson). E.g., Tischendorf did not mention the absence of "*oun* (then) from Rome Vaticanus and London Sinaiticus. But he did mention its presence in e.g., the Ethiopic Version. Why was e.g., the Ethiopic Version one of the persuasive influences on him in his second edition of 1842, but not in his 8th edition of 1869-72?<sup>8</sup>

The answer surely lies in the fact that because he now had the two Alexandrian Texts (Tischendorf's 8th ed., 1869-72), not just Rome Vaticanus (Tischendorf's 2nd ed. 1842), he had founded the neo-Alexandrian School in the basic form that we now know it. And with both major Alexandrian texts following the same reading and not having "*oun* (then)," Tischendorf was now reluctant to move away from it. Thus he did a back-flip summersault at Matt. 15:33.

---

St. John's Square, London, England, UK, 1815 (British Library 691.d.21), pp.5-7, and 35-7 (Mark 16), 37-8 (John 8), 38-41 (I John 5).

<sup>5</sup> Tischendorf's early reliance on Griesbach (1745-1812) is evident in the "Lectiones Variantes" Appendix of his *Novum Testamentum* 2nd edition (1842), and remains in the symbol "Gb" throughout his 8th edition (1869-72).

<sup>6</sup> Tischendorf's *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Paris, France, 2nd edition, 1842, "Lectiones Variantes," p. 5; and at p. 35 he includes "*oun*," in the main text.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. xvii.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. xxii.

Even though I disagree with Tischendorf both before and after he founded the Neo-Alexandrian School, I do not make this criticism of him over Matt. 15:33 in order to necessarily criticize a man for changing his views. (Indeed I myself have changed my views on a number of issues when receiving better information, or attaining to a better understanding, I have thought it right to do so.) Rather, I make reference to this fact in order to show that Tischendorf went in a transition culminating in the founding of the Neo-Alexandrian School. He started out as a normative religiously liberal form critic of the NT, like Lachmann, and so e.g., criticized the absence of “*oun* (then)” at Matt. 15:33 in the Received Text; and then later tailored and modified form criticism to include a high view of the Alexandrian Texts. Since to retain his earlier view that “*oun* (then)” should be present at Matt. 15:33 would now require that he was not only was critical of the TR, but also of *both* of the Alexandrian texts, he changed his position on the matter.

This kind of alteration in Tischendorf’s Greek NT texts thus makes the point that Tischendorf is very specifically the founding father of the Neo-Alexandrian School. Of course, once established by him, it has then taken on a life of its own<sup>9</sup>. Thus the Neo-Alexandrian School has plagued us ever since Tischendorf’s time with men such as e.g., Westcott and Hort, Eberhard Nestle, Erwin Nestle, Bruce Metzger, and Kurt Aland, all of whom are opposed to the Neo-Byzantine School of the NT Received Text.

Thus when we neo-Byzantine defenders of the *Textus Receptus* and King James Version did battle with the old Latin Papists, there is a sense in which the battle was closer to our own breast because we too respect the Latin textual tradition, and have a certain affection for the Clementine, even though we reckon it to be an inferior blade to that of the Greek Received Text. By contrast, when we neo-Byzantines do battle with the new Papists wielding e.g., their neo-Alexandrian *RSV Catholic Edition* (1965) or *Jerusalem Bible* (1966), there is a sense in which the battle is much further away from our own breast since they are relying on manuscripts outside the closed class of sources, and in the end, for the purposes of determining the NT text, we really do not care what these manuscripts outside the closed class of sources do or do not say.

The old Latin Papists were more of an enemy *whose ideas were clearly coming from within the church* (II Thess. 2:4), for they shared with us certain fundamental beliefs such as God’s preservation of the Latin text. (In this sense, they are like the Burgonites, since in practice their Majority Text always equates either the representative Byzantine Greek Text or is a sizeable minority Byzantine reading, both of which are part of the

---

<sup>9</sup> Tischendorf’s strong bias for Codex Sinaiticus over Codex Vaticanus where the two disagree, has not been followed by subsequent neo-Alexandrians. Indeed, Westcott & Hort went the other way, preferring Codex Vaticanus over Codex Sinaiticus. Some evolution occurred with Westcott and Hort claiming a “neutral” Alexandrian text, most especially evident in Codex Vaticanus, and particularly clear when Codex Vaticanus was in agreement with Codex Sinaiticus, an idea abandoned in such absolutist terms by later neo-Alexandrians. The idea of “external support,” especially where the two Alexandrian texts are split, has also been further developed.

Divinely preserved Byzantine text; even though the Burgonites add to this a relatively small number of spurious texts outside the Divinely preserved closed class of sources which do not affect this outcome.) By contrast, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists are more an enemy *whose ideas are clearly coming from outside the church* (I John 2:14-17), since they have taken up secular anti-supernaturalist views of religiously liberal neo-Alexandrian Protestants which deny God's preservation of both the Latin and Greek NT texts.

In the Preface to Volume 1, (Preface, Section 5, Greek and Latin Texts), I decided that when I refer to the Clementine Vulgate's NT, unless otherwise stated, it would be to Merk's edition that I refer (Augustinus Merk's *Novum Testamentum*, Pontificii Instituti Biblici, Rome, Vatican City, 9th ed., 1964). In doing so, I noted some variation occurs between editions. E.g., at Matt. 10:3, Merk's edition reads, "Cananaeus." However, old Latin Versions c, f, & l read, "Chananaeus," as does Colunga and Turrado's Clementine Vulgate (Colunga, A., & Turrado, L., *Biblia Sacra*, Biblioteca de Autores Christianos, Matriti, 1965).

In general, this was more theoretical than practical, since in the citations I used for my purposes, differences did not generally emerge. However, I did note a difference between the two editions in the commentary at Matt. 13:28 (although I will revisit this verse in the revised volume 1). In order to resolve this issue for future editions, given that Merk makes some changes to the older Clementine Vulgate (Merk's *Novum Testamentum*, pp. 23-4), I have decided that for subsequent volumes starting with Volume 2, I will reverse this order and now favour Colunga and Turrado's edition of the Clementine Vulgate (1965<sup>10</sup>) over Merk's revised edition (1964), unless otherwise stated. But I would remind the reader that any Latin version based on Latin manuscripts that are in the closed class of sources, can be used to *manifest* the Latin reading inside the closed class of sources; and since Merk (d. 1945) was a pre-Vatican II Roman Catholic of the Latin School, his Latin work (which was to some extent edited after his death by Stanislas Lyonnet<sup>11</sup>), can still generally be used in this way. But whether citing the Clementine Vulgate (1592, Colunga & Turrado), or revised Clementine Vulgate (1592, Merk's 8th edition, 1964), it must be remembered that such Latin versions can only ever *manifest* a Latin reading from inside the closed class of sources, and this underpinning Latin text is what one must ultimately refer to.

---

<sup>10</sup> Michael Tweedale's Electronic Internet Edition, London, UK, 2005, is a good and useful edition of the Clementine which is well set out and presented with black writing and red verse numbering on a white background (<http://vulsearch.source.forge.net/html/index.html>). I have also used the internet to access Edward Siever's 1892 edition, (Druck & Verlag, Paderborn,) of a Latin Vulgate Codex, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron ([www.hypotyposeis.org/weblog/2006/01/codex-sangallensis-online.html](http://www.hypotyposeis.org/weblog/2006/01/codex-sangallensis-online.html)).

<sup>11</sup> Merk's *Novum Testamentum*, p. 7; Metzger, B., *The Text of the NT*, Oxford, UK, 1964, p. 143.

Thus on the one hand, the closed class of Latin sources ends at the same time as the closed class of Byzantine Greek sources, i.e., 1599 A.D. (“\*Determining the representative Byzantine Text,” *infra*). Hence e.g., I would accept any handwritten manuscripts copied out by Latin scribes of texts up till 1599. But on the other hand, the Clementine is no more such an example of this, than Erasmus’s or Beza’s texts would be of the Greek. In general, the Clementine is clearly a composition of Latin texts arranged on the basis of Latin textual analytical principles, in the same way that e.g., Erasmus’s or Beza’s texts are clearly a composition of Greek and Latin texts arranged on the basis of neo-Byzantine textual analytical principles. Thus the Clementine, which is historically also a printed document, is not itself in the closed class of sources, even though it is generally useful for manifesting Latin readings that are inside the closed class of sources.

In retaining my commitment to using the Clementine in this way, I take the opportunity to remind the reader that notwithstanding criticisms of the Clementine Vulgate that I make in this commentary, I nevertheless regard the Clementine as a valuable and useful tool. As previously stated in Volume 1, though it is a Roman Catholic work, the wider value of the Clementine Vulgate was historically recognized in Protestantism. E.g., the Latin titles of the psalms throughout the Psalter in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* are all based around the Clementine Vulgate, rather than Jerome’s Vulgate. Notwithstanding criticisms I make of it (e.g., Vol. 2 at Matt. 15:14a, “Preliminary Textual Discussion,” “The Second Matter”), in general terms the Clementine Vulgate is a particularly useful work for showing that various readings have support in the wider Latin textual tradition upon which it is based. But where that cannot be done, it has no intrinsic standing in its own right (see commentary at Matt. 15:14a; 15:31c).

Therefore the position towards the Clementine I adopt conforms with this historic Anglican Protestant position, and might be described as one of a certain ambivalence. For on the one hand, we defend the *Textus Receptus* against all comers, and this historically meant upholding the Authorized Version and Received Text against Papists using the Douay-Rheims and Clementine Vulgate. But on the other hand, when all the dust’n’smoke settled after these Protestant-Papist battles, which the reader will find some reference to in this commentary; we Anglican Protestants, (and possibly some other Protestants,) still found value in the Clementine Vulgate *for our own somewhat different purposes*. Hence its use in e.g., the 1662 Anglican prayer book, *supra*; and my own usage of it in these commentaries as a text which generally manifests Latin readings inside the closed class of sources.

This makes the Clementine quite different to the Vulgate, since if e.g., a reading has the support of the representative Byzantine text, no good textual argument against it, and attestation from antiquity in St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate; then providing there is no particularly strong attestation for the variant anywhere else inside the closed class of sources, the reading would be a likely candidate to get an “A” rating (e.g., see commentary at Matt. 15:31c). Thus whereas the testimony of the Vulgate is intrinsically worth a good deal, by contrast, the Clementine is intrinsically worth nothing. The Vulgate stands in its own right, whereas the Clementine stands only as a mirror reflecting

earlier readings in the Latin textual tradition. The Clementine's strength is in its reflective capacity, nothing more, nothing less.

Though looking upon it with some ambivalence, and at times criticizing it (e.g., at Matt. 15:14a), and at times praising it (e.g., at 15:22b), overall, the Clementine remains an important and useful work for we neo-Byzantines of the *Textus Receptus*. In this sense, it is like the Burgonites' Majority Text, which has similar qualities since even though the Burgonites include some texts from outside the closed class of sources (more so in the case of Hodges & Farstad than in the case of Robinson & Pierpont), their numbers are so small as not to change it from a Byzantine text form. Since *in practice* its text is either the representative Byzantine Text or a sizeable minority Byzantine reading, we neo-Byzantines look upon its completed product with both similar ambivalence and interest. The reality is, that both the Clementine and Majority Text can be profitably used by we neo-Byzantines, albeit with a caution, qualification, and circumspection, that neither Latin Papist nor Burgonite respectively, could ever accept. For whilst on the one hand, I support neither the textual theory underpinning the Latin Papists' work of the Clementine Vulgate, nor the Burgonites' Majority Text; nevertheless, on the other hand, I believe we should give credit where credit is due. With these qualifications, I give credit to both groups.

Lest criticisms I make of it be decontextualized and misinterpreted (e.g., at Matt. 15:9); as I have said before, so I now say again, we neo-Byzantines most assuredly will not be singing of the Clementine:

Oh my darlin', Oh my darlin',  
 Oh my darlin', Clementine;  
 Thou art lost and gone forever,  
 Dreadful sorry, Clementine.

Contextually, in its plenary meaning, this song does not, as I use it, relate to the Clementine Vulgate, but rather to the 1849 Californian gold rush, being about "a miner, '49er, and his daughter, Clementine." In March 2009 I undertook a tour of North America, on return home to Sydney from London, in westward circumaviation of the globe. Among other places, I visited the US Congress in Washington D.C. where inside the Dome called, "The Temple of Liberty" the tour-guide pointed to a man swinging a pick and described this as a "Californian forty-niner gold miner." I also later visited Auburn, California (c. 130 miles north of San Francisco), which is one of the sites connected with the 1849 Californian gold rush. Among other things, I saw a large impressive statue of Claude Chana, who found gold at Auburn in May 1848, together with a number of older buildings from the general era, and I also visited a museum which included gold mining history in the Town Hall.

My usage of this old gold rush song to express one element of my ambivalent feelings about the Clementine, thus also has another level of appropriateness. For there remains a time and a place to consult the Clementine (*Clementina Vulgata*), and to

compare it with the Vulgate (*Vulgata*) and other texts of Scripture<sup>12</sup>. The lesson which, by the grace of God, I learnt with the OT Apocrypha, namely, like a gold-digger to pan out the gold from the dross, is an important skill to acquire, whether one learns it from usage of the Apocrypha or somewhere else. When cross-applied, this same skill of differentiation does, by the grace of God, allow us to perceive the good that is in the Clementine Vulgate (or Burgonite Majority Text), while simultaneously perceiving and discarding the bad in the Clementine (or Majority Text). Our methodological approach to the Clementine is thus that of a gold-digger i.e., we pan out and discard the dross, and treasure the gold.

By contrast, the NT in the Roman Catholic Church's *Neo-Vulgate* (1979) or *Nova Vulgata* (*Nova Vulgata Bibliorum sacrorum editio*, Rome, 1979), is in broad terms, a Latin translation of a neo-Alexandrian Greek text. Therefore we can safely take the *Neo-Vulgate* ("New Vulgate") and "file it" in "the circular-shaped filing cabinet," more commonly called, "the rubbish bin" or "the trash can." Which of course, is exactly where the apostate Protestant, Tischendorf found his first forty-three sheets in a monastery in 1844, a "discovery" that led him back to this monastery in 1853 and 1859, and with this, the birth of the modern neo-Alexandrian School with the "discovery" of *Codex Sinaiticus* (London Sinaiticus) in 1859.

The Bishops of Rome took an early interest in Tischendorf's work. Tischendorf had a papal audience with Pope Gregory XVI (Pope 1831-1846) in May 1843, followed by what Tischendorf describes as, "my intercourse with Cardinal Mezzofanti." It was then from the Bishop of Rome's Library in Rome, that the second major Alexandrian Text, Rome Vaticanus, would come. And Tischendorf lists among his "flattering distinctions," the fact that with regard to his editorial work in producing a facsimile copy of *Codex Sinaiticus*, "the Pope," i.e., Pope Pius IX (Pope 1846-1878), "in an autograph letter, has sent to" him "his congratulations and admiration<sup>13</sup>." Later Bishops of Rome have continued this support e.g., the *Neo-Vulgate* (1979) was initiated by one Bishop of Rome, Pope Paul VI (Pope 1963-78), and promulgated by another Bishop of Rome, Pope John Paul II (Pope 1978-2005).

Tischendorf made it clear that he was against the Received Text and Authorized (King James) Version. In Tischendorf's *The New Testament: The Authorised English*

---

<sup>12</sup> Volume 1, Preface, Section 1, "Textual Commentary Principles," subsection, b, ii, "New Testament." The standard Latin grammar referred to in these volumes is La Fleur's revision of Wheelock's *Latin Grammar* (2005). Frederick Wheelock (1902-1987) was an American (USA) teacher, who taught at e.g., Darrow School for Boys (New York), Harvard University (Massachusetts), and Florida Presbyterian College (later called Eckerd). However, see my comments at Matt. 17:3 on an English (UK) teacher, namely, the author of Allen's *Latin Grammar* (1898).

<sup>13</sup> Tischendorf, C., *When were our Gospels written?* With a narrative of the Discovery of the Sinaitic Manuscript, The Religious Tract Society, London, 1896, pp. 13-32, at pp. 15,23-8,32.

*Version* (1869)<sup>14</sup>, there are numerous footnotes claiming the two major Alexandrian texts are to be preferred over the neo-Byzantine readings of the Authorized Version. So too, these are the same approximate years of Tischendorf's 8th edition neo-Alexandrian Greek NT Text (1869-72). Thus in 1869, Tischendorf published both the first part of his 8th edition neo-Alexandrian Greek NT Text, which attacks the neo-Byzantine Greek NT Received Text; and also *The NT: The Authorised English Version*, which very specifically targeted the neo-Byzantine Authorized Version.

Against this backdrop, it is notable that in the very next year of 1870, a resolution initiated by the established *Church of England's* Bishop Wilberforce (Bishop of Winchester), as amended by Bishop Ollivant (Bishop of Llandaff), in the Upper House of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, was passed by both Houses of the *Church of England* Convocation. This 1870 resolution set up a revision committee, consisting of both Anglicans and others, including Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists, and Baptists, to produce the neo-Alexandrian Revised Version (RV) (1881-1885), (also known as the English Revised Version). Later an American Committee of Revision produced an American edition of this with the American Standard Version (ASV) (1901) (also known as the American Revised Version)

But while the leader of the great apostasy (II Thess. 2:3), whose office of the Roman Papacy first came into existence with the decree of Phocas making him "universal bishop" in 607, namely, the Bishop of Rome, and also the increasingly apostate Church of England Bishops, thus sang the neo-Alexandrian Tishendorf's praises; not all Bishops have looked with such favour on Tischendorf's work. The *Church of England (Continuing)* is an independent Anglican Church (i.e., one that is outside of the Anglican Communion). The C. of E. (Continuing) is a Reformed (Evangelical) Anglican Church, that wisely uses only the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* and *Authorized Version (1611)* in its church services. The immediate catalyst for its breaking away from the *Church of England* in 1994 was the ordination of women priests by the C. of E., but it actually has a much wider raft of concerns as to the way the C. of E. had been going for a long time. I too am an independent Anglican, and when in England, over the years I have attended a number of such C. of E. (Continuing) services. Thus e.g., a retired Anglican clergyman, the Reverend Brian Felce, is favourably known to me because he is a member of the congregation at St. John's *Church of England (Continuing)*, Wimbledon (London). The Reverend Mr. Felce is *Vice-Chairman of the Trinitarian Bible Society*, an organization wisely committed to the Received Text and Authorized (King James) Version.

Bishop David Samuel is a Bishop in the C. of E. (Continuing). I have met Bishop Samuel both in his Cathedral Church of St. Mary's Reading (just outside of London), and elsewhere on different trips to London. Bishop Samuel maintains that "the intrinsic worth of the Authorised Version is shown by its adherence to the Received

---

<sup>14</sup> Tischendorf, C., *The New Testament: The Authorised English Version with Introduction, and various readings from ... three ... manuscripts of the ...Greek text*, B. Tauchnitz, Leipzig (Germany), & S. Low, Marston, Low & Searle, London (UK), 1869 (copy in Moore Theological College, Sydney, Australia).

Text.” The good Protestant Bishop says of the discovery by Tischendorf of his manuscript sheets (which in turn led to his later discovery of Codex Sinaiticus), “in a waste paper basket in ... [a] monastery,” that “Tischendorf ... does not appear to have asked himself why it came to be there in the first place!”<sup>15</sup>

**\*Elzevir’s 1624 Textual Apparatus.**

Elzevir editions of the Greek NT Text were published in 1624, 1633, and 1641. From the 1633 Elzevir edition comes the Latin name, “*Textus Receptus*,” “Therefore (*ergo*) the text (*textum*) he holds (*habes*) by (*ab*) now (*nunc*) all (*omnibus*) receive (*receptum*)”<sup>16</sup>.

No-one who understands the great work of the 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantine textual analysts, such as Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, and Elzevir, could doubt that they were aware of both variants and rival Greek text types. E.g., Beza was clearly aware of the Western Greek Text, since he gave the Greek-Latin diglot (Greek, D 05; Latin, old Latin d), as a gift to Cambridge University, for which reason it is now known as *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis*. Even though the Greek Western Text had accessibility over time in Western Europe, nevertheless, its consistent deviations from the Byzantine Greek and Latin, and its obvious conflation of the text, meant that it was ruled out of the closed class of sources as a clearly unreliable Greek text type. (Although Latin manuscripts may be considered, and so while e.g., Greek D 05 was ruled out, old Latin d might still be used.)

For in broad general terms (I do not say absolute terms), the evidence indicates that in the West, if a scribe was talented he served as a Latin scribe; but if he was a bumbler’n’fumbler he served as one of the odd Greek scribes. Fortunately, in the providence of God, a higher view of the Greek prevailed in the East, which generally preserved the Byzantine Text. Thus while e.g., Erasmus of Rotterdam was strong in both Latin and Greek, since in the west the educated man was judged more on his Latin than on his Greek, Erasmus would no doubt have still been considered a great man of learning even if he had not been strong on the Greek. For while in theory the classic education included both Latin and Greek, in practice, the Western culture strongly favoured the Latin. But with the coming of the Protestant Reformation, the importance of the Greek to New Testament studies (and to a lesser extent Old Testament studies with the Septuagint,) helped to correct this imbalance.

<sup>15</sup> Samuel, D.N., *The Church in Crisis*, Published by the Church of England (Continuing), Printed by Maurice Payne Printers, Reading, England, UK, 2004, pp. 57,61.

<sup>16</sup> “*Textum ergo habes, nunc ab omnibus receptum*” (Quoted in the Preface, *H Kaine Diatheke, The New Testament*, The Greek Text Underlying the English Authorised Version of 1611, Trinitarian Bible Society, London, England, UK, [undated]; reprinting Scrivener’s *New Testament in ... Greek*, 1894 & 1902).

While the Latin-Greek balance was held by 16th century Protestants, and formed an integral part of Reformation Lutheran Protestantism and Reformation Anglican Protestantism, the rise of Puritan Protestantism often (I do not say always or necessarily,) brought with it an opposite tendency which in over-reaction to the Latin Church, i.e., Roman Catholicism, sometimes magnified the Greek in such a way as to set aside the Latin. Hence e.g., in the English civil war (1640s & 1650s), the (generally English) Puritans sometimes ran rife against Latin using Anglicans, whom they thereby depicted as “Popish.” In fact, such Anglicans were simply a cultural part of a historically wider Western European Latin culture of learning, which preceded the 7th century rise of the medieval institution of the Papacy (the first Bishop of Rome to become a Pope was Boniface III, in 607), and continued after the Papacy’s demise when from the 16th century, “The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England” (Article 37, Anglican 39 Articles). Of course, one can also find other Puritan Protestants of a better era, who would join their Anglican brethren in Protestant Christianity in condemning the mad and insane nonsense of civil war English Puritan Latin-phobia. Indeed, even at the time of the civil war, the Scottish Puritans were still using some Latin, and they generally put a distance between themselves and the English Puritans, refusing e.g., to support a revolutionary republic in sedition against the Anglican Crown<sup>17</sup>.

---

<sup>17</sup> Consider e.g., the Anglican Article 28 of the 39 Articles, “The sacrament of the Lord’s Supper” is an “ordinance,” i.e., Reformation Anglicans might use both the terms “sacrament” and “ordinance” for Baptism and Communion, although they strongly favoured the term, “sacrament.” This “sacrament” terminology derives from the statement that St. Paul and St. Sosthenes were “ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God” (I Cor. 1:1; 4:1). The Greek “mysteries” here refers to something expressed as a symbol i.e., both the sacraments of baptism (I Cor. 1:13-17) which symbolizes redemption (I Cor. 10:2) through spiritual baptism (1 Cor. 12:13), and Communion (1 Cor. 11:19-34) which symbolizes feeding on Christ in our heart by faith (I Cor. 10:3,4), both of which had suffered from certain abuses at Corinth. At I Cor. 4:1 “mysteries” is Greek *musterion*, and at Eph. 5:32 the same root Greek word is rendered in the Latin Vulgate from the root word, *sacramentum*. Hence the propriety of the Latin derived term “sacrament” on the basis of I Cor. 4:1. The Puritan Presbyterians used the term “sacrament” in their *Westminster Confession* chapters 27-29, which Confession was adopted by the Scottish Parliament as the Act, *Charles I. Parliament 2. Session 2. Act 16*, of 1649. “Sacrament” was also retained by the Puritan Congregationalists in their *Savoy Declaration* (1658), chapters 28-30. However, to some extent reflecting the idea that “Latin is Popish,” we find that the term “sacrament” is completely removed and replaced by “ordinance” in the Puritan Baptist’s *Baptist Confession* or *London Confession* (1689) in chapters 28-30. I.e., this reflects a Puritan sentiment that would say something like, “The word ‘sacrament’ is not Biblical, because the New Testament is written in Greek, not Latin.” Of course, for we Protestants who believe in the Received Text, Latin is indeed one of the Biblical languages, albeit at the point of Divine Preservation rather than at the point of Divine Inspiration.

As a special neo-Byzantine classic texts treat, from Vol. 2 on I will make *some* limited selective reference to Elzevir's Greek textual apparatus of 1624<sup>18</sup>. No-one who examines this amazing document, can be left in any doubt that great neo-Byzantine textual analysts such as the Dutch Protestants of Belgian descent, the Elzevirs of Leiden, Holland, were well and truly aware of a host of variants. (Most of the variants in this Elzevir 1624 edition I do not discuss.) Some of these variants referred to in Elzevir's textual apparatus (1624), the neo-Alexandrians now effectively try to palm off as some kind of as essentially "new discoveries" (even though this is a covert inference, rather than an overt statement on their part, when they talk about "better manuscripts" that "have now" been found) (see e.g., commentary at Matt. 16:11b or Matt. 16:14).

Like references throughout this commentary to many of the variants inside the closed class of sources, some reference to Elzevir's textual apparatus (1624) is thus a good antidote to the illness of amnesia that neo-Alexandrians play on, when people look to what they erroneously think of as "new neo-Alexandrian discoveries of readings unknown since ancient times till the 19th century." It is also a good antidote to the illness of slackness that the Burgonites play on, when they encourage people to follow Burgon's idea of a simple count of manuscripts (even though both Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont have in different ways revised Burgon's basic idea in their respective majority texts,) and so they ignore all minority readings, making no distinction between good, bad, and indifferent variants.

The reader will note that Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) makes no reference to the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus. That is not because the matter was entirely unknown to them. Rome Vaticanus was hidden and obscured from general accessibility before the 15th century, suddenly appearing from nowhere in the Papal Library built by Nicholas V (Pope 1447-1455), and then to some extent it was further hidden from the light of day after the 16th century by the general consent of textual scholars up till the 19th century. It thus gathered dust in a dark corner of the Pope's Library. The basic assessment of Erasmus against it in the 16th century, had stood the test of time, and had been confirmed by e.g., Mill in the 17th and early 18th century. It only really came to more popular light after Tischendorf made much of it, and photographic facsimiles were then made of it in 1889-1890 (Giuseppe Cozza-Luzi), and 1904 (NT, Milan, Italy).

The Vatican Library was founded in 1448, and library catalogue cards show the presence of Rome Vaticanus there in 1475 and 1481. The great neo-Byzantine textual analyst, Erasmus of Rotterdam, asked the Vatican Library Prefect, Paul Bombasius in 1521 if it contained I John 5:7,8, and he was advised it did not. The subsequent Prefect, John de Septueda, advised Erasmus in 1533 of some 365 places where Codex Vaticanus disagreed with his Greek text in preference to the Latin Vulgate. Erasmus drew the obvious conclusion that *Codex Vaticanus* was a corrupt text not worth worrying about. Time has shown Erasmus of Rotterdam was absolutely correct on this matter. After all,

---

<sup>18</sup> Printed in an Appendix of Frederick H. Scrivener's *An Exact Transcript of the Codex Augiensis*, Deighton, Bell, & Co., Cambridge, England, UK, 1859 (copy of Melbourne University, Victoria, Australia).

if there were this many variations in areas where Rome Vaticanus agrees with the Vulgate over the *Textus Receptus*, (and in fact later collations have shown far more disagreements between Rome Vaticanus and the Received Text,) it is axiomatic that the thing has been through the hands of them “which corrupt the Word of God” (II Cor. 2:17); and in the words of the holy Apostle, St. Paul, we should not “suffer fools gladly” (II Cor. 11:19). It was a case of, “Say no more,” as Codex Vaticanus was fairly rejected on the same type of grounds that the Greek Western Text was rejected.

Collations of Rome Vaticanus were also made in 1669 by Giulio Barolucci, though little interest was shown in them until they were used by Scholz from 1819. So too collations of it were made by Mico for Bentley in 1720. Then after the King of Denmark, Christian VII (Regnal Years 1766-1808), commissioned Andrew Birch to examine various manuscripts in Europe, Birch published a selection of the variations in Rome Vaticanus in 1798-1801 at Copenhagen.

The reality is that the great neo-Byzantine textual analysts of the 16th and 17th centuries realized that if Rome Vaticanus disagreed with Erasmus’s text in over 350 places where it agreed with the Latin Vulgate, it was clearly a corrupt text not worth worrying about. They were certainly correct to draw such a conclusion. This is seen in e.g., the views of the Reverend Mr. John Mill (c. 1645-1707), an English theologian and Anglican clergyman, educated at Oxford University. He was a Chaplain to King Charles II (Regnal Years: King *de jure* of the three kingdoms, 1649-1685; King *de facto* of Scotland, 1649-1650/1; King *de facto* of England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1660-1685), and from 1685 Principal of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford. His Greek New Testament (a 30 year work), used the text of Robert Stephanus (1550), but added to it readings from a number of manuscripts. His view on Codex Vaticanus, stated in his Prolegomena (1707) typify neo-Byzantine views, namely, he did not think it was important to collate the data from this aberrant manuscript<sup>19</sup>.

Thus my selective citations of Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) acts to remind the good Christian reader that the neo-Byzantines historically rejected both the Alexandrian and Western Texts, as being outside the closed class of sources used to compose the Received Text. For whilst on the one hand the neo-Byzantine textual analysts of the 16th and 17th centuries lacked the detailed collations of the Alexandrian Text’s *Rome Vaticanus* (B 03) and Western Text’s *Bezae Cantabriginiensis* (D 05) that we now have; they knew enough about the Alexandrian Text Rome Vaticanus’s departures from Erasmus’s Greek Text in over 350 places where it agreed with the Latin Vulgate against the neo-Byzantine Greek (and unlike the Vulgate, it appeared from nowhere in the Vatican Library in the 15th century i.e., it did not have general accessibility over the centuries), and enough about Beza’s Western Text *Bezae Cantabriginiensis*, to know that both of these texts had been through the grind-mill of them “which corrupt the Word of God” (II Cor. 2:17), and ought not to be consulted for the purposes of composing the *Textus Receptus*. The position that I adopt in this

---

<sup>19</sup> “Codex Vaticanus,” *Wikipedia* (June 2009) ([en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Codex\\_Vaticanus](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Codex_Vaticanus)).

commentary as a neo-Byzantine textual analyst is thus classic neo-Byzantine with respect to the repudiation of both the Alexandrian and Western Texts, and this is reflected in the absence of citations from them in e.g., Stephanus's mid sixteenth century textual apparatus or Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624).

Also in this context, from Matt. 20 onwards I have the benefit of Scholz's *The Student's Analytical Greek Testament* (1894), which contains the variations of the Greek New Testaments of Stephanus (4th edition, 1550), Beza (5th edition, 1598), and Elzevir (2nd edition, 1633)<sup>20</sup>; as well as copies of Erasmus's 1516 Greek-Latin NT and 1522 Greek-Latin NT<sup>21</sup>, both of which are now being specially featured from time to time in this commentary. Thus while Elzevir produced three editions (3rd edition, 1641), the combination of the textual apparatus from Elzevir's first edition (1624) with the text of his second edition (1633) helps to give us a better view of the last major neo-Byzantine textual analyst since myself (Vol. 1, 2008), i.e., in about 350 years<sup>22</sup>, or if one counts from Mill in 1707, in about 300 years. I.e., *since I am the first neo-Byzantine textual analyst in about 350 years if one counts from Elzevir, or about 300 years if one counts from Mill, those who accept the Biblical teaching of the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture should be supporting my work on the Received Text, even if they disagree with me in some other areas.*

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)<sup>23</sup> 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.

---

<sup>20</sup> *The Student's Analytical Greek Testament*, presenting ... the text of Scholz ... with the readings ... of Griesbach; and the variations of Stephens, 1550; Beza, 1598; ... Elzevir, 1633; Samuel Bagster & Sons, London, England, UK, 1894 (photocopied from Moore Theological College Library, S 225.48 SCH).

<sup>21</sup> *1516 & 1522 Erasmus New Testament*, Computer Disc, Reformed Church Publications, P.O. Box 171, Zeeland, Michigan, 49464, USA; & *Erasmus Greek-Latin New Testament 1522*, bound photocopy (<http://www.bibles.org.uk>).

<sup>22</sup> I.e., a rounded number, there are 367 years from Elzevir's 3rd edition in 1641 to my first volume in 2008 (Matt. 1-14).

<sup>23</sup> Scrivener, F.H.A., *H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ* Novum Testamentum Textus Stephanici A.D. 1550, Deighton, Bell, & Co. Cambridge, and Whittaker & Co., London, 1877.

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, in conjunction with others (e.g., Scrivener, 1881, Appendix<sup>24</sup>), I consulted for the main commentary at Matt. 20:15c.

Though Scholz’s selectiveness means that my usage of his work is necessarily patchy relative to the variants I cover, nevertheless, I think we are better off with what insights we can gain from it, than without it. It should also be remembered, that Scholz’s selectiveness is comparable with the general selectiveness of other textual apparatuses. In such circumstances, we do the best we can with what we have got. *Contendam!*<sup>25</sup>

***Byzantine Text Bonus for Commentary: Two Sydney University Greek Lectionaries!***  
***A) Sydney University: It’s got “the name;” \* B) Sam Angus of Sydney University: the big heretic; \* C) “Bonjour” to the Two Greek Lectionaries kept at Sydney University. D) Some general matters with respect to the two Sydney University Lectionaries.***

We have already said “Bonjour” (French, “Hi” / “Goodbye [Australian colloquialism = ‘Good day’],”) to a special Latin treat that starts from Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), to wit, the inclusion of Latin citations from the church doctor, St. Gregory. Now in this section we will be saying, “Bonjour” to a special Greek treat that starts from Volume 2, to wit, the inclusion of Greek citations from two Byzantine Text Greek Lectionaries held at an old *Alma Mater* of mine, Sydney University. These are the only two Greek Lectionaries inside the closed class of sources anywhere in *The Land of the Southern Cross*. Both this special Latin treat (St. Gregory) and special Greek treat (Sydney Universities Lectionaries) will be incorporated into the revised Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) which is scheduled, God willing, for dedication on 30 January 2010.

As part of discussing Greek Lectionary 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) and Greek Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) inside the closed class of sources i.e., 16th century or earlier), three matters will be considered. Firstly the prestige name of Sydney University, which is comparable to Oxford and Cambridge in England, or Harvard and Yale in the USA. It is here, at Sydney University, that these two Lectionaries are kept. These are the only two Greek Lectionaries inside the closed class of sources to be found in Australia. Secondly, because one of these two Lectionaries first was owned by a well known heretic, Professor Angus of Sydney University, and before that, by another religious liberal, Professor Deissmann of Berlin University, I shall discuss Angus’ heresies. This is done to make a

---

<sup>24</sup> Scrivener’s, *The New Testament in the Original Greek According to the Text followed in the Authorized Version, Together with the Variants Adopted in the Revised Version*, Cambridge University, England, UK, 1881, Appendix, pp. 648-56. (Copy available at Moore Theological College Library, Sydney, 225.04 SCR.)

<sup>25</sup> Latin, “I shall strive” (Indicative active future, 1st person singular verb, from *contendo*).

most important point about Divine Preservation, which has come to be misunderstood by some. Finally, I shall discuss in more detail the Lectionaries themselves, and their importance to this commentary.

A) *Sydney University: It's got "the name."*

For those who are in to such things (some are and some are not), Sydney University, of which I am twice a graduate, is regarded as the most prestigious university in New South Wales. Hence when I dress for Church in my "Sunday best," I generally, though not always, wear the tie of Sydney University. It's got "the name" as the prestige university for three reasons: Its history; its architecture; and its academic entry requirements which are the highest of any university. But from the Christian perspective, this type of thing needs to be taken with qualifications that secularists would not make.

On the one hand, if we are fortunate enough to be in a country that has them, we Christians should also look to Christian tertiary Colleges where the issue of Christ's pre-eminence and Biblical authority is important, but I here speak in the world's terms. Now "the world passeth away," "but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever" (I John 2:17). Lest I be misunderstood in this section, for the broader perspective into which such matters of social "prestige" should be put, I ask the reader to consider I Cor. 1:18-29; Philp. 3:4-11.

With respect to the first criterion, the history of Sydney University, it is Australia's oldest university, being founded in 1850. For many years till around the end of World War Two or so, it was often referred to by Sydney-siders and New South Welshmen as simply, "*the university.*"

In this context, it is notable that the football game of rugby originated at Rugby School in England, in proto-form in 1823, and later form around 1838-9. I have twice visited Rugby and Rugby School, on both occasions this was an incidental side-trip, the main reason for my being in the area was that from here one catches the bus to Lutterworth, where I was interested to see the John Wycliffe sites. Nevertheless, with this qualification, I visited Rugby School on St. George's Day (23 April), 2003, among other things inspecting a monument to the game's founder, William Ellis (1806-72), school courtyard, and school oval where the game originated. I was also interested to see a mosaic cross from the old school Chapel dating to c. 1830, and the cart originally used to carry boys injured in the game off the field. I was also at Rugby, England, again in October 2003, and took a photo of the school Chapel and main part of the school as visible across the school oval. The game of rugby thus originally had an elitist connotation of connection to this private school, even though rugby (in its various derivative forms,) later shed that connotation. But to some extent reflecting this type of earlier thinking, the Sydney University Rugby Union team is one of the New South Wales State's official teams, and Sydney University is the only educational institution so represented.

In saying this, I do not wish the reader to think that I endorse these kind of worldly values. I frankly think that in general sports are a stupendous waste of time, and act to provide a focus for people that is other than where it should be i.e., a false god. Their sporting “stars” become those who can perform some sporting manoeuvres better than others. Is this really the type of person we should be elevating in people’s minds? Little wonder then, they think so highly of such talentless fools as their rock’n’roll idols. With specific respect to the game of rugby, I note that the cart used to remove injured players that I inspected at Rugby School, dates from the 1800s and was in use till the 1950s. It was, and is known, as “The Death Cart.” How many people have been needlessly injured by this game, sometimes permanently, I do not know; but quite a lot. It actually sickens me to think very much about the “god of sport” in which people’s minds are overly focused on this or that sporting game, e.g., rugby, so that it comes to consume their time, energy, and talents, in a way that detracts from what should be their greater focus on God and his ways and works. The unduly dangerous nature of the game, the fact that like so many other sports, it tends to become an obsession to those involved in it, so that both the game itself, and its “stars” become gods, as people waste inordinate amounts of time, energy, and effort on such silly, fleeting things, is truly sad. Rather than focusing on, and delighting in such things, I would recommend that people focus on, and delight in, “the law” (meaning “the teaching” or “the instruction” Hebrew *torah*) “of the Lord” (Ps. 1:1,2).

Nevertheless, while I do not doubt it is the “foolish” “wisdom of the world” (I Cor. 1:20) that considers the presence of a State Rugby Union team conveys and reflects social prestige on Sydney University, at least in worldly-wise terms, we cannot doubt that this is the case<sup>26</sup>.

Furthermore, the university is the base of *Sydney University Regiment* (SUR). SUR was founded in 1900 a year before the federation of Australia in 1901. After

---

<sup>26</sup> Under the Establishment Principle (Ps. 2:10-12; Isa. 49:22,23); when the natural order is in place under good government (which thing has not been so in the Western world in specific terms since around the early to mid 18th century, nor in general terms since the end of World War II; although in Australia the general structures stayed in place till Sir Robert Menzies’ departure in 1966); then in such a white Protestant society, this side of glorification, there will always be a larger *outer sanctum* group of Caucasians who are culturally “Protestant” or “Christian,” and accept the general morality of Protestantism, but who are not saved; and an *inner sanctum* group of saved ones under covenant of grace. In the spirit of Christian paternalism, provisions must be made for this outer sanctum group operating only under common grace, and this includes the provisions of sports such as rugby, in which they greatly delight, as they do so many sports. But as with other sports, it must be *much more moderated* than it now is (see e.g., the excessive place it is given in newspapers or on TV media news). Even so, for the inner sanctum group operating under special grace, this type of sporting focus is a very poor substitute indeed for *that which really matters*, i.e. the holy things of God, and study of his most precious Word.

federation it became part of the Australian Army Reserves. Once again, both the older founding and later history of SUR, acts to bestow and reflect some degree of social prestige upon the university. In this particular instance, because I think some military service is of value to both the individual and society, I consider there is some validity in this type of connection. Indeed, I was in SUR (actively for about 18 months) in my university days.

Graduates of Sydney University also include various persons of note, e.g., a number of Australian Prime Ministers. This includes both a Liberal Prime Minister of Australia, Sir Billy McMahon (Prime Minister 1971-2), and a Labor Prime Minister of Australia, Gough Whitlam (Prime Minister 1972-5). It also includes Australia's first Prime Minister, Sir Edmund Barton (Prime Minister 1901-1903); Australia's shortest serving Prime Minister, Sir Earle Page (Prime Minister 1939, for 19 days); and Australia's second longest serving Prime Minister, John Howard (Prime Minister for 11¾ years, 1996–2007).

The second feature that gives Sydney University its prestige is its beautiful neo-gothic sandstone architecture in the older sections of the university. As one who has visited both Oxford and Cambridge Universities in England on a number of occasions, I can testify that the beautiful sandstone architecture of e.g., the Main Quadrangle of Sydney University, is very much in the finest and best traditions of Oxbridge Colleges. It is much more elegant and grand than either some of the newer Oxbridge buildings, or for that matter the buildings of Harvard University in Cambridge, Boston, USA, which I visited in March 2009.

Inside the Main Quadrangle ivy is grown over one section, signifying that it is an ivy league university. My matrilineal uncle, Brian Davis (1923-2000), got his dental degree from Sydney University (being a student here in the late 1940s and early 1950s); and when he visited Sydney in 1990, he and I, both being graduates of Sydney University, walked around the older sections of campus. We had some photos taken of us standing together at the (old) Medical Building, where he undertook some of his dental studies. This too is an attractive sandstone building, being situated next to the Main Quadrangle Building.

When I have used the Fisher Library at Sydney University in recent years on a Saturday, e.g., looking up Scripture citations by St. Gregory in Migne, I have found in the afternoon numbers of people having their wedding photos taken with the Main Quadrangle as the background. It seems that in an era when Church weddings are increasingly avoided by the increasingly heathen population, the secular state "neutrality" of Sydney University means that its neo-gothic buildings have come to replace neo-gothic Churches as the venue for a number of people's wedding photos. Of course, I regard the notion of the secular state being "neutral" to be as absurd as the Westcott-Hort claim that the Alexandrian Text was a "neutral" text, although even they distinguished between a *more* "neutral" text of *Codex Vaticanus* and a *less* "neutral" text of *Codex Sinaiticus*, considering where the two agreed they generally had a very definitely "neutral" text. Of course, while Tischendorf would be in general agreement with this

idea (although he never expressed it in this same “neutrality” terminology of Westcott & Hort,) if we were to express his evident views in such terms, then he would insist that the *more neutral* text was *Codex Sinaiticus* and the *less neutral* text was *Codex Vaticanus*. So much for “neutrality”! The secular state is ideologically guided, biased, and indeed spiritually blinded. It is so biased as to insist on an anti-supernaturalist interpretation for anything and everything in e.g., history and science. It certainly is not “neutral.”

Though secularists are very pleased with these paradigms, and greatly acclaim them, we of the household of faith know that “the wisdom of the world” is “foolishness” (I Cor. 1:20,21). E.g., the claims of their science departments denying old earth creationism and maintaining the ridiculous Darwinian theory of macroevolution; or the claims of their Divinity departments in favour of the absurd theory of the Neo-Alexandrian School. Such is the folly of anti-supernaturalism. “The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God” (Pss. 14:1; 53:1).

The third feature that makes Sydney University the prestige university in worldly-wise terms, is the intellectual elitist status it holds as the most academically difficult university for undergraduate students to get into in New South Wales, a factor that gives it a slightly higher academic standing over other NSW universities, even though academic standards are basically the same in all Australian universities.

With regard to this third feature, it should also be noted that Sydney University has always been a state university representing public education. But the high costs of university fees meant that in its earlier days, to a much larger extent than now-a-days, those who could afford private schools were the ones who could afford Sydney University, unless, of course, they won a scholarship.

These two types of students are to some extent reflected in some of the older Sydney University plaques. The main entrance to the Sydney University Quadrangle has two war memorial plaques in honour of Sydney University students who died in World War One, both with Latin inscriptions underneath them. On the left as one goes through the main archway are the fallen Sydney University students of 1914-1918; and to the right is a plaque referring among other things to those who fell at Gallipoli. The first panel of this second three panelled plaque refers to “The Armidale School: Forty six old boys.” This reference to “old boys” from “The Armidale School” (T.A.S.); reflects the wealthier socio-economic background that was formerly more often connected with Sydney University students.

But as one walks through this archway to the very well maintained inner lawn section of the main quadrangle, where the ivy grows over an archway, and if one immediately turns left (towards the direction of the sandstone Medical Building that is next to this main quadrangle), and then left into the first door, one will find above that door, on the inside, another plaque. This plaque is to “Frederick Mate,” and says he was a “university general scholar,” “Cooper classical scholar, and “Barker mathematical scholar A.D. 1864,” who “almost at the close of his brilliant academic career was removed by sudden illness” in “1864 ... in the 20th year of his age.”

At the bottom of the plaque, it contains the same quote in the two classical languages of learning, Latin and Greek, from the OT Apocrypha book, “Wisdom of Solomon,” known in the Greek as *Σοφία Σαλωμων*<sup>27</sup>, or in the Latin as *Sapientiam Salomonis*. In English, *Wisdom of Solomon* 4:13 (Apocrypha), may be rendered, “He, being made perfect in a short time, fulfilled a long time.” The Greek quote on this Sydney University plaque is from the Septuagint, “Τελειωθεις εν ολιγω επληρωσε χρονος μακρους<sup>28</sup>,” and the Latin is very similar to the Vulgate “*Consummatus Brevi Complevit Tempora Multa*<sup>29</sup>.”

Concerning the first two plaques, while most of them are solely focused on Sydney University students, the reference to T.A.S., is now notable (though at the time, probably not thought of as extraordinary, since it merely reflected what was then the more common wealthier socio-economic background of many students at the university). *The Armidale School* has sometimes been called, “a rich man’s orphanage,” on the basis that wealthy persons wanting to send their sons off to a distant boarding school, may well send them to T.A.S. . This sadder element of the school aside, it must still be said that T.A.S. is regarded as a prestige Anglican School, being the only General Public School (G.P.S.) outside of Sydney. That a World War One memorial plaque for war dead from this school would be given so privileged a position at Sydney University, is thus a dated, but still interesting commentary, on the fact that in former days it was to a large extent those from such wealthier backgrounds that could afford to go to Sydney University unless they won a scholarship.

But the second plaque reminds us that some less wealthy persons sometimes gained admission to the university via scholarship. Thomas Barker was an early Sydney industrialist who opened the first flour mill in New South Wales in 1825. He is remembered as one of the early supporters for establishing Sydney University, and when this occurred in 1850, he thereafter became the university’s first benefactor. The university honours him as by an old tradition dating from 1873, his portrait is one of those hung in the Great Hall. Thomas Barker established the Barker scholarship fund in 1853 in order to encourage mathematical science. Now-a-days such a scholarship is more akin to winning a university medal, rather than a mechanism by which a poorer

---

<sup>27</sup> “*Sophia Salomon*.”

<sup>28</sup> “*Teleiōtheis en oligō eplerōse chronos markrous*.”

<sup>29</sup> The only difference is in the translation of, “fulfilled.” In rendering the Greek, “επληρωσε (*eplerōse*, indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *plerōō*),” the Latin Vulgate reads, “*explevit*” rather than, “*complevit*.” Both Latin translations are indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verbs, the former from *expleo*, the latter from *compleo*. Both can mean, “completed” or “finished” or “fulfilled.”

person can afford to go to university<sup>30</sup>. But in the 1860s, such a scholarship was the financial gateway to a university education, and Frederick Mate was the recipient of this scholarship in the years from 1862 to 1864. The memorial plaque remembering his premature and tragic death, is thus a dated, but still interesting commentary, on the fact that in former days, some persons of a less wealthy background who won a scholarship, were thereby able to go to Sydney University.

However, increasingly over time, the provision of scholarships opened the way for much greater access to Sydney University for non socio-economic elites. During this second era of the university's history, these scholarships often came from government departments, and tied the student to a particular degree, thereafter bonding him for a set time. E.g., the *Department of Public Works* provided scholarships for a certain number to undertake Engineering Degrees, or the NSW *Department of Education*<sup>31</sup> provided a certain number of scholarships for teachers to undertake a Bachelor's degree at Sydney University and a Diploma of Education and the connected Sydney Teacher's College. Access to university for non-socio-economic elites though thus wider, was still in many instances controlled and directed to certain areas with a certain number of scholarships. Thus both socio-economic elites with free access to any degrees; and also non socio-economic elites with free access to the degree of their choice on some scholarships / bursars, as well as access to specific degrees with connected bonded jobs via highly competitive scholarships, came to co-exist side by side at Sydney University.

E.g., in Case Study 1, on Sir Garfield Barwick, *infra*, who graduated in 1922, he says, "My Leaving Certificate results gained me a bursary [/ scholarship] tenable at Sydney University which paid my fees." Sir Garfield says his "schooling, apart from the preparatory school at St. John's Darlinghurst, was wholly in state schools; ... in Crown Street; then ... at Cleveland Street High School; then at Fort Street, to which I obtained a bursary [/ scholarship]<sup>32</sup>." Sir Garfield is thus an example of the state school scholarship (bursar) student who co-existed at Sydney University in the same type of era as the socio-economic elites from private schools, who around that time erected, "The Armidale School: Forty six old boys" World War I (1914-1918) plaque.

Then in the university's third stage, in a way more pronounced in the post World War Two era, and very clearly discernable from around the 1960s onwards, Sydney University became increasingly more financially accessible to more and more people who gained access to it purely on the basis of their pre-university academic results. Thus today these plaques in the Main Quadrangle of Sydney University, referring to a time

---

<sup>30</sup> Barker's fund was established with a gift of £1000 (one thousand pounds), which was worth a good deal more in 1853 than it is now.

<sup>31</sup> Name later changed to the NSW *Department of Education and Training*, and inside NSW, now commonly called, "The DET."

<sup>32</sup> Sir Garfield Barwick's *A Radical Tory*, Federation Press, Sydney, Australia, 1995, pp. 6,11-12.

when a much larger percentage of students were from a wealthier background as reflected in the fact that they had gone to a private Anglican school such as T.A.S., or from a less wealthy state school background reflected in the fact that they had gained the necessary finances for admission via a scholarship, are simply a historical legacy of the university's past that no longer reflects *the general type* of school background, of most of its later students. (Although such socio-economic elitism remained much more strongly, though not universally, connected with admission to the three male residential colleges, St. Paul's College, St. Andrew's College, and St. John's College.)

With respect to being a student at the University of Sydney, these plaques are thus an interesting historical relic of a bygone era. They have long since ceased to reflect the general socio-economic backdrop and schooling of the university's students and graduates. Most students in the university's third stage would now come from the socio-economic middle-classes, and most would come from state schools (known in NSW as "public" schools). *Thus Sydney University went through a three-fold transition from being largely the playground of socio-economic elite schoolmen co-existing with a smaller number of intellectually elite schoolmen on scholarships, to being the playground of socio-economic elite schoolmen co-existing with an increasingly larger number of intellectually elite schoolmen on scholarships, to being the playground of intellectually elite schoolmen irrespective of their socio-economic background.*

But there is no automatic or necessary nexus between intellectual capacity on the one hand, and either moral virtue or spiritual wisdom on the other hand. In general, the new intellectual elite who have come to predominate at Sydney University are base, carnal, and unsaved. Their "wisdom of the wise" (I Cor. 1:19) is generally like that of the ancient Greco-Roman world's "wisdom of the world" (I Cor. 1:20). To we regenerated Christians, it is "the Greeks foolishness" (I Cor. 1:23). Indeed, it is a sad comment on reality, that as a general rule, the non socio-economically elite group that have percolated up through the university system to become teachers, whether lecturers or tutors, have been far more hostile to godly Christian men and their moral values, than ever the old combination of socio-economic elites and scholarship elites were. Though more generally of my type of socio-economic background, they have more ruthlessly supported "politically correct" values against men like me, than was ever dreamed of before their arrival.

For under the old system, if by the grace of God, a man like myself had somehow managed to get to university, he would not have been inhibited in his undergraduate studies, or stopped in any post-graduate work he pursued, or academic career, in the same way he would now be inhibited or stopped by the "politically correct" "human rights" groups with their anti-supernaturalist ideology and notions of anti-racism, anti-sexism, etc. . The new elite who control the universities are certainly not a socio-economic elite, and indeed they are quite hostile to the old socio-economic elitism of the university. But they are an ideological elite whose opposition to men like myself far exceeds that of the old elite which was a combination of socio-economic elites and non socio-economic scholarship elites, who generally "made some room" for some of the more godly Christian and intellectually gifted persons in at least some areas e.g., the social sciences.

(Although even they pursued anti-supernaturalism in the so called “natural” sciences – note the very anti-supernaturalist connotation of “natural” here, thus e.g., disallowing old earth creationists from around the mid to late 19th century onwards.)

By contrast, the new philosophical elites now totally exclude us from all the academic positions (a process that generally begins in greater earnest at the point of thesis work). To the extent that the old elites of about the first 100 to 120 years of Sydney University “made some space” for us, they thus gave us a better deal than the ideological elites of more recent times, who though allowing far greater entry at the undergraduate level to persons of my socio-economic and state school background, nevertheless so tightly control matters like marking, thesis work, and tutorial positions on an ideological basis, that beyond undergraduate work (and some non-thesis based postgraduate work in some masters’ degrees,) give ultimately give “no space” whatsoever to the intellectually and spiritually gifted sons of the Lord in e.g., the teaching positions (other than perhaps occasionally a some short-term casual tutorial position to a person whom they have not yet ideological vetted).

Nevertheless, none of this affects the fact that in the worldly wisdom (II Cor. 1:12) of broad New South Wales social terms, Sydney University remains the most prestigious university. The average man on the street would know nothing about the internal workings of such a university, but he knows that “Sydney University has the name” for graduates who have been there. And so it is, that for these three reasons, its history, its architecture, and its intellectual elitist status as the most academically difficult university for undergraduate students to get into, that in socio-cultural terms, Sydney University is, and remains, “the prestige university” that has “the name.”

And while it is true that we “do count” “all things” “but dung, that” we “may win Christ” (Phil.3:8); it is also true that we must be *in the world* (I Cor. 5:10) but not *of the world* (I John 2:15). And perhaps that is why it is, that it is also the case, that when I wear my “Sunday best” to Church, I generally don the Sydney University tie and cuff-links.

**\*B) *Sam Angus of Sydney University: the big heretic.***

**\*1) *What Angus said.* \* 2) *Some lives hurt by Angus’s heresies: Four case studies.***

**\*1) *What Angus said: a) On sedition & murder against the Crown; b) in denial of the Apostles’ Creed; & c) in attack on race based nationalism.***

I now come to the issue of the heretic, Sam Angus (1881-1943). Though he died some 17 years before I was born, it is surprising how many men in Sydney I have come into contact with, who knew of, or were influenced by, Sam Angus or one of his followers. The influence on men’s spiritual lives has always been a negative one, for Angus was one of those “false teachers” prophesied of by the holy Apostle, St. Peter, “who privily ... bring in damnable heresies” (II Peter 2:1). A Professor of New Testament, Greek, and Church History at St. Andrew’s (Presbyterian) College, Sydney

University (1915-1943), Angus was a well known heretic in Sydney, and a number of people in Sydney I have known from his era have told me about his negative influence. Angus denied e.g., the virgin birth, bodily resurrection of Christ, Divinity of Jesus Christ and thus the Trinity, and Divine Inspiration of Scripture<sup>33</sup>.

Angus was a religiously liberal Presbyterian who wrote a book that was published in the year of his death, entitled, *Arms For Oblivion: Chapters from a Heretic's Life* (1943)<sup>34</sup>. The fact that he here identified himself as living “a heretic’s life,” if nothing else, is honest. For my purposes, I note *with particular reference* just three broad areas that he touches on in this self-proclaimed “heretic’s” book: Angus’s seditious sentiments against the Crown; Angus’s heretical denial of the Articles of the *Apostles’ Creed*; and Angus’s vicious attack upon the Biblical definition of a nation.

*1a) Angus on sedition & murder against the Crown.* Before discussing the Jacobite followers of the Papist King James II (Regnal Years: 1685-8), I remind the reader that in English law if something is voidable, it is lawful till declared void. In the case of an English King, he is required as Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church to hold to the 39 Articles and 1662 prayer book. As a Papist, James II did not, and so in recognition of his voidable office, Members of Parliament invited the next in line, William III as consort of Mary II, to jointly reign i.e., in substance though not form, James II had *de jure* abdicated the Protestant throne. A Convention Parliament in February 1689 then recognized James II had *de facto* abdicated by deserting his post when fleeing London and discarding the Great Seal into the River Thames. It also recognized his legal successors were William III of Orange and Mary II. (William III & Mary II, joint reign 1689-1694; William III, sole reign 1694-1702). The Jacobites were those who then seditiously sought, under James II and his descendants, to illegally reclaim the throne for Popery. Defeated in the shorter term at the *Battle of the Boyne* in Ireland in 1690; they were finally defeated at the *Battle of Culloden* in Scotland in 1746.

With respect to the first matter in his book, *Arms For Oblivion: Chapters from a Heretic's Life*, i.e., Angus’s seditious sentiments against the Crown; he says, “Grandmother Angus, ... brought me up on the sentimental Highland Jacobite traditions. Her ancestor had fought at Culloden for Prince Charles [i.e., the descendant of James II]. He must have been a remarkable fellow ... . No one was more indoctrinated into the Stuart tradition” i.e., in favour of the Papist Stuart King, James II (Regnal Years: 1685-8), “than I was.” In some tricky terminology, he then first says, “but I have since repented of any Stuart sympathies,” i.e., indicating that he no longer supports the Papist James II and his descendants; but then he finishes the sentence this way, “and regret that

---

<sup>33</sup> “Samuel Angus,” *Wikipedia* (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Samuel\_Angus, June 09).

<sup>34</sup> Angus, S., *Arms For Oblivion: Chapters from a Heretic's Life*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 1943. (Copy at Sydney University, Fisher Library Call no. A 828.91.)

Mary of Scots and Charles I were the only Stuarts to be beheaded. Well had it been ... if every Stuart had been led at an early age to the executioner's block<sup>35</sup>.”

Thus Angus's final position is that he thinks “every Stuart,” not just “Charles I” (Regnal Years: 1625-1649), should have been “beheaded” at “the executioner's block” i.e., he is against the union of Scotland with England and Ireland under James I. Angus thus stated a seditious sentiment in which he would like to have set aside the sixth commandment, “Thou shalt not kill” (Exod. 20:13), and have seen murdered, King James I (Regnal Years: 1603-1625) of the King James Bible, Charles II (Regnal Years: King *de jure* of the three kingdoms, 1649-1685; King *de facto* of Scotland, 1649-1650/1; King *de facto* of England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1660-1685), Mary II whose marriage to William III facilitated the accession to the throne of William of Orange, and the last Stuart, Anne (Regnal Years 1702-1714).

This means that Angus set his face against the Biblical teaching opposing “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:20,21) and requiring that we “Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17). This teaching was historically found in the solemn services of state offices in the Anglican prayer book from 1662 to 1859. I.e., *Papists' Conspiracy Day* (5 Nov.) upheld King James I against Papists in the Gunpowder Treason Plot of 1605, and King William III against the Papist Jacobites; and *King Charles the Martyr's Day* (30 Jan) and *Royal Oak Day* (29 May) upheld Charles I and Charles II respectively, against the English Puritan republic revolutionaries. Yet Angus's regicidal desires would have, if he could have, murdered all of these, not just Charles I!

What saith the Word of God? Hear what St. Paul saith: “Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; ... seditions, ... murders, ... and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (Gal. 5:19-21). Hear also what St. John the Divine saith, “murderers ... shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone” (Rev. 21:8).

*Ib) Angus in denial of the Apostles' Creed.* The *Apostles' Creed* is found among Christians of the holy Protestant faith e.g., in historic Anglicanism (*Book of Common Prayer*, 1662), Lutheranism (*Luther's Short Catechism*, 1529), and Presbyterianism. Bearing in mind that Angus was a Presbyterian, with regard to the latter, I note that this Creed is found in the Presbyterian *Shorter Catechism* as approved by the Scottish Parliament at Edinburgh in 24 Charles I, Session 19 (1648 A.D.)<sup>36</sup>. While the *Apostles' Creed* is not a sufficiently detailed statement of the Christian faith to stand by itself, it nevertheless covers a number of the fundamentals of the faith. To deny its Biblical teachings is to attack broad fundamentals of the Christian faith, as historically taught and upheld in the holy Protestant faith.

---

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

<sup>36</sup> Neither Anglicans nor Lutherans have ever agreed with the traditional Presbyterian view of the Creed's words, “he descended into hell.” But I shall not now discuss that view, nor other erroneous views, such as the “limbo” view.

After joining the *Church of England Boys' Society* (C.E.B.S., pronounced, "Sebs"), at the age of 10 in June 1970 at All Saints' Greensborough, Melbourne, an Evangelical Anglican Church in the Diocese of Melbourne, I recall that one night we were all lined up on the hall wall. The C.E.B.S. leader made reference to the teaching of I Cor. 12:3, "no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost" (I Cor. 12:3), and "if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved" (Rom.10:9). He then went along the line, asking each boy if they believed in Jesus as "Lord." I recall one before me saying "Yes," and the CEBS leader saying something like, "Then you are saved." Another boy before me was uncertain, and the CEBS leader simply let it go, saying that it was not compulsory to say, "Yes." When he came to me, at the age of 10, I made this public profession in Christ, saying, "Yes," and he replied something like, "Then you are saved." He then moved onto the other boys in the line.

The meaning of "Jesus" as Lord," was further developed by CEBS in the usage of the *Apostles' Creed*, Article 2 of which includes after the "I believe" of Article 1, "in Jesus Christ ... our Lord." I first learnt this creed as a boy, and recited it at the age of 12 as a requirement for being "an Esquire" member in the *Church of England Boys' Society*<sup>37</sup>; and I again gave my allegiance to it when at the age of 20 I was Confirmed by the Anglican Bishop of Parramatta, Sydney. Beyond being a Biblically sound and useful statement of the Christian faith *so far as it goes*, I have additionally found it to be a useful creed when dealing with heresies of both religious liberals and various cults.

Let us now consider the second matter in his book, *Arms For Oblivion: Chapters from a Heretic's Life*, namely, Angus's heretical denial of the Articles of the *Apostles' Creed*. In broad terms, the heretic Sam Angus was a religious liberal, who did not believe in miracles. If there are, as Angus claimed, no miracles, then e.g., there can be no virgin birth of Christ (Isa. 7:14; Matt. 1:18-25; Luke 1:26-35). This is thus e.g., a denial of Article 3 of the *Apostles' Creed*, which says that Christ "was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary."

By contrast, Angus claimed that "with each repetition of a miracle story more miraculous embellishment were added," till we get the Biblical stories which posed "not

---

<sup>37</sup> I became an "Esquire" (boys 12 to 15), at St. Philip's Eastwood (Sydney), having first been "a Page" there (after moving back to Sydney from Melbourne in late 1970). Though membership entry of both Pages and Esquires required the recitation of the *Lord's Prayer*, recitation of the *Apostles' Creed* was not required before Esquires. (Curnow, K. & Hudson, B.P.G, *The Page Handbook of the Church of England Boys' Society*, Published by the National Council of the Church of England Boys' Society in Australia, 1963 & 1967, p. 4 – my admission on 7 June 1970 & p. 11, my recitation of the *Lord's Prayer* on 24 July 1970; and *The Esquire Handbook of the Church of England Boys' Society*, Published by the National Council of the Church of England Boys' Society in Australia, 1968, p. 5, my recitation of the *Lord's Prayer* and *Apostles' Creed* on 24 March 1972, and the 1662 prayer book form of these at p. 10).

merely physical but moral difficulties in some of the miracles, such as the destruction of the Gadarene swine with Jesus consent<sup>38</sup> i.e., he regarded Jesus' actions in having so many swine killed to pose "moral difficulties." In part, this thus simultaneously attacks the Trinitarian teaching of the sinless human nature of Christ, as being the same as that of the first Adam *before* the Fall (II Cor. 5:21; Heb. 4:15; 7:26; I Peter 1:19; I John 3:5)<sup>39</sup>.

Angus here moves beyond sedition against the Crown of human monarchs, *supra*, to direct sedition against the Divine Crown of King Christ, who says, "Every beast of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills. I know all the fowls of the mountains: and the wild beasts of the field are mine." "The world is mine, and the fullness thereof" (Ps. 50:10-12). Angus was thus broadly against all miracles<sup>40</sup>, and since this requires a clear setting aside of the Word of God as inspired by God through the Holy Ghost (II Tim. 3:16; II Peter 1:21); he thus unmistakably set aside Article 9 of the *Apostles' Creed*, "I believe in the Holy Ghost"<sup>41</sup>."

In his book, *Arms For Oblivion: Chapters from a Heretic's Life*, Angus then specifically denied the death, descent into hell, and bodily resurrection of Christ. Of course, if there is no death of Christ, it follows that there can be no atonement of Christ either, for "without" the "shedding of blood" there "is no remission" of sins (Heb. 9:22)<sup>42</sup>. Angus here tells of how he first started "doubting ... the corporeal resurrection and the empty tomb, and dismissing the angels and the women" of the resurrection accounts in the Gospels. Then in time, he came to the view "that Jesus resurrection was not the reanimation from the grave of a body which could be touched and bear the marks of wounds and eat with his followers as of old, nor even a recall by God of his spirit from the underworld of the dead." Thus speaking of "Christ," Angus says, "I realized that he was never dead and a visitor in the lower world for three days or any portion of them – the reputed thirty-six hours of his descent into hell. Not for one moment, much less thirty-six hours, was he dead or under the power of death." Christ, Angus claims, "was ... not ... in the lower regions, nor [did he go] to preach to the spirits in prison"<sup>43</sup>."

<sup>38</sup> Angus, S., *Arms For Oblivion: Chapters from a Heretic's Life*, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

<sup>39</sup> Thus Christ was "perfect man" (*Athanasian Creed*).

<sup>40</sup> Angus, S., *Arms For Oblivion: Chapters from a Heretic's Life*, *op. cit.*, pp. 100-102, entitled, "Questionings in the New Testament."

<sup>41</sup> For, "I believe in the Holy Ghost, ... who spake by the prophets" (*Nicene Creed*).

<sup>42</sup> Thus Christ "suffered for our salvation" (*Athanasian Creed*). It was "for us men, and for our salvation" that he "came down from heaven, and was incarnate ..., and was crucified ... for us under Pontius Pilate. He suffered and was buried." (*Nicene Creed*).

<sup>43</sup> Angus, S., *Arms For Oblivion: Chapters from a Heretic's Life*, *op. cit.*, pp. 102-103.

Thus for Angus, there could be no triumphal march of Christ through hell in which he preached to the spirits in prison, in which the Lord of heaven and Lord of hell went as jail keeper through the pits of hell, telling them that their doom was now well and truly sealed (Eph. 4:9,10; Col. 2:15; I Peter 3:18-20). This type of thing by Angus is a clear denial of e.g., Ps. 16:10, “For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption” (Ps. 16:10); or the preaching of the holy Apostle, St. Peter, on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2:29-32). Angus’s views here are clearly contrary to Articles 4 & 5 of the *Apostles’ Creed*, which state Christ, “suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried, he descended into hell” (Article 4), and “the third day he rose again from the dead” (Article 5.).

During the Church Fathers’ Era, the orthodox defended the Trinity against the Apollinarian heretics (named after Apollinarius of Laodicea, d. 392), who denied the humanity of Christ by claiming that in Christ the Logos (Divinity, John 1:1) took the place of the human soul, i.e., claiming that Christ was not a true man consisting of body and soul / spirit (Gen. 2:7; Ps. 139:14-16; Matt. 10:28). Thus Apollinarius was an antichrist (one of “many,” I John 2:18,) who “confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” (I John 4:3). The Apollinarians were routed by the orthodox, who used Christ’s descent into hell to prove that his humanity consisted of “flesh” (body) and a “soul” (Ps. 16:9,10; Acts 2:26,27). I.e., Christ clearly had a soul; for we read that God “wilt not leave” his “soul in hell” (Acts 2:27), not his “body” or “Divinity (Logos)” in hell. *Therefore he must have had a soul that was distinct from both his human body and his Divinity, whose motion went into hell.* In celebration and recognition of this important victory for Trinitarian orthodoxy, the words, “he descended into hell” were in time incorporated into the *Apostles’ Creed* (a creed named after, not written by, the Apostles)<sup>44</sup>.

Christ’s spirit first went to the Father (Luke 23:46) and then descended into hell (Acts 2:26,27). Since Christ was, on inclusive reckoning, three days in the “belly of hell” as prophetically typed by Jonah in the whale (Jonah 2:2; Matt. 12:40), his spirit / soul must have gone down into hell on the Good Friday i.e., Friday = Day 1; Saturday = Day 2, Sunday = Day 3. But Angus’s attack on what he calls “the reputed thirty-six hours of his descent into hell” is too precise in time terms, since e.g., Christ’s soul may have been less than an hour in heaven, or some hours in heaven, before his soul descended into hell on the night of Good Friday. More importantly though, since the words of the *Apostles’ Creed*, “he descended into hell” relate to Ps. 16:9,10; Acts 2:26,27, with Christ’s soul first descending into hell, and then rejoining his body so that God did not “suffer” his “Holy One to see corruption” i.e., “corruption” of the body (Ps. 16:10; Acts 2:27), this means that the *Apostles’ Creed* here contextually teaches *the bodily resurrection* of Christ in the words of Article 5, “the third day he rose again from the dead,” and *bodily ascension* of Christ in the words of Article 6, “he ascended into heaven.” This is thus a contextual proof relevant to Articles 8 and 12 of the Creed, i.e., “

---

<sup>44</sup> So too, these words are found in the *Athanasian Creed* (a creed named after, not written by, Athanasius).

... he shall come to judge the quick and the dead” (Article 8), and “I believe in ...” “the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting” (Article 12).

Angus also violates the Third Commandment by committing blasphemy (Exod. 20:7; Col. 3:8; I Tim. 1:13; II Tim. 3:2). E.g., he utters horrible words I shall not hear repeat (Eph. 5:12) in his denial of the Matthean account “of the dead in the graveyards around Jerusalem rising up from their tombs and” going into “the city” (Matt. 27:52,53)<sup>45</sup>. Of course, if there was no bodily resurrection of Christ, nor could there be a bodily ascension, and thus Angus denied what he called, “Jesus ... reputed miracles, ... particularly the stories of the empty tomb and the physical resurrection and the bodily ascension<sup>46</sup>.” In denying Christ’s bodily Ascension (Acts 1:9-11), Angus thus further denied Article 6 of the *Apostles’ Creed*, “he ascended into heaven.” I do not say that this is the end of Angus’s heresies, but merely a sample of them.

In his book, *Arms For Oblivion: Chapters from a Heretic’s Life*, in addition to committing blasphemy, Angus thus clearly denied Articles 4, 5 & 6 of the *Apostles’ Creed*. What saith the Word of God? Hear what St. Paul saith: “Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; ...heresies ... and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (Gal. 5:19-21).

*1c) Angus in attack on race based nationalism.* We now come to the third matter in his book, *Arms For Oblivion: Chapters from a Heretic’s Life*, namely, Angus’s vicious attack upon the Biblical definition of a nation. While it is true that the gospel is racially universal (Gal. 3:28), such Scriptures are not to be confused with the Biblical teaching of racial segregation and nations. For while God “hath made of,” or from, “one blood all nations,” they are no longer of “one blood,” but rather, under God’s law, are to be in set in their “bounds of” “habitation” (Acts. 17:26) i.e., racial segregation (Acts 21:17ff).

The Bible clearly teaches race based nationalism, in which one’s racial family is one’s nation (Gen. 10; 12:3; Acts 3:25; Gal. 3:8)<sup>47</sup>. At maximum stretch, this allowed countries like Canada, New Zealand, or Australia, to have a white Japhethite / Caucasian / Aryan racial and cultural identity, while requiring something inside of these boundaries in Aryan / Japhethite lands of Europe. During Angus’s life, the *White Australia Policy* was firmly in place, as was section 127 of the Australian Constitution which recognized

---

<sup>45</sup> Angus, S., *Arms For Oblivion: Chapters from a Heretic’s Life*, *op. cit.*, p. 104 (I shall spare the reader of some other horrid blasphemy uttered by this evil man).

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 100.

<sup>47</sup> See e.g., Knox, D.B., *Not By Bread Alone*, Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, 1989, chapter “Race;” & Payne, T. *et unum* (Editors), *D. Broughton Knox Selected Works*, Volume III, The Christian Life, Matthias Media, Sydney, Australia, 2006, Part 3, “The Christian in Society,” chapter 12, “Race.”

that the pre-Australian aboriginal inhabitants, (while citizens of the state or territory in which they lived,) were not citizens of Australia, whose origins date from 1788.

Yet in this context, in which the race based nationalism of a white Christian Australia was firmly in place, Angus helped to start the process of Babelism (both racial and religious). He thus attacked the nation at a foundational point, even as he had attacked the church at a foundational point (Ps. 11:3). Angus made himself one of them “that call evil good, and good evil: that put darkness for light, and light for darkness: that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter” (Isa. 5:20), as he wickedly referred to the “unethical White Australia policy<sup>48</sup>.” His rhetoric of trying to equate any form of race based nationalism with Nazism and “the Hitlerian ethics<sup>49</sup>,” anticipated later post World War II propaganda to this effect, which was then used to brainwash the moronic masses, and semi-intellectuals of the universities, media, etc. . Suffice to say, Angus was clearly one of those dirty “bastards” condemned in Holy Writ (Heb. 12:8). *Long may he burn in hell!*

**\*B) Sam Angus of Sydney University: the big heretic.**

**2) Some lives hurt by Angus’s heresies: Four case studies.**

It has been a surprise to me, how a number of people in Sydney have all, quite unexpectedly, told me stories about Sam Angus. These stories have always been one of two types. Either they have been about someone whose religious faith was destroyed by Sam Angus or one of his followers (Case Study 1); or of how as a consequence of their religious convictions in favour of orthodoxy, someone was driven out of a Presbyterian Church of Australia (PCA) under a Sam Angus influenced minister (Case Studies 2, 3, & 4). To give the reader an idea of this, I shall recount four case studies.

*Case Study 1: Sir Garfield Barwick.* Sir Garfield (1903-1997) was a Commonwealth of Australia Attorney-General in the Menzies Government and then a Chief Justice of the High Court of Australia. Sir Garfield Barwick maintained a commitment to Christian morals in the law - manifested in e.g., legislation under him when he was Commonwealth Attorney-General, but he lacked any spiritual faith. E.g., in a letter I sent to him on 22 Oct. 1996, I said, among other things, “... The philosopher said, ‘Evil triumphs when good men stand back,’ and it seems to me a great pity that good men such as yourself and Sir Robert Menzies no longer have the influence they once did in The Liberal Party. Of course, while you and I are in general agreement on the desirability of a nexus between Christian morality and the law, you would not agree with me on my spiritual-religious belief, since I see an underpinning spiritual battle behind the whole thing, with God desiring that the people learn basic Decalogue morality and ideas such as restraint, offering ‘the forgiveness of sins’ (*Nicene & Apostle’s Creeds*) to those who with faith in Christ repent; and the Devil seeking to lead people into sin.

---

<sup>48</sup> Angus, S., *Arms For Oblivion: Chapters from a Heretic’s Life, op. cit.*, pp. 219.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 221.

Nevertheless, we are both agreed on the benefit to society of e.g., family values, and the destructive impact of libertinism, which is increasingly masked in political discourse behind the name of so called 'rights' ... .”

In a recorded interview I did with Sir Garfield in 1991, it was he who first told me about Sam Angus. He said, “My own personal background was that I had been brought up in a Wesleyan household - at least my mother was a Wesleyan and I had been sent to Sunday School and I became quite a good student of the Bible, and on top of that in my university days I was secretary of the Christian Student Movement and I, at that time when Dr. Sam Angus [was there,] he was a great Presbyterian heretic ... , and it was with him I did quite a good deal of study of the New Testament and New Testament origins.” Sir Garfield then recounted how, as a consequence of this, “I became more skeptical of things on the theological side, though always tremendously wedded to the social values and standards of the Christian ethic and I maintain those now<sup>50</sup>.”

In unrecorded conversation with Sir Garfield, he told me of how he no longer had any belief in the spiritual or supernatural i.e., he had become an atheist. In his autobiography, *A Radical Tory* (1995), published some four to five years later, he also refers to Angus. In the front of a copy of this book he wrote to me, “To Gavin, I hope you’ll find my book interesting particularly about mat[rimonial] causes and racial matters. Garfield Barwick 27/11/95.” Here he tells of how growing up in the Sydney suburb of “Burwood the family joined the congregation of Burwood Methodist Church, and my brother and I attended its very active Sunday School.” He further says, “My Leaving Certificate results gained me a bursary [scholarship] tenable at Sydney University which paid my fees.” Here Sir Garfield studied such subjects as e.g., English, History, Latin, and Law. At the University of Sydney, he says, “I became active in the Student Christian Movement and joined in critical studies of the basics of the Christian religion. This brought me into touch with ... Dr. Sam Angus of the Presbyterian Church. Dr. Angus was a Greek scholar ... and a clergyman with radical ideas whom many in his church regarded as a heretic. ... From him I learnt much of the history of the development of the gospels, and over time I became less convinced of the theology of the Christian Church, as did others ... . But of the validity of the Christian ethic I remained and still remain unreservedly convinced<sup>51</sup>.”

I saw Sir Garfield on a number of occasions in his Sydney Office, although I also saw him at his residence (designed for retirees, he had his own nurse), and elsewhere. Sir Garfield’s Sydney Office, like the place of his residence, was surrounded with a good deal of secrecy. Even now, I dare not disclose the relevant addresses. Upon going to a certain floor of a building in the Central Business District of Sydney, one would see an unmarked door that looked something like a broom cupboard. Upon opening it, one

---

<sup>50</sup> INTERVIEW WITH SIR GARFIELD BARWICK and Gavin Basil MCGRATH on Tuesday 12 February 1991 at SYDNEY. Transcript as modified and approved by Sir Garfield.

<sup>51</sup> Sir Garfield Barwick’s *A Radical Tory*, *op. cit.*, pp. 9,11-12.

would go down a long dark corridor with light at the end, and upon reaching this one would encounter Sir Garfield's Secretary. Inside a further door Sir Garfield sat behind an office desk.

Sir Garfield had had a lot of skin cancers removed from his forehead, which correspondingly gave his forehead something of a plastic look. In his old age, Sir Garfield's eyesight was very poor, and we had a security and clarification arrangement that whenever I saw him I would say my name before anything else e.g., upon entering his Office, (even though his Secretary would first tell him I was there,) I would say, "It's Gavin McGrath here, Sir Garfield." Sir Garfield used to say that when he saw me he could see a shadow so he knew someone was there, but he could not see well enough to identify someone. (Hence his handwriting to me in the front of his autobiography, *supra*, is not as neat as it would have been if he had possessed good eyesight.) But his mind was still sharp, for when I met him on one occasion in the 1990s at the funeral of a mutual friend of ours (which I had earlier advised him of), at St. Martin's Anglican Church, Killara (Sydney), he darted with great speed down the aisle and outside. Given his poor eyesight, I was quite surprised. But he had used the feel of the pews with his left hand to guide him, and his ability to detect a person's presence as a shadow to avoid hitting anyone. This was quite a feat!

Thus I remember Sir Garfield as a short man who was physically scarred on the forehead, and who had very poor eyesight. As Commonwealth Attorney-General and then Chief Justice in the High Court of Australia, Sir Garfield had held the highest legal and judicial offices in the land. But as a tender, young, and impressionable Sydney University schoolman, Sir Garfield had been spiritually mauled and clawed by Sam Angus, and Sir Garfield bore the horrible scars of that spiritual assault for the rest of his life. Angus had plucked out one of Sir Garfield's spiritual eyes, and so badly damaged the other, that all he could see of value in Christianity was its Biblically based morals.

On the one hand, we see in Sir Garfield Barwick a man who in his day, wielded great political power with Sir Robert Menzies, whom he told me did have a spiritual belief in God, and indeed "was a very strong Presbyterian<sup>52</sup>." A man who used this power to uphold Biblical Christian morals in law and society. Sir Garfield did not agree with Angus's anti-racist views, and indeed upheld the White Australia Policy when he was Attorney-General; and he also used the law to restrain such wickedness and vice as pornography, abortion, sodomy, easy divorce, etc. . He then proceeded to the High Court of Australia, where he became its Chief Justice. But on the other hand, Sir Garfield was a man whose spiritual belief in God and Christian theology had been ruined by the heretic, Sam Angus. Angus had given him an inaccurate religiously liberal slant on the Bible's composition, and he sadly kept that with him for the rest of his life, with

---

<sup>52</sup> INTERVIEW WITH SIR GARFIELD BARWICK and Gavin Basil MCGRATH on Tuesday 12 February 1991 at SYDNEY. Transcript as modified and approved by Sir Garfield.

the effect that it totally destroyed his belief in the supernatural world and spirituality. *Now in contemplating Angus' destructive heresies here, I ask, "How wicked is that?"*

*Case Study 2: Condell Park PCA.*

Before considering this Case Study 2, it is important to understand Angus's denial of man's sinfulness, and associated need for Christ's atonement i.e., the fact that Christ died in our place for our sins (Rom. 5:6,8; 6:10), "to redeem" us (Gal. 4:5), so that "we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace" (Eph. 1:7). Angus denied the words of St. John the Baptist spoken at the start of Christ's public ministry, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1:29). Angus denied the words of Christ spoken during his 3½ year public ministry, that he "came" "to give his life a ransom for many" (Matt. 20:28). And Angus denied the words of Christ spoken near the end of his public ministry with regard to the symbolism in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, for Christ says, "this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sin" (Matt. 26:28).

As already noted, *supra*, in *Arms For Oblivion: Chapters from a Heretic's Life* (1943), Angus specifically denied the death, descent into hell, and bodily resurrection of Christ; and if there is no death of Christ, it follows that there can be no atonement of Christ either, for "without" the "shedding of blood" there "is no remission" of sins (Heb. 9:22). Angus himself evidently drew this conclusion, thus denying that Christ "suffered for our salvation" (*Athanasian Creed*). This is stated in his book, *Essential Christianity* (1939), which in harmony with his admission in the title of his other work we have considered, should be understood as "Christianity" viewed from "a heretic's" perspective.

Angus denies man's state as a sinner, for in Eph. 2:3, St. Paul says the unsaved are "by nature the children of wrath." Rather, Angus says, "If we were 'by nature the children of wrath' ... our case would be hopeless." But instead, "There are resident in our personalities ... the divine within us<sup>53</sup>." Thus Angus concludes, "one of the lasting defects of ..., classical Christologies since Paul's day is that they have been built ... on a theory of redemption ... ." Thus he says, "The truth of the Atonement ... consists in recognition that the Atonement was ... the supreme illustration of the moral order, convincing us that the sacrificial life, ... is the highest life for ... [Jesus'] followers<sup>54</sup>." I.e., he claims the meaning of "Atonement" is that Jesus lived a "sacrificial life" and so should we. Thus with regard to the Biblical Christian doctrine of atonement, Angus claims, "it is morally impossible [any] longer to believe in the ... conception of the 'wrath of God,' or to hold to a God who could not or would not forgive sins apart from a blood sacrifice or a propitiation or the action of a third party<sup>55</sup>." Hence Angus

---

<sup>53</sup> Angus, S., *Essential Christianity*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney & London, 1939, p. 25.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 103,110,112.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 24.

heretically claimed, “Jesus is” “not” a “mediator” “in the ... sense of making expiation or sacrificial propitiation or substitution<sup>56</sup>.”

At this point, Angus also denies the connection between Articles 4, 7, & 11 of the *Apostles’ Creed*. These say that Christ, “suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried” (Article 4), “sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty” (Article 7), and we have “the forgiveness of sins” (Article 11).

That is because Christ is “mediator of the new testament” “by means of death, for the redemption of” “transgressions” (Heb. 9:15); and so related to Christ’s atonement, he “is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens” (Heb. 8:1); where “he ever liveth to make intercession for” us (Heb. 7:25; cf. 1:3; 7:21-8:1). Thus “when he had by himself purged our sins,” he “sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high” (Heb. 1:3). “Christ died for the ungodly,” so that “while we yet sinners, Christ died for us” (Rom. 5:6,8). “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). “Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: We have such an high priest who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens” (Heb. 8:1).

With these thoughts in mind, we now come to *Case Study 2*.

This story was given to me by an independent Baptist Minister, Brian Wenham, who uses the Authorized Version of 1611, and indeed his entire church is an AV only church. He told me in 2009 of the origins of his church at Condell Park (Sydney), and he then sent me their official history. This states that in 1938 a Reverend Mr. McAllister, who had been “a student of Samuel Angus, Professor of New Testament at the United faculty of Theology in Sydney whose teaching involved denial of such truths as the Deity of Christ, the inerrancy and authority of the Scripture, the virgin birth, the bodily resurrection of Christ, the miracles, substitution atonement, and many others,” arrived at Condell Park *Presbyterian Church of Australia* (PCA). “Conflict occurred between many members of the congregation and Rev. McAllister over his teachings” and some “administrative issues.” In June 1938 the “conflict came to a head,” when “during the morning service,” “Rev. McAllister” said “something like ‘I don’t know why Jesus had to die for me: I’m not a sinner’.” I.e., this was a denial of sin and the corresponding need for a Saviour, and typical “Angus Minister” denial of Christ’s atoning death. I.e., the heretical claim: *no death* of Christ, *no atonement*, because *no sin* (I John 1:7-10).

The PCA Elders at Condell Park then walked out, and established an independent church called “Condell Park Gospel Mission<sup>57</sup>.” The matter was also reported in the

---

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 147.

<sup>57</sup> Conversation with Church Minister, Brian Wenham (b. 1933), June 2009; and official history of his church that he emailed to me that month, entitled, “Condell Park Bible Church (formerly The People’s Church) (formerly Condell Park Gospel Mission).”

*Sydney Morning Herald* newspaper<sup>58</sup>. On the one hand I do not want to white-wash Condell Park Bible Church, since it too has developed some serious theological problems<sup>59</sup>. But on the other hand, it has taken a stand against religious liberalism, and indeed its foundations grew out of opposition to religious liberalism as found in a PCA Angus influenced Minister. *Now in contemplating Angus' destructive heresies here, I ask, "How wicked is that?"*

*Case Study 3: Denis Shelton, a Presbyterian Elder and co-founder of the Presbyterian Reformed Church of Australia.* I first met Denis as a Teaching Elder of the *Presbyterian Reformed Church (PRC)* at Epping in Sydney, Australia. Denis uses the *King James Version* of 1611 both in the pulpit and in his private use, but sadly, many others in the PRC use the *New King James Version*. The *Presbyterian Reformed Church of Australia*, of which Denis was one of two co-founders, separated from the *Presbyterian Church of Australia (PCA)* in 1967 partly due to the rise of religious liberalism and apostasy in the latter church, although additional reasons are also found in the fact that the PRC has made some changes to the historic Presbyterian *Westminster Confession*. A former secondary school teacher, Denis also became a tertiary College teacher at PRC's *John Knox Theological College* at Peakhurst in Sydney, where he has now been the College Principal for over 20 years, lecturing in Old Testament, New Testament, and Pastoral Theology. Biblical Apocalyptic was included within this orbit of subjects, and Denis built up an extensive personal library including historicist works which he started collecting when a teenager.

I have spoken to Denis on a number of occasions. E.g., on one occasion, some years ago now, when I was speaking to Denis at his Epping home, I recounted to him the

---

<sup>58</sup> "Presbyterian Dispute. Condell Park Church. 'Opposition' Services," *Sydney Morning Herald* (newspaper), 27 July, 1938. This newspaper report which says "several members of the church committee walked out of the church during the morning service," records that "Mr. A.J. McAllister was appointed in February" to the PCA Church. It says, "The Committee previously appointed the preachers each Sunday. With the advent of Mr. McAllister, ... clashes have occurred between him and the committee over a number of matters." The newspaper is focused on clashes over "the appointment of preachers," and does not specifically itemize the substance of the main concern. The article also says, "Mr McAllister's supporters said ... that for a number of years the church had been in charge of persons of various denominations, including only a small percentage of Presbyterians." This helps to explain why the Condell Park Bible Church which grew out of this incident is a Wesleyan Arminian Baptist Church; but it does not invalidate the fact that the fundamental concern behind their departure was not a denominational issue, but an issue of opposing the religiously liberal and heretical Angus teachings denying sin and atonement, as taught and promulgated by McAllister.

<sup>59</sup> These include: 1) sexually permissive views towards racially mixed marriages (Gen. 6:1-3,9; Dan. 2:43,44; Matt. 24:37-39); 2) a denial of the validity of infant baptism (Matt. 19:14; Acts 2:39; I Cor. 1:16; 10:1,2); and 3) an adoption of Wesleyan Arminianism (Rom. 9-11; Eph. 1 & 2).

story of Sir Garfield Barwick, *supra*, and he said he had always found the Angus influenced Ministers in PCA basically the same i.e., they were religiously liberal in spiritual areas, but generally considered Christian morals to be beneficial to society.

On some other occasions, Denis advised me of the following. He was brought up at St. Margaret's PCA<sup>60</sup>, Turrumurra (Sydney)<sup>61</sup>. The Minister at St. Margaret's was a religious liberal, Ernest Vines, known as "Ernie" Vines (also referred to in *Case Study 4, infra*). Vines was what Denis called "an Angus man," i.e., trained under Angus in his College days, who denied the Biblical miracles, e.g., he denied the bodily resurrection of Christ, and considered that Christianity simply meant one should, "Love God and neighbour, and do good."

Denis (b. 1939), recalled how as a young man at Sydney University in 1957, a friend of his, Harold Skinner, had been converted; and everybody Denis knew, all of whom were unconverted, commented on how Skinner had become "strange." At a youth camp in June 1957, Denis had been asked to preach at Blackheath PCA by its Minister, Eric Robson. As he thought about sermon material, he asked his converted friend, Harold Skinner, if he had any ideas? Harold turned to him and said, "Denis, are you a Christian? What is your relationship to the Lord Jesus Christ?" The Bible verse was used, "Commit thy way unto the Lord" (Ps. 37:5), and Denis says he was "flawed." He could suddenly see that he was a sinner and needed a Saviour. He was, he testifies, then and there converted to a lively faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Erstwhile, back at Blackheath PCA, the religiously liberal Minister, Eric Robson, was awaiting Denis's arrival to preach. To the great surprise, and indeed shock, of both Robson and Vines, Denis preached on, "Ye must be born again" (John 3:7). Denis says,

---

<sup>60</sup> Margaret of Scotland (1045-1093), was the sister of Edgar Aetheling, a short-term uncrowned Anglo-Saxon king of England. Elizabeth married Malcolm III, King of the Scots, to become Queen of the Scots. Her life was marked by Christian charity, including the fact that she personally served orphans and the poor with daily food, before eating herself (Matt. 25:37,40). She is remembered in Presbyterian Scotland with e.g., the *Queen Margaret University* (1875), *Queen Margaret College*, Glasgow, or *Queen Margaret Hospital* (near Dunfermline). Other Presbyterian Churches dedicated to the honour of God and in special memory of Margaret of Scotland, include e.g., St. Margaret's Presbyterian Church, Blaxland (in the Blue Mountains, c. 35 miles or c. 60 kilometres west of Sydney).

<sup>61</sup> St. Margaret's PCA, Turrumurra no longer exists. In 1977 with the formation of the Uniting Church of Australia (drawn from PCA, Methodist, and Congregationalist Churches), St. Margaret's Presbyterian Church, Turrumurra, Trinity Methodist Church, Turrumurra, and St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, South Turrumurra, were combined to become the one congregation of South Turrumurra Uniting Church. In 2006 there was a later redivision into South Turrumurra Uniting Church and St. Andrew's Uniting Church, Turrumurra.

“Ernie Vines was knocked for six!<sup>62</sup>,” and asked him, “What’s it all about?” On the one hand, Vines did not like it, and was not moved by Denis’s testimony to conversion himself. But on the other hand, Denis testifies that Vines did not try to dissuade him, nor persecute him for his new found faith.

Denis was at Sydney University where he was studying to become a school teacher, undertaking a Bachelor of Science degree (B.Sc.) and a Diploma of Education at the connected Sydney Teachers’ College. But due to illness, he failed some subjects in 1957. The New South Wales *Department of Education* said that if he did an ex-university course for one year at Sydney Teachers’ College, he could still become a teacher, and Denis accepted this offer. Thus he is an old student of Sydney University, but not a graduate of Sydney University. Denis then became a school teacher at rural Condoblin (western-central NSW) from 1959 to 1963. He then studied for the Presbyterian Ministry with PCA at the United Theological Faculty, St. Andrew’s College, Sydney University, where after four years he was “Licensed” (this was not a degree granting College) as a PCA Minister, and required to undertake two further university subjects at the University of New England, Armidale (north-eastern NSW). Ordained to the PCA Ministry in 1967, Denis Shelton then became the Minister at St. Andrew’s Warren (western-central NSW).

At this same time, in the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand (PCNZ), a religiously liberal heretic who was the Principal of John Knox (Presbyterian) College, at Dunedin, Lloyd Geering (b. 1918), denied the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ. He stated this heresy in print both before (“The Resurrection of Jesus,” *Outlook*, the PCNZ Periodical, 1966<sup>63</sup>) and after (“Resurrection,” 1971) his heresy trial 1967. E.g., referring to what Geering called, “the traditional conception of the resurrection of Jesus, a view often known as ‘bodily resurrection,’ which ... has dominated Christian tradition for about eighteen centuries,” Geering claimed, “it is no longer possible to defend on historical grounds a view of the resurrection of Jesus which necessitates an empty tomb and a restoration of the dead body of Jesus to some form of physical life<sup>64</sup>.”

The 1967 PCNZ ridiculously refused to convict Geering of heresy. Denis Shelton considered that this typified wider problems of religious liberalism in the PCA. In early 1968, he and Grahame Kerr formed the first Presbyterian Reformed Church of

---

<sup>62</sup> The colloquialism, “knocked for six,” comes from the game of cricket, where if a ball is hit so hard as to go out of bounds (“an out of boundser”), then the player scores six points and does not have to run, while the ball is retrieved (or a new one supplied). Thus “knocked *for six*” is a metaphor meaning “knocked *hard*” or “hit hard.”

<sup>63</sup> Ward, R.S., *The Bush Still Burns*, The Presbyterian & Reformed Faith in Australia 1788-1988, p. 406; on PRC see also pp. 405, 409-412. (The author, Rowland Ward, wrote as a PCEA Minister.)

<sup>64</sup> Geering, L., *Resurrection*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, England, UK, 1971, p. 60.

Australia (PRC) presbytery, while Denis was still a PCA Minister. As the Minister of St. Andrew's PCA, Warren, Denis had the Warren PCA Session send a motion to the May 1968 PCA State Assembly of NSW, meeting some months after the inaugural PRC presbytery had been formed. This PCA motion stated that in view of the Geering controversy in the PCNZ, the PCA State Assembly of NSW wished to confirm the truthfulness of the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ<sup>65</sup>. But the PCA State Assembly of NSW refused to pass this motion.

Denis says that while there was no specific connection between Lloyd Geering of PCNZ and Sam Angus of PCA, that the reason why this motion failed was because of the Angus influenced PCA Ministers in the Assembly. I.e., even though Angus (d. 1943) had been dead for about 25 years in 1968, he had used his position at the PCA's United Theological Faculty to drop the poison pill of religious liberalism to generations of PCA Ministers. Denis said he could "count" the "Angus" Ministers on this vote (and he also mentioned that Angus denied the Divinity of Jesus Christ in the book, "Essential Christianity," *infra*).

Denis says that was then it. He could no longer stay in a church like the Presbyterian Church of Australia (PCA) which due to Angus's influence, refused to affirm the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ. He said that he and Grahame Kerr (d. 1988, aged 60)<sup>66</sup>, the two co-founders of Presbyterian Reformed Church of Australia

---

<sup>65</sup> In discussing this matter with me, Denis Shelton only mentioned, and put the stress on, this issue of the bodily resurrection of Christ. But in some associated paper work he mailed to me, some other issues were also mentioned. See *Minutes of Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Australia in New South Wales*, Held in Sydney, May, 1968, 103rd Annual Session, Ambassador Press, Sydney, 1968, pp. 64-65 (section 100 Complaint by Rev. Shelton), p. 189 (s. 154 re: Warren Session), pp. 210-211 (Complaint of Rev. Denis Shelton on Sunday School materials), p. 215 ("Session of St. Andrew's, Warren" on Geering's "heresy trial in the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand in 1967").

<sup>66</sup> A. Grahame Kerr (1928-1988), ordained in 1959, was the PCA Minister of Sutherland (Sydney). This PCA Session together with over 80 members of the congregation formally left the PCA in December 1967, and together with Denis Shelton formed the nucleus of the then fledgling PRC. (Denis Shelton's, "A Narrative of Separation from an apostate denomination in Australia," *Sword & Trowel*, July-Aug, 1981, the paper of Metropolitan Baptist Tabernacle, London, England). Both men made "Headlines" in local newspapers. "Presbyterians in 'breakaway' form church," *Leader* (Local Newspaper, 172-174 Forest Rd., Hurstville), No. 8, Vol. 26, Wed. 3 Jan. 1968 p. 1 (on Kerr); & "Minister Quits Over Dispute With Hierarchy," *Daily Liberal & Macquarie Advocate* (Local Newspaper, 23 Church St., Dubbo), No. 93, Vol. 113, Thurs. 13 June, 1968, p. 1 (on Shelton). Kerr retired due to ill health in 1977, and he was subsequently excommunicated from the PRC in the 1980s. He had made what Denis says the PRC considered were "unfounded accusations" about the PRC and its Elders at Sutherland (Denis Shelton's email to me, 30 June 2009), and so was essentially excommunicated for violations of the 9th commandment, "Thou shalt not bear false witness" (Exod. 20:16).

(PRC), then worked to build up the PRC which they had co-founded earlier that year<sup>67</sup>. The PRC has now grown with over one and a half dozen congregations in: New South Wales (Epping in Sydney; Sutherland in Sydney; St. George in Sydney; Bathurst; Gosford; Lithgow / Bathurst / Orange; Wagga Wagga; and Wollongong); the Australian Capital Territory (Canberra); Queensland (Brisbane South; Everton Park; & Toowoomba); South Australia (Adelaide); Victoria (Melbourne & Wangaratta); outside of Australia in New Zealand (Avondale in Auckland); and the Pacific Islands of Vanuatu and Fiji.

On the one hand I do not want to white-wash the PRC, since it too has some serious theological problems<sup>68</sup> e.g., Denis and I have debated the Establishment

---

<sup>67</sup> Denis Shelton was always a Minister or Teaching Elder in the PRC. He was a PRC Minister at Brisbane, Queensland (1968-1975), Peakhurst in Sydney (1976-1986), and Epping in Sydney (1986-1993). He then retired and became a PRC Minister or Teaching Elder “without charge and unavailable for a call,” although he accepted election by the Epping PRC congregation to be an Elder of their Session. While Minister of PRC Brisbane, he clashed with Geering when Geering came to preach at PCA Aspley in Brisbane (“Uproar over Presbyterian Theological Professor in Brisbane,” *The Rock*, A religious newspaper, Box 17 P.O. Glebe, N.S.W., 2037, Vol. 26, No. 4, New Series, Thurs. 11 June, 1970).

<sup>68</sup> Bad modifications made by the PRC to the Westminster Confession (WC), include: 1) sexually permissive views that repealed part of WC 24:4 so as to allow, e.g., the very type of incest that Henry VIII broke with Rome over (Mark 6:18). (This attack on the English / Anglican Reformation includes an attack on the legitimacy of Elizabeth I.) 2) Altering WC 28:2 so that it reads, “In baptism ... crossing ... causes it to be no sacrament, for it was void of all such inventions devised by men,” thus claiming Anglican baptisms are “void” because they use “crossing” i.e., the sign of the cross. (While Puritans historically opposed the sign of the cross at baptism, this level of anti-Anglican sentiment is historically more common among the pro-Cromwell English Puritans, than among either the Scottish or Irish Puritans. This section also applies to the Romanists, and indeed by false implication thereby depicts Anglicans as “Romish.” But since e.g., both Luther and Calvin were baptized as infants by Roman Catholic priests, this crazy PRC section would mean that they both died unbaptized.) 3) Removal of the Establishment Principle (see next footnote). These three changes to the WC seem to represent some kind of accommodation, or compromise with, or influence by, their fellow Puritans who are Congregationalists and Baptists. Thus the PRC incest views and opposition to the Establishment Principle is the same as that in the Congregationalist’s *Savoy Declaration* of 1658 (21; 24; 25:4) and *Baptist Confession* of 1689 (21; 24; 25:4). And the PRC view on baptism is a half-way house with the Baptists, i.e., on the one hand, agreeing with Baptists that Anglican and Roman Catholic baptisms are “no sacrament;” but on the other hand, disagreeing with Baptists on the validity (PRC) or invalidity (Baptists) of e.g., Presbyterian and Congregationalist infant baptisms. Certainly on all these issues they have repudiated the teachings of historic *Westminster Confession* Presbyterianism. Of course, these type of changes may possibly also include a factor of “Presbyterian politicking” i.e., after leaving PCA, providing a “justification” for the

Principle<sup>69</sup>. But on the other hand, PRC has taken a stand against the religious liberalism in the PCA associated with men like Angus and others. So here we have a former school teacher, who became a PCA Minister, and then left the PCA to join with another man and form the PRC due to the rise of religious liberalism in the PCA, which was a manifestation of the Sam Angus influence on Angus influenced Ministers. *Now in contemplating Angus' destructive heresies here, I ask, "How wicked is that?"*

*Case Study 4: Alex Neil, a Presbyterian Elder.*

Before considering this *Case Study 4*, it is important to understand Angus's denial of the Deity of Christ and Holy Trinity. As already noted, *supra*, the official history of the Condell Bible Church states that "Angus ... teaching involved denial of such truths as the Deity of Christ" (*Case Study 2*), and Denis Shelton mentioned to me that Angus

---

establishment of PRC, as opposed to joining a pre-existing Presbyterian Church in Australia, e.g., the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia (PCEA) (as occurred with Alex Neil in *Case Study 4, infra*).

<sup>69</sup> This is a third bad modifications made by the PRC to the Westminster Confession (WC), their repeal of various parts of WC 20:4; 23:3; 31:2-5; so as to deny the Establishment Principle. E.g., talking to Denis in June 2009, I referred to Ps. 2:10-12 and Isa. 49:23, and the Queen of Australia, Elizabeth II (Regnal Years: since 1952), because of the Established *Church of England*, being *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* and *Defender of the Faith*. But Denis said he was against this, saying that "Defender of the Faith" was "a Papist title," because it was first given to Henry VIII by the Pope. I replied that it had thereafter evolved to acquire a Protestant connotation, which is the meaning that I support. Denis then referred to the *Church of Scotland* Disruption and associated 1843 formation of the *Free Church of Scotland* under Thomas Chalmers, which he connected with the appointment of bad ministers because the C. of S. was Established. I replied that Chalmers still supported the Establishment Principle, but wanted it in a doctrinally sound church. I.e., Chalmers opposed abuses under the Establishment Principle in the C. of S., but not the Establishment Principle itself. I then referred to how the Establishment Principle in the C. of E. was an important component in getting rid of the Papist King, James II (Regnal years 1685-8), since his voidable office of king was declared void because he did not meet his requirements as Supreme Governor of the C. of E. and C. of I., by e.g., swearing allegiance to the 39 Articles. Denis replied he could see no difference between James II who did not subscribe to the 39 Articles, and Charles I and Charles II whom he said did not believe in the 39 Articles. We were unable to agree in our assessments of the two Caroline kings. While I would make certain criticisms of both Charles I and Charles II, I would be more moderate in my tone and substance than would Denis. Once again, I distinguish between abuses that may and have occurred under the Establishment Principle, and the Establishment Principle itself. I.e., due to sin many things have been abused e.g., the sacraments, but I still uphold them in a Biblical manner; and this also is my view of the Establishment Principle. By contrast, the PRC view resembles more that of the historic Congregationalists and Baptists, than historic Presbyterianism.

denied the Divinity of Jesus Christ in his book, “Essential Christianity” (*Case Study 3*). Denis Shelton further said to me, that Angus taught that Christ was simply “a good man.” I have also already observed that Angus claimed, “There are resident in our personalities ... the divine within us<sup>70</sup>” (*Case Study 2*), *supra*.

Since reference is made in this Case Study 4 to the Three Creeds: Apostles’, Athanasian, and Nicene, and the English version I use is that of the 1662 Anglican prayer book, a word of explanation with respect to some terms is also first required<sup>71</sup>. Specifically, “only Son” of the *Apostles’ Creed*, or “only begotten Son of God” of the *Nicene Creed*, and “The Son is of the Father ... begotten” in the *Athanasian Creed*; and also the terminology of being “begotten before” the “worlds” in, “begotten of his Father before all worlds” in the *Nicene Creed*, and “God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds” in the *Athanasian Creed*. That is because to understand the form used in the Anglican prayer book requires a prior reference to both the Latin and Greek forms of the *Nicene Creed*; and stemming from this, some more general understanding of the Latin as compared and contrasted with the Greek of the New Testament.

In the Greek New Testament, the terminology of “the only begotten” for “the only begotten Son” in John 1:14,18; 3:16,18; I John 4:9, is from the root Greek word, *monogenēs*. This does not refer to the quite separate, though also important truth, that Christ is begotten of the Father from the dead (Ps. 2:7; Acts 13:33). Rather, it refers to the eternal relationship of the Father and the Son, for like God the Father (and God the Holy Ghost,) God the Son is “from everlasting” (Micah 5:2). It is a Divine Attribute that “God” is “from everlasting” (Ps. 90:2). As taught by e.g., John 1:1, the Son has eternal pre-existence with the Father. Thus he is “begotten” (*monogenēs*) from eternity i.e., he has always been God the Son, and God the Father has always been God the Father. Thus when we look at the Greek form of the *Nicene Creed*, we find it reads, “the only begotten (*monogene*, masculine singular accusative adjective, from *monogenēs*) Son of God, begotten of [his<sup>72</sup>] Father before (*pro*) all (*panton*) eternity (*ton aionon*)” i.e., “eternally begotten.”

However, in the Latin Vulgate New Testament, the terminology of “the only” for “the only Son” is from the root Latin word, *unigena* in John 1:14, or *unigenitus* in John 1:18; 3:16,18; I John 4:9. This may be rendered into English as “only” or “only begotten.” One of these two meanings i.e., “only,” can also be rendered by the Latin, *unicus*, and this is the root Latin word in the *Apostles’ Creed* that “Jesus Christ” is God the Father’s “only Son,” which is Latin, “*Filium (Son) eius (his) unicum (only)*.” Furthermore, in the Latin form of the *Nicene Creed*, we find that it reads, “*unigenitum*

---

<sup>70</sup> Angus, S., *Essential Christianity*, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

<sup>71</sup> The “I believe” of e.g., the *Nicene Creed* is Greek, *pisteuo* or Latin, *Credo*, and hence the term, “creed” is derived from the Latin, *credo*.

<sup>72</sup> Literally, “the.”

(masculine singular accusative adjective, from *unigenitus*)” i.e., “the only” or “the only begotten Son of God, begotten of [his<sup>73</sup>] Father before (*ante*) all (*omnia*) worlds (*saecula*).”

Thus in this context, the Latin derived term, “only (*unigenitum*) Son” (John 3:16, Vulgate & St. Gregory<sup>74</sup>) or “*Filium* (Son) ... *unicum* (only)” (*Apostles’ Creed*), has the same meaning as the Greek or Latin derived terminology, “only begotten (Greek, *monogenē*; Latin *unigenitum*) Son. And so too, the Latin derived terminology, “before (*ante*) all (*omnia*) worlds (*saecula*),” has the same meaning as the Greek terminology, “before (*pro*) all (*panton*) eternity (*ton aionon*)” i.e., “eternally.” Hence the *Apostles’ Creed*, which is derived from the Latin, reads, “I believe in God the Father Almighty, ... and in Jesus Christ his *only Son* our Lord;” but the meaning here of “only Son,” is the same as the terminology in the Greek and Latin derived *Nicene Creed* which refers to the “only begotten Son.” Moreover, the Latin derived terminology, “before all worlds” in the *Nicene & Athanasian Creeds*, means “before all eternity” i.e., “eternally<sup>75</sup>.” Hence e.g., the statement of the *Apostles’ Creed* that “Jesus Christ” is God the Father’s “only Son,” requires belief in the Deity of Christ as begotten from eternity, which is thus the contextual meaning of “Lord,” in the words, “his only Son our Lord.”

By contrast, for Angus, it is this “divine within us” that matters, for “Christian character does not seem to be determined or shaped by the acceptance of ... an infallible Book ...<sup>76</sup>.” I.e., Angus denied that “the Holy Ghost ... spake by the prophets” (*Nicene*

---

<sup>73</sup> Literally, “the.”

<sup>74</sup> St. Gregory the Great in: Migne (Latin Writers Series) (1849 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 76, p. 1287 (Latin).

<sup>75</sup> The 1662 prayer book *Nicene Creed* is rendered from the later Western Latin form, rather than the earlier Greek form. Although it is very largely derived from the creeds of the Councils of Nicea (325) and Constantinople (381), the *Nicene Creed* is named after, not written by, the *Council of Nicea* (325). E.g., in both their Greek and Latin forms, the *Nicene Creed* reads, “I believe” (Greek, *pisteuo* or Latin, *Credo*), whereas the antecedent creeds of Nicea and Constantinople used, “We believe (Greek, *pisteuomen*; if translated into Latin, *credimus*),” as they were statements of faith by those (plural) present at the councils. The Greek form, “*pisteuo* (I believe)” was used for the Creed of the *Council of Nicea* (325) by Eutyches (a prominent monophysitist heretic, d. 456) in 449 A.D. (Tanner, N.P., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, Steed & Ward, London, UK and Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., USA, 1990, Vol. 1, p. 4). Since the Reformation Anglican basis for the acceptance of all three creeds is that “they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture” (Article 9, 39 Articles), the usage of the later Latin form is perfectly proper since it is Biblically correct. Thus unlike the Greek form, the Latin and English Anglican forms include the words, “God of God,” Latin, “*Deum de Deo*” (found in the earlier Creed of Nicea, 325), as well as, “and the Son,” Latin, “*Filioque*.”

<sup>76</sup> Angus, S., *Essential Christianity*, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

*Creed*), and denied the *sola Scriptura* (Scripture alone) of the Reformation Motto (II Tim. 3:16; II Peter 1:21). He thus also denied Article 9 of the *Apostles' Creed*, "I believe in the Holy Ghost."

Years ago, I heard an Arian heretic in the Jehovah's Witnesses cult say that when his wife would go out shopping and see something she liked, she would say, "Oh! It's divine" i.e., meaning, "Oh! It's simply wonderful." The Jehovah's Witness heretic then claimed that this was the meaning of Christ's Divinity in John 1:1, i.e., he claimed it meant St. John was saying Christ "was simply wonderful."

Though Angus does not specifically use the words, "simply wonderful" to define the meaning of "Divine" with respect to Christ, nevertheless, at this point, Angus's Arian view of Christ's "Divinity" seems to be basically the same as this Jehovah's Witnesses' Arian view. Given that Presbyterians sometimes refer to the compilers of the *Westminster Confession* as "the Westminster Divines," meaning, "The Westminster Theologians," (this terminology is also used of "St. John the Divine" as the writer of the Book of Revelation i.e., meaning "St. John the Theologian,") it is also possible that with reference to Christ, Angus sometimes used the term to mean he was a "Theologian." If so, and it must be stressed that this possibility is *purely conjectural*, then Angus must have limited such usage of "Jesus the Divine" to oral contexts. That is because such a meaning does not emerge in his written works that I have examined, since in these works the meaning of "Divine" is this Jehovah's Witness idea of Christ being "simply wonderful."

While Angus was prepared to sometimes use the terminology of "Jesus ... Divine Sonship," he did so in the wider context of "our Divine Sonship." He discusses some of these ideas in a chapter entitled, "The Filial Consciousness or Our Divine Sonship"<sup>77</sup>. Angus's basic idea is that there was some kind of *spark of Divinity* (meaning something like, "the simply wonderful") in Christ, just like there is some kind of *spark of Divinity* (meaning something like, "the simply wonderful") in us; and so like Christ, we need to discover "the divine within us"<sup>78</sup>, (meaning something like, "discover the simply wonderful within us"). While this "Divine Sonship" i.e., meaning something like "simply wonderful sonship," includes within it a component of recognizing God, it is the Arian's God rather than the Trinitarian's God that Angus then points men to.

Angus's confusingly misleading usage of the terminology "Jesus ... Divine Sonship," in which Angus took orthodox sounding terminology, and gave it an unorthodox meaning; was replicated in his usage of some other terminology. He was prepared to take the terminology of John 1:18, and say, "The God of Jesus is not a God who has only one son, though he has only one Son 'in the bosom of the Father' in whom all the sons of God contemplate their high calling"<sup>79</sup>. I.e., while Angus regarded Jesus

---

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 140-149.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 25.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 145.

from an Arian perspective as a normal sinful man, because he was *the Christian leader* there was a sense in which he *was a little bit better* and “the only or unique Son of God in that in his filial relation to God he alone lived ever in awareness and realized the fullness of divine Sonship<sup>80</sup>.”

Thus when it suited his deceitful purposes, Angus could make what sounded like an orthodox statement, by saying that he believed in “the Divine Sonship of Jesus.” And he could *go even further* in this deception, by saying, “he is the only one Son ‘in the bosom of the Father’,” or even “the only or unique Son of God.” But all this was simply a ruse to throw the unwary off, and cloak his true purposes in order to more effectively deceive them and try to lead them into Trinitarian heresy and other heresy. That is because, what Angus meant by these words, “the Divine Sonship of Jesus,” i.e., something like, “the simply wonderful sonship of Jesus,” and what he meant by “the only one Son ‘in the bosom of the Father’,” or “the only or unique Son of God,” was that Jesus recognized his divinity whereas those around him failed to recognize their divinity. *But on Angus’ view we can “correct” that by following Jesus in “recognizing our divinity” i.e. also being simply wonderful ourselves.* This type of thing is clearly quite different to the Biblical and orthodox meaning of these words. *Put simply, Angus was an Arian heretic who denied the Deity of Christ and the Holy Trinity; but he used trick terminology with esoteric hidden meanings, only usually known to his foolish followers, which deceitfully made him sound orthodox when it so suited him.*

Thus his *modus operandi* including the taking of orthodox terminology or orthodox sounding terminology, and giving it an unorthodox meaning. This allowed him and his minions to skirt around difficulties that he or they might otherwise encounter, such as the possibility for Angus of a heresy trial, *infra.* *Put simply, Angus was an Arian heretic, but he was not always “a straight shooter.” He would deviously conceal his Arianism behind orthodox sounding terminology when it suited him to do so, and then push his Arian views when he thought he could get away with it.*

In his chapter, “The Filial Consciousness or Our Divine Sonship,” e.g., Angus claims “Jesus’ consciousness of his sonship was primarily moral, nor metaphysical.” He claims, “It would be an exiguous gospel which declared Jesus is God’s only Son;” and thus “essential Christianity for his followers is the religion of their divine sonship,” because “the deterrent formulae, ‘his only Son’ came later and not from Jesus<sup>81</sup>.” Angus’s usage here of the Latin derived form, “his only Son” rather than the Greek or Latin derived form, “his only begotten Son,” means he is very specifically attacking the terminology of the *Apostles’ Creed*, i.e., “I believe in God the Father Almighty, ... and in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord” (Articles 1 & 2), found in e.g., the Presbyterian *Shorter Catechism* (1648 A.D.). This Presbyterian College Theologian is thus very specifically attacking the confessional standards of Presbyterianism in particular, in his wider attack on Christianity in general.

---

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 143; cf. p. 109.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 141-143.

Angus's claims are contrary to e.g., Christ's high priestly prayer of John 17. It is also a denial of the Biblical teaching that since from eternity the Second Person has *always* been the Son of the First Person, he is, as taught in the *Nicene & Athanasian Creeds*, thus *neither made nor created, but begotten from eternity* (Micah 5:2; John 1:1,14, 3:16-18; 1 John 4:9). It is a fundamental attack on the words of e.g., John 3:16, which contrary to the claims of Angus were spoken by Jesus himself, that he is the "only begotten Son." Thus it is a heretical attack on the associated usage of "only Son" in Article 2 of the *Apostles' Creed, supra*.

Angus claims, "Jesus himself gives no sign that he knows any metaphysical sonship; [and] appeals to no pre-temporal source of revelation<sup>82</sup>." In the first place, this shows a faulty view of Scripture, since "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God" (II Tim., 3:16), not just the words that Jesus spoke in the Gospels. Thus we believe something because it is said in Scripture, not only if it is recorded as said by the lips of Jesus during his earthly Ministry. In the second place, it is factually wrong with respect to what Christ actually did say in the Gospel. E.g., the words of Jesus, "Before Abraham was, I am" (John 8:58); and "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was" (John 17:5). It is a denial of the words of Christ, "he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God" (John 3:18).

Angus quotes approvingly of Caird, who claimed, "Christ is divine *just because* he is the most human of men ... he is the ideal or typical man ... the attempts of theology to raise Christ above the condition of human life, and to give him a metaphysical ... greatness of another kind, really end in lowering him and depriving him of his true position ...<sup>83</sup>." Thus for Angus, "divine" is a play-word that he uses, to mean something like, "wonderful;" and to claim any "metaphysical" or spiritual sense in which he is "divine" is "depriving him of his true position." I.e., he regards Christ as a good man, well worth imitating, but just a man, like any other sinful, fallen man. This is clearly a fundamental denial of Christ's Deity and the Holy Trinity.

Therefore Angus's usage of the term, "Jesus ... Divine Sonship," is certainly not the Biblical teaching of Christ's Divinity. Angus clearly denies the orthodox teachings of the Trinity. E.g., he claims, "the doctrine of the Trinity" was derived from a combination of "the New Testament doctrines of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit," which together "with other less useful material, was worked into the later dualistic doctrine of Trinitarianism<sup>84</sup>." Hence he claims, "another deflecting factor in determining historically what is essential Christianity is the undue reliance on ... ecumenical councils." He refers specifically to e.g., the "Council" held at "Constantinople" in "381"

---

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 143; quoting E. Caird's *Evolution of Religion*, II, p. 232f.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 106.

(condemning the Apollinarian heresy that denied Christ had a soul and was fully human; condemning the Macedonian heresy which denied the full Divinity of the Holy Ghost; and reaffirming the anti-Arian Creed from the Council of Nicea, 325); the “Council of Ephesus in 431” (condemning the Nestorian and Pelagian heresies), and “the Council of Chalcedon in 451” (condemning the Apollinarian, Nestorian, and Monophysitist heresies; & upholding the orthodox teaching that Christ is fully God and fully man).

With great blasphemy, the heretic Angus says, “It is difficult to understand how any one familiar with what happened at the Ecumenical Councils can consider that their decisions have much moral or spiritual value. The Council of Ephesus in 431, ... and the Council of Chalcedon in 451, were all almost equally farcical ... .” I shall spare the good Christian reader of too much detail since his claims are deeply offensive and blasphemous, e.g., he claims that these two Trinitarian councils exhibited “the activity of the spirit of the devil<sup>85</sup>.” With regard to the Council of Nicea (condemning the Arian heresy, 325), in addition to some shocking blasphemies not fit for publication, the heretic Angus further says, “One weakness in the authority of ... the first Ecumenical Council, that of Nicea,” was that in it “the catholic and apostolic church of God anathematizes’ those who ... held other even Scriptural views than those of the majority<sup>86</sup>.” I.e., he considers the Arian heresy to be “Scriptural.”

Thus we cannot doubt that Angus denied Article 2 of the *Apostles’ Creed*, “I believe” “... in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord.” That is because to call Christ “Lord” in the Biblical sense (I Cor. 8:6; 12:3), requires a recognition of Christ’s Divinity as the Second Divine Person of the Holy Trinity (John 1:1-3; 5:17,18; 10:30); and hence St. Thomas says to Christ, “My Lord and my God” (John. 20:28). So too the *Nicene Creed* says, “I believe in ... one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten before all worlds [i.e., ‘eternally begotten,’], God of God, ... very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance [i.e., ‘one Being’] with the Father ... .”

---

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 40-1.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 43-4. I here “spare the good Christian reader” and deem certain things “not fit for publication.” I would caution the good Christian against reading these types of works unless he is: strong and knowledgeable in the faith; of more mature years; and required to do so by some necessity. E.g., I here do so both in order to expose his heresies and state orthodox truth (I Cor. 11:19), and also in connection with the particular point that unorthodox persons may be involved of the processes of Divine Preservation (Rom. 3:1,2; 11:29), which in this respect are different to the processes of Divine Inspiration in which only the orthodox wrote the verbally inspired books of the Bible. Hence I recommend that if anyone cites works of heretics, that he only isolates what is necessary for the more general reader / listener to know, i.e., sanitizing the evil work for his presentation purposes, for “it is a shame even to speak of” some of “those things” that are said in the dark pages of such works (Eph. 5:12). I find reading the works of deranged men like Geering or Angus to be very painful indeed; and I would spare as many as possible from such pain, lies, blasphemy, and horror.

And the matter is further dealt with in that most excellent Confession of the Christian Faith known as the *Athanasian Creed*.

E.g., drawing on the authority of Gal. 5:20,21, that those in “heresies” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God,” and that non-believers or “unbelievers” “shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone” (Rev. 21:8; cf. Mark 16:16; Eph. 2:12), the *Athanasian Creed’s* damnatory clauses are Biblically sound in their condemnation of heretics and unbelievers alike. This is relevant to the condemnation of a heretic like Angus, who on authority of Scripture is bound in the bonds of anathema, and declared to be damned.

Among other things, the *Athanasian Creed* says, “Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold the catholick [‘catholic’ = ‘universal’] faith. Which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled: without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. And the catholic faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in unity; neither confounding the Persons: nor dividing the substance ... . The Father is made of none: neither created, nor begotten. The Son is of the Father alone: not made, nor created, but begotten ... . Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation: that he also believe rightly the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the right faith is, that we believe and confess: that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man; God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds [‘before the worlds’ = ‘from eternity’]: and man, of the substance of his mother, born in the world: perfect God, and perfect man: of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting; equal to the Father, as touching his Godhead... one; not by conversion of the Godhead [‘the Godhead’ = ‘Divinity’] into flesh: but by the taking of the manhood [‘manhood’ = ‘humanity’] into God ... . For as the reasonable soul and flesh [‘flesh’ = ‘body’] is one man: so God and man is one Christ; who suffered for our salvation: descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead. He ascended into heaven, he sitteth on the right hand of the Father, God Almighty: from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies: and shall give account for their own works. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting: and they that have done evil into everlasting fire. This is the catholick faith: which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved. Glory be to the Father, and to the Son: and to the Holy Ghost; as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen<sup>87</sup>.”

With these thoughts in mind, we now come to *Case Study 4*. Alex Neil is a Free Presbyterian Elder in the *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia* (PCEA). The PCEA is the Australian derivative of the *Free Church of Scotland*, whose first Moderator (1843), was Thomas Chalmers (1780-1847). Thomas Chalmers is more generally remembered beyond Free Presbyterianism as a well known old earth creationist who advocated the Gap School i.e., the belief that between the first two verses of Genesis,

---

<sup>87</sup> Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), the *Quicumque Vult* for usage at Morning Prayer upon certain feast days. The usage of the *Gloria Patri* (Glory be to the Father” etc.,) at the end of the Creed is an Anglican tradition.

God created (Gen. 1:1) a succession of multiple “worlds” (Heb. 1:2; 11:3) spanning many “generations” (Gen. 2:4). Different Bible translations are used in the PCEA, although St. George’s PCEA in the Central Business District of Sydney remains an AV Church. Alex is a strong AV man, and he uses only the Authorized Version of 1611.

Gordon Alexander Neil (b. 24 May 1929), known as Alex Neil, is a good example of those who gained entry to Sydney University in the days when a fairly large number of scholarships were available for earmarked degrees with a bonded government job; in his case, he gained a New South Wales Government *Department of Education* scholarship with a subsequent 5 year bonded job as a school teacher<sup>88</sup>. He was thus educated at the prestigious Sydney University from 1946-1949, graduating with a Bachelor of Arts degree and a Diploma of Education. In 1951 he was a geography teacher (junior demonstrator) at Sydney Teacher’s College. Alex then moved into school teaching from 1952 to 1969, ending this career as an Acting Deputy Principal at Westfield High School (later renamed, Westfield Sports’ High School) in western Sydney.

Alex married his wife, Flora, in 1976. She had been a white Christian missionary nurse to the coloured people of India for fourteen years till 1975. He had one child, a son, John. Unhappy with certain changes in the New South Wales State Education Department, he thereafter started a second career in the Registrar’s Office of Sydney University, where he rose to be an Executive Assistant by the time of his retirement at 60 in 1989.

Alex’s Christian background was as a member of the *Presbyterian Church of Australia* (PCA). This is the federal body that unites various state churches e.g., the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales or the Presbyterian Church of Tasmania. Hence in conversations with him, he sometimes refers to his time in the PCA as his time in the “*Presbyterian Church of New South Wales.*” He was a Ruling Elder in St. John’s PCA Narrandera (south-central NSW). He moved back to Sydney in 1957 where he attended St. Andrew’s North Strathfield PCA (Sydney), where he was also a Ruling Elder.

Alex was aware of the issue of religious liberalism in the PCA, and specifically knew about the now deceased Sam Angus. He had a general concern that the PCA was not prepared to discipline religious liberals like Sam Angus and other who did not adhere to Scripture as the Divinely inspired and authoritative Word of God. Alex decided he had to take a stand on the authority of the Bible, and on what as a Presbyterian he saw as his associated belief in the Westminster Confession. He therefore resigned as both a Ruling Elder, and a member of, the PCA.

---

<sup>88</sup> Before proceeding to Sydney University, Alex was educated at NSW State Schools: Taree Primary School (until 1939) (central east NSW, north of Newcastle), Penrith (western Sydney) Primary & Intermediate High School (1940,1941-3), and his final two years (then called “4<sup>th</sup>” & “5<sup>th</sup>” years) at Parramatta High School (1944-45). (Years later, I procured the *NSW Teacher’s Certificate* while on a 1-2 term block at Parramatta High School in western Sydney.)

Alex then joined the congregation of St. George's *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia* (PCEA), in the central business district of Sydney<sup>89</sup>. This is a Free Presbyterian Church. Alex there became a deacon. He then moved out to the Hawkesbury-Nepean Congregation of PCEA in the western suburbs of Sydney, where he again became a Ruling Elder<sup>90</sup>. A resident of Penrith (Western Sydney), he is also a longstanding adult Sabbath School teacher at this PCEA church. Indeed, he has been a Sabbath School teacher since the age of 23, originally with the PCA.

The *Presbyterian Church of Australia* is derived from the *Church of Scotland*; whereas the *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia* is a Free Presbyterian Church founded in 1846, derived from the *Free Church of Scotland*, which broke from the *Church of Scotland* in 1843. Thus when Alex left the PCA, the PCEA was a pre-existing Church that had earlier left the same basic church. When Alex sought membership of the PCEA, having left the PCA over his belief in the authority of the Bible and his commitment to the Westminster Confession, the PCEA extended to him the right-hand of fellowship.

Thus Alex Neil is a Presbyterian who as a PCA Elder left the PCA for another Presbyterian Church in which he once again become an Elder. Notwithstanding any theological differences which I have with the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* or PCEA, I have known Alex Neil as a man who has a strong commitment to religiously conservative Reformed Protestantism. He believes in e.g., justification by faith, regeneration by the Holy Ghost, the authority of Scripture, the Received Text of Scripture, and the Protestant Reformation. He also exhibits personal qualities of Christian commitment and dedication e.g., Alex's work as an adult Sabbath (Sunday) School teacher. He is a graduate of Sydney University and at the time of his departure from PCA held a respectable middle class vocation as a school teacher.

*This is the type of man that any decent Presbyterian Church can ill afford to lose!* That the *Presbyterian Church of Australia* was prepared to lose such good men, for the price of retaining bad men such as Sam Angus and a host of religiously liberal Ministers, is a trade-off that I can only describe as "the folly of fools" (Prov. 14:8).

Though the *Sydney Morning Herald* Editorial and correspondence of December 1959 and January 1960 involving Ernie Vines and Alex's brother, Douglas, *infra*,

---

<sup>89</sup> St. George (martyred early 4th century) is the national (motif) saint of England. The St. George's Cross (a red + shape on a white background), is found as one of three crosses on the Union Jack, in the top left corner of the Australian Flag and all six State Flags of Australia.

<sup>90</sup> Free Presbyterian Church at 115 Mt. Druitt Rd., Mt. Druitt (in Western Sydney), N.S.W., 2770. The stamps inside the Bibles of this church read, "Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia (commonly known as Free Presbyterian) Hawkesbury-Nepean Congregation."

transpired about six months after Alex left the PCA and joined the PCEA, the matters raised in this debate are antecedent to the time Alex so left the PCA. This is significant because whenever Alex Neil has spoken to me with respect to a specific and tangible example of what he means by the general departure of the PCA from the Bible and Westminster Confession, he has always focused on the fact that the PCA was prepared to tolerate men like Sam Angus and Ernie Vines who denied the Deity of Christ and Trinity. He has repeatedly said to me that he could not be a member of a church which like the PCA was not prepared to defend the doctrine of the Deity of Christ and the Trinity against such heretics as Sam Angus and Ernie Vines. Therefore let us now consider this Trinitarian matter more closely.

Alex's brother, Douglas (1927-1990), also had a PCA background. E.g., Alex mentioned a sermon he preached at St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church (PCA), Penrith around 1951<sup>91</sup>. It was drawn from the writings of the Anglican Archbishop, Richard Trench (1807-1886)<sup>92</sup>. The sermon was on Lazarus and Dives (Luke 16:19-31). Douglas Neil put a special emphasis on the teaching of "hell" (Luke 16:23) in this Parable, and the fact that, "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Luke 13:28) in hell. A religious liberal in the congregation, Bill Calander, afterwards told Douglas that he did not believe in hell. Calander's religiously liberal denial of hell is contrary to Article 4 of the *Apostles' Creed*, which says of Christ, "he descended into hell" (Ps. 16:10; Acts 2:27, 31; Eph. 4:9). The incident is important for showing a background by Douglas Neil in defending religiously conservative Protestant teaching, such as the reality of hell, about 8 or 9 years before the incident we will now consider in 1959-1960<sup>93</sup>.

About six months after Alex left the PCA for the PCEA, on Christmas Eve, 1959, the Editor of the *Sydney Morning Herald* wrote an Editorial entitled, "What Christmas means to the Christian." I regret that such a good Editorial as this would no longer be

---

<sup>91</sup> St. Andrew, the Apostle (e.g., Matt. 4:18-20; 10:2; John 6:8), is the national (motif) saint of Scotland, and this is thus a favourite name of many Presbyterian Churches. The St. Andrew's Cross (a white X shape on a blue background), is found as one of three crosses on the Union Jack, in the top left corner of the Australian Flag and all six State Flags of Australia.

<sup>92</sup> *Church of Ireland* Archbishop of Dublin, 1864-1884.

<sup>93</sup> As a young man living in Penrith (western Sydney) in the late 1940s and early 1950s, Alex (b. 1929) became friends with a couple of boys, the two youngest in the Calander family, Ron (b. c. 1932) and William (Bill) (b. c. 1929). Their father worked for the Post Master General's Department, and they had moved around Victoria and New South Wales. They had come to Penrith in Sydney from Cootamundra in New South Wales. Alex lost contact with them when he moved to Narrandera (south-central NSW), where he attended St. John's Church (PCA), named in memory of St. John, the beloved Apostle, who wrote the fourth Gospel *et al.* Just this year, Alex said Bill Calander contacted him for the first time in over 50 years. Alas, this now retired school teacher was still a spiritually dead man.

likely to appear in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, a newspaper which has long since greatly deteriorated in its moral and spiritual standards. I shall underline the key parts that are relevant.

Among other things, the Editor said, “Ninety per cent of the people of New South Wales claim to be Christian, although about two-thirds do very little about it in practice. How will Christmas be kept this year? That depends on what people really believe about Christianity. Certainly ... to the Christian it ... is essentially a religious festival ... . On the first Christmas Day, God the Son came into the world for us men and for our salvation ... . Its teaching is summed up in the word ‘incarnation,’ meaning ‘in the flesh,’ or clothed in flesh; and when Christians speak of the Incarnation of Jesus Christ they mean the clothing of the Son of God in flesh. That is to say, God assumed our human nature in the person of Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin Mary – altogether God and altogether man. Jesus is God. There is the heart of the Christian religion.” The Editor then refers to those who are, “So accustomed ... to pictures of Jesus as the babe lying in the manger, as a boy in a carpenter’s ship, and the great teacher and healer going about doing good, that” they “tend to think of him only as a human being, a good man,” when in fact, “He is God. He who from all eternity has reigned in the power and glory of heaven, the Almighty and eternal God who made us, came to live here on earth, ... our Redeemer. Jesus is God. That is the basic fact of Christianity summed up in the magnificent prelude to St. John’s Gospel, ‘In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God ... and the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us.’ [John 1:1,14, Authorized Version of 1611] He came to show us what God is like, and by his life, his death on the Cross, and his resurrection, to save man from sin. ‘So God loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, to the end that all that believe in him should not perish, but have everlasting life’ [John 3:16, Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662, The Communion Service]<sup>94</sup>.”

In response to this Editorial, the heretic Ernie Vines (also referred to in *Case Study 3, supra*.) wrote a Letter to the Editor. Once again, I shall underline some relevant parts. Vines, signed himself as “E.H. Vines, Presbyterian Minister” at “Dee Why” (Sydney), and identified himself as replying to “the writer of your leader [article] (‘Herald,’ December 24).” Among other things Vines said, “it should be pointed out that not all Christians share the view set forth in this leading article. There are many Christian who do not believe that Jesus is God. ... Surely at Christmas time there should be a more generous attitude than is expressed in the dogmatism of the leader writer. He is entitled to his point of view. Could he not at least suggest that other Christians hold other views?<sup>95</sup>”

Vines letter is here quite devious, since in holding himself out as a “Presbyterian Minister,” people would naturally enough think he was a Trinitarian, and in this capacity

---

<sup>94</sup> Editorial, “What Christmas Means to the Christian,” *Sydney Morning Herald*, Thursday 24 Dec. 1959.

<sup>95</sup> Vines, E.H., Letter to Editor, *Sydney Morning Herald*, Tuesday 29 Dec. 1959.

he was urging tolerance for anti-Trinitarians such as the Jehovah's Witnesses<sup>96</sup>. In fact, he was himself an anti-Trinitarian heretic who embraced the errors of Sam Angus's anti-Trinitarianism. Of course, even if he were a Trinitarian, what he is saying would still be very wrong. Hear what the Holy Ghost speaking through the Apostle, St. John saith, "For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist." "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds" (II John 7,9-11).

Several *Letters to the Editor* appeared on both the Christmas Eve Editorial and Vines letter<sup>97</sup>. One such letter came from Alex Neil's brother, Douglas (d. 1990 aged 63)<sup>98</sup>. Placed under the title, "Divinity of Christ," Alex's brother, Douglas Neil of Parkes (central NSW, west of Orange), said, "It is difficult to understand why the Rev. E.H Vines ('Herald,' Dec. 29) should question the views contained in your Christmas leader. Like all ordained ministers of the Presbyterian Church, Mr. Vines would have declared his belief in "The Westminster Confession of Faith" ... . The Confession states: 'The Son of God, the second Person in the Trinity, ... did ... take upon him man's nature ... . So that two whole, perfect, and distinct natures, the Godhead and the manhood,' are 'inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion. Which person is very God and very man, yet one Christ ...' (Chapter 8, Section 2). Any person believing this doctrine should commend your Christmas editorial and not suggest a more generous attitude to the views which others may hold<sup>99</sup>."

In discussing this matter, Alex Neil also referred to a heretical book written by Angus, entitled, *Truth and Tradition*<sup>100</sup>; and he showed me a book which records the fact

---

<sup>96</sup> See Anthony Hoekema's *The Four Major Cults*, Eerdmans, Michigan, 1963, pp. 223-326 (Jehovah's Witnesses), & Appendix D has more detail on Arianism (pp. 327-344).

<sup>97</sup> E.g., Reverend D.L. Rose of Hurstville, Reverend Brian Heawood of Old Guildford, and Reverend C. Baldwin of Northbridge all had *Letters to the Editor* published under the title, "Divinity of Christ," in which they upheld the Trinity, the latter two of which specifically repudiating Vines' heresy, in *Sydney Morning Herald*, Thursday 31 Dec. 1959. Or in opposition to Vines, the Trinity was also maintained by E.C.B. MacLaurin from the Department of Semitic Studies at Sydney University, in *Sydney Morning Herald*, Saturday 2 January, 1960.

<sup>98</sup> At the time, Douglas Neil was a Civil Engineer for the NSW Government Railways at Parkes.

<sup>99</sup> Neil, D.M., Letter to Editor, *Sydney Morning Herald*, Friday 1 Jan. 1960.

<sup>100</sup> Angus & Robertson, Sydney, Australia, 1934.

that in 1936, 79 PCA Ministers in Victoria signed a document stating that Angus's book, *Truth and Tradition* (1934), was a denial of the PCA's Confessional standards<sup>101</sup>. Though this matter to do with the *Sydney Morning Herald* Editorial and correspondence, *supra*, occurred about six months after Alex had left the PCA, he strongly links it with his departure from PCA. *Alex sees this antecedent issue which publicly manifested itself in a prominent Sydney newspaper about 6 months after he joined the PCEA, in which Ernie Vines argued for tolerance to Arian heretics, and so followed in the teachings of the heretic, Sam Angus who denied the Divinity of Jesus Christ, as manifesting the type of reasons why he had left the PCA. As a consequence of Alex's commitment to the authority of the Bible, he said that he could not be a member of a church such as PCA that would not defend the Deity of Christ and doctrine of the Trinity against heretics such as Sam Angus and Ernie Vines. Now in contemplating Angus's destructive heresies, and the fact that a PCA Elder felt compelled to leave the PCA for the PCEA because of his belief in the authority of the Bible (connected in his Presbyterian mind to upholding the Westminster Confession,) as being attacked in the PCA by men like Sam Angus and others following religiously liberal teachings, I ask, "How wicked is that?"*

*In overview of these four case studies, let the reader consider the effect of Angus's heresies, and the failure of the Presbyterian Church of Australia (PCA) to declare him a heretic, and seek to stop his promulgation of heresy. Untold numbers of peoples, of which a man who held the very highest legal and judicial offices in the land is but one example, had their faith in Christ and the gospel destroyed (Case Study 1). The Elders of the Condell Park PCA with a number of Sunday School teachers and other members of that congregation left the PCA to form an independent church (Case Study 2). Another PCA Minister left his PCA Church at Warren as one of two co-founders of a new Presbyterian denomination, the *Presbyterian Reformed Church of Australia* (PRC), which has now grown to more than one and half dozen congregations (Case Study 3). And yet another PCA Elder, left the PCA at North Strathfield to become an elder in a pre-existing Presbyterian Church, the *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia* (PCEA), as a consequence of the PCA's tolerance to this type of thing in general, and in doing so he knew about the specific issue of the heretic Angus. Shortly after he left, he was confirmed in his belief that he had done the right thing in leaving the PCA when a known PCA Angus Minister, Ernie Vines, argued for tolerance to Arian heretics in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, and Alex's brother, Douglas, wrote a letter disagreeing with this Angus Minister (Case Study 4).*

Though the PCA Church was split over what to do with Angus, his influence as a College teacher on numerous PCA Ministers gave him an undeserved sense of "loyalty" from many of them, who were themselves both tragically deceived, and went forth to tragically deceive others. In a 1934 PCA General Assembly, a motion to "proceed by judicial process" against Angus i.e., a heresy trial, was sadly defeated by a two-thirds (154 votes) to one-third (79 votes) vote. Furthermore, a motion was carried "accepting

---

<sup>101</sup> Harman, A., *et unum, Reaching Forward: From a Rich Heritage to a Certain Goal*, The Presbyterian Church of Victoria [the Victorian State Church in the PCA] 1859-2009, Printed by Burning Bush, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia, 2009, pp. 36-37.

Dr. Angus's assurance that he held the essential substance of the Church's faith," by a similar two-thirds (174) to one one-third (83 votes) vote<sup>102</sup>.

Of course, some of those so voting were possibly naïve and negligent persons, who may have been misled by the deceitful Angus's misleadingly crafted brief statements that he believed in "Jesus Divine Sonship," *supra*, without looking into the matter further, as they were duty bound to do. As already noted, Angus was prepared to use some orthodox sounding terminology, but give it an unorthodox meaning. When it suited him, Angus would say he believed in "Jesus Divine Sonship," by which he meant *Jesus was simply wonderful*; or even "the only or unique Son of God," by which he meant that *Jesus recognized his spark of divinity whereas those around him who had the same spark of divinity failed to recognize theirs*. Angus's deception in using this types of orthodox sounding terminology when it suited him, but giving it an unorthodox meaning *which he only explained to some*, reminds me of the type of deviousness we have come to associate with Jesuitry; although this technique of *saying one thing but meaning another* is also found among the cults<sup>103</sup>.

Ironically for the two-thirds of the PCA General Assembly members who voted in favour of him, Angus would ultimately pour some scorn, contempt, and ridicule upon

---

<sup>102</sup> "Assembly Win for Dr. Angus – Suspension Move Fails, Assurance Accepted on Faith of Church," *The Sun* (newspaper), Thursday 24 May, 1934.

<sup>103</sup> E.g., Joseph Smith's *Book of Mormon* makes Trinitarian sounding statements e.g., "Behold the Lamb of God, yea, even the Son of the Eternal Father" (1 Nephi 1:21), "By the manifestation of the Spirit of God ... I say ... Jesus Christ shall come, yea, the Son, the only begotten of the Father" (Alma 5:48). So too we find the Trinitarian formulae of words, "I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen" (3 Nephi 11:25). Then when it suits Smith, he drops a doubt about Trinitarian monotheism, referring to, "A time to come in the which nothing shall be withheld, whether there be one God or many gods, they shall be manifest" (*Doctrine & Covenants* 121:28). Then having introduced the doubt about monotheism, shortly later he introduces polytheism, "According to that which was ordained in the midst of the Council of the Eternal God of all other gods" (*Doctrine & Covenants* 121:32). His real teaching is that in the next life, Mormons shall "be gods," for "Then shall they be gods, because they have all power, and the angels are subject unto them" (*Doctrine & Covenants* 132:20). Thus Mormons wrongly think there will be a time when they "sit upon thrones, and are not angels but are gods" (*Doctrine & Covenants* 132:37). Nevertheless, when it suits their purposes, they can quote some orthodox sounding Trinitarian passages from the *Book of Mormon*. So too, Seventh-day Adventists will say they believe in "a closed canon of Scripture," which sounds very orthodox; but they then give this an unorthodox meaning so as to include Ellen White as a "prophetess," contrary to the Biblical teaching that the gift of prophesy existed only in Bible times (Dan. 9:24; Luke 11:49-51; 1 Cor. 13:8, NASB; Eph. 2:20; Rev.11:4).

them. That is because, in his book, *Arms For Oblivion: Chapters from a Heretic's Life* (1943), *supra*, he publicly paraded the fact that he was a “heretic” in the book’s title. Angus felt safe enough to do this, because a large number of PCA Ministers had been his former College students. Angus had most of them “in his pocket,” “under his hypnotic spell,” and he wanted “all the world” to know about it. So tight was this sinister figure’s mind-control over most of his former College students, (no doubt aided in this by the help of devils,) that even 25 years after his death in 1968, they were still known as “Angus Ministers” or “Angus men;” and “an Angus man” could still be counted on to defeat a motion put by Denis Shelton, asking the the PCA State Assembly of NSW to confirm the truthfulness of the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ, *supra*. The spectacle of a man teasing the orthodox in the PCA by publicly talking about his life as a “heretic,” in *Arms For Oblivion: Chapters from a Heretic's Life* (1943), though aimed as a taunt against those who, like one-third of the PCA General Assembly, wanted him brought to a heresy trial, was thus, in reality, also a taunt of the two-thirds of the PCA General Assembly who were silly enough to stop him from being brought to a heresy trial.

Angus had e.g., denied Article upon Article of the *Apostles' Creed*, for instance, he was an Arian heretic who denied the Deity of Christ as “Lord” (John 1:1; 20:28), “the only begotten Son of God” (John 3:18); and thus he further denied the associated doctrine of the Holy Trinity. He had, like Vines in his Letter to the Editor of the *Sydney Morning Herald*, *supra*, urged tolerance to Arian heretics, since Angus criticized the “Council ... of Nicea” (325) for saying, “the catholic and apostolic church of God anathematizes” those who ... held other ... Scriptural views” i.e., like those of the Jehovah’s Witnesses cult, Angus here claimed the Arian heresy is “Scriptural.” And in a similar vein, Angus had said the Trinitarian “Council of Ephesus in 431, ... and the Council of Chalcedon in 451,” exhibited “the activity of the spirit of the devil,” *supra*.

Yet though Sam Angus would not confess the Deity of “Jesus Christ” as “Lord,” the “only Son” of “God the Father” (Articles 1 & 2, *Apostles' Creed*), Angus had been spared a heresy trial. The *Apostles' Creed* is e.g., found in the Protestant Catechisms of Lutheranism (Luther’s *Short Catechism*), Anglicanism (*Book of Common Prayer*, 1662), Presbyterianism (*Shorter Catechism*), and the Dutch Reformed Church (*Heidelberg Catechism*). By any broad Protestant standards of orthodoxy, to not proceed against Angus as a heretic was a sad joke.

Angus’s views on Christ and the Godhead had some remarkable similarities with what one finds in both the Jehovah’s Witnesses and Mormon cults. His anti-Trinitarian and Arian views are like those of the Jehovah’s Witnesses cult; and his view that all can follow Christ to become divine have similarities with, though are not identical with, what one finds in Mormonism. Thus those following Angus’s heresies could with relative ease be led into giving some kind of “fellow Christian recognition” to Jehovah’s Witnesses and Mormons. We thus see that this Angus type of religious liberalism, which opposes heresy trials for those who like Angus deny such broad fundamentals of the faith as the Trinity and *Apostles' Creed*, is one route to the further heresy of giving religious recognition to those who like the Jehovah’s Witnesses and Mormons “transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ,” and who “hath not God” (II John 9). Those who

do so become “partaker of” the “evil deeds” of these spiritually deadly dangerous cults (II John 10).

Furthermore, while Angus’s views are not identical with those of the Mohammedans, who would not accept his religiously liberal anti-miracles views; it is nevertheless notable that many of Angus’s views are similar to those of the Mohammedans, who on the one hand, likewise deny Christ’s Divinity and the Trinity, deny the vicarious atoning death of Christ, deny his resurrection (saying he never died); and on the other hand, likewise say that Jesus was “a good man.” We thus see that this Angus type of religious liberalism, which both denies such truths, and also opposes heresy trials for those who like Angus deny such broad fundamentals of the faith as the Trinity and *Apostles’ Creed*, is also one route to the further heresy of the inter-faith movement which claims e.g., that differences between Christianity and Mohammedanism are of “a minor” or “secondary” “nature” to having some kind of “religious faith.” Those who do so seek to unite Christian truth with Mohammedan falsehood, contrary to the Scriptures which prohibits union “with unbelievers,” asking, “What concord hath Christ with Belial?” (II Cor. 6:14,15); and which also state the “unbelieving” will “have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone” (Rev. 21:8).

Thus to not defend by heresy trial the type of fundamental doctrine evident in the *Apostles’ & Nicene Creeds*, or *Reformation Motto* (Gal. 1:6-9; 3:11; II Tim. 3:15-17), is itself a serious heresy by those who fail to so act (Rom. 16:17; II Thess. 3:6; I John 4:1-3; II John 9-11). Thus because Angus was one of those who “transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ,” those in the PCA General Assembly who refused to cast him out as a heretic, even if themselves otherwise orthodox, by their inaction in defending the doctrine of the *Apostles’ Creed*, became a “partaker of his evil deeds” (II John 9,11).

Those who like to talk about an “inclusive policy” that does not excommunicate heretics who e.g., deny the doctrine of the *Apostles’ Creed*, like Sam Angus (or Ernie Vines), never like to talk about all the innocent people who get their faith destroyed by them, or who are forced out into other churches because of them. This type of so called, “inclusiveness” by PCA religious liberals is like the so called “inclusiveness” of libertines in the wider society, which is likewise destructive to a Christian society, family values, racial fraternity and thus nationalism, etc. . It is a deeply hurtful and painful “inclusiveness” which cruelly targets for injury the very best and finest people in the community, while simultaneously seeking to elevate the scum of society.

The stories that have come to me about Sam Angus over the years, are simply something that has come my way as I have e.g., “rubbed shoulders” with a number of Sydneysiders in the normative operations of my life. Although I looked up Angus’s works held at Sydney University Library for the purposes of this Preface section; the four case studies I use have not been compiled by me after undertaking any kind of detailed

systematic study of Angus and his influence. Rather, the four case studies are merely selective examples drawn from my normative experience of life in Sydney<sup>104</sup>.

When Sir Garfield Barwick first mentioned the heretic Angus to me (Case Study 1), I had never heard of him. Then some years later, in conversation with the co-founder of the *Presbyterian Reformed Church of Australia*, Denis Shelton, he mentioned to me the presence of Sam Angus's "Angus men" in the *Presbyterian Church of Australia* when he left it (Case Study 3). Some years later again, after I had known Alex for some years, he first told me of how he left PCA and joined PCEA, and in doing so Alex made reference to the name of Sam Angus once again. For Alex, the issue involving Ernie Vines supporting Arianism and Alex's brother, Douglas, opposing it in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, even though occurring about 6 months after Alex joined PCEA, is regarded by him as an integral element of his departure from PCA, since he considers PCA's failure to discipline Ministers like Angus or Vines who denied the Deity of Christ and Trinity, clearly manifests his own *raison d'être* for exiting the *Presbyterian Church of Australia* and joining what he regarded as a much better Presbyterian Church in the *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia*. Thus whenever he had spoken to me about why he left the PCA, he has always put an emphasis on these December 1959 and January 1960 *Sydney Morning Herald* letters and Editorial; which he regards as integral to his slightly earlier departure from PCA (Case Study 4).

Then after I "discovered" and decided to include these Sydney University Lectionaries in these commentaries, including this section in the Preface since one of them was owned by Angus, considering the way this information with its these three case studies (Case Studies 1, 3, & 4) came to me was an example of how the Lord had brought these things to my attention for use in the Preface of Volume 2, I mentioned what I was intending to do from Volume 2 on to Brian Wenham. His Baptist eyes lit up, as he told me about how Angus's heresies had been integral to the formation of his own Condell Park Baptist Church, and how he had studied the matter in recent years due to a Church anniversary he was involved in. *This was all news to me!* Thus only as recently as mid 2009, another case study was added in (Case Study 2).

On the one hand, it must be said that the PCA culture in which PCA Ministers coveted the friendship and approval of Angus and fellow "Angus Ministers," so that at least in part, through this associated social pressure they desired to be "an Angus man," is a social pressure that has now mercifully died out. Although the wider damaging inroads of religious liberalism, in which Angus stands as one of a number of figures who

---

<sup>104</sup> E.g., newspaper articles on Angus (*Sun*, 24 May 1934 & *Sydney Morning Herald*, 27 July 1938) were given to me by Brian Wenham, Pastor of Condell Park Bible Church (Case Study 2); those to do with PRC (*Leader* 3 Jan. 1968 & *Daily Liberal & Macquarie Advocate* 13 June, 1968), were supplied to me by Denis Shelton, the co-founder of PRC (Case Study 3); and those to do with Douglas Neil (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 24 Dec. 1959; 29 Dec. 1959; 31 Dec. 1959; 1 Jan. 1960; 2 January, 1960), were given to me by Alex Neil, a Ruling Elder of the PCEA Hawkesbury-Nepean Congregation (Case Study 4).

promoted this evil, still continues to plague a large minority section of the PCA (generally estimated to be about 40% of the Ministers), and likewise continues to impact negatively on the Uniting Church of Australia which was formed from the greater number of PCA Churches, greater number of Congregationalists Churches, and all the Methodist Churches of Australia<sup>105</sup>.

But on the other hand, given the large number of “Angus Ministers” that formerly existed in PCA Churches, and the manner in which these stories about Angus have come to me; I think one can safely conjecture that there are no doubt even more stories of people having their faith shattered (Case Study 1), or leaving a religiously liberal PCA Church for a religiously conservative church (Case Studies 2, 3, & 4), as a consequence of PCA Angus Ministers and / or in conjunction with their concerns about the failure of PCA to discipline men such as Sam Angus and his followers in the PCA. Indeed, in this context, I note that Sir Garfield Barwick (Case Study 1) referred to “others” whose faith had been so shattered, when he said that from “Dr. Sam Angus ... I learnt much of the history of the development of the gospels, and over time I became less convinced of the theology of the Christian Church, as did others of my companions in the student movement” “at Sydney University<sup>106</sup>.” And likewise, Denis Shelton (Case Study 3) attributed the defeat of the 1968 resolution in the PCA State Assembly of NSW to the large presence of “Angus” men whom he said he could “count” all voting the resolution down. This therefore indicates a larger number of untold stories about both Sydney University students who came into contact with Angus through “the student movement” there, as well as PCA Ministers who as “Angus men,” all had their faith damaged or destroyed over the years.

Though I had never heard of, and knew nothing about, Sam Angus, when Sir Garfield first told me in 1991 of how his Christian faith had been destroyed by Angus when he was a university student, nevertheless, over the years I have come across enough information on Angus’s heresies to be able to compile these four case studies, *supra*. I would probably not have mentioned Angus at all in these textual commentaries, were it not for the fact that after my “discovery” of the two Sydney University Lectionaries earlier this year (2009), to my great surprise, I learnt on the Library card that one of them had belonged to Angus, and I then considered these matters particularly relevant to the issue of Divine Preservation, *infra*. I.e., as I pondered the matter I realized that this was a very good example of how Divine Preservation of the Scriptures does not require the theological orthodoxy of those involved (Rom. 3:1,2; 11:29), as is clearly evident in the

---

<sup>105</sup> I am advised that the PCA has improved in more recent decades. In 1977 about two-thirds of the PCA joined with Congregationalists and Methodists to form the Uniting Church of Australia. Of what remained in the PCA, a majority (I am told, though I have not checked the veracity of this, of about 60%.) are more in the religiously conservative direction. E.g., in 1991 the PCA reversed the earlier decision to allow the Ordination of women Ministers; and in NSW a number of their Ministerial Candidates have been trained at the Reformed Anglican’s *Moore Theological College* in Sydney.

<sup>106</sup> Sir Garfield Barwick’s *A Radical Tory*, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-12.

fact that Greek Lectionary 2378 was in Angus's possession for less than 10 years in the 1930s and 1940s.

In the Bible, the unclean animals of Lev. 11 & Deut. 14 are sometimes used to represent devils (Rev. 16:13,14; 18:2). Within this type of imagery, I think of that "unclean ... bird" (Rev. 18:2) "the vulture" (Lev. 11:14; Deut. 14:13). While the vulture usually attacks wounded or sick animals, or consumes dead carcasses, it is also known to sometimes attack the young. E.g., vultures sometimes disable young lambs and calves by first blinding them through pecking out their eyes, and then attacking other soft and vulnerable parts of their body<sup>107</sup>. So too, that great vulture, the Devil, "hath blinded the minds" of many (II Cor. 4:4), and in this process he particularly likes to target the young, such as the PCA College students who studied under Sam Angus, or came under his influence when they attended Sydney University. And like his "father the Devil" (John 8:44), Sam Angus (and Ernie Vines) exhibited that quality of his (and Ernie Vines') father, that gave Satan the name, which "in the Greek tongue" is "Apollyon" (Rev. 9:11), and in the English tongue, is "Destroyer."

***Why are we considering these matters to do with Angus?*** The reason relates to the fact that Byzantine Lectionary 2378 (11th century, Sydney University), *infra*, first belonged to the religiously liberal Adolf Deissmann, and then the religiously liberal, Sam Angus. Indeed, Angus quotes approvingly from one of Deissmann's books, as in unison with him, Angus joins Deissmann in attacking the Biblical Jesus. In typical religiously liberal form criticism, Deissmann attacks what he calls, "the cult-name 'Jesus,'" in favour of his own unBiblical "Jesus" whom he falsely claims is the "Jesus" of "history." (This is sometimes referred to by religious liberals under the misleading terminology of, "the historical Jesus.") And in Angus's book, *Essential Christianity*, Angus makes it clear that he likes what Deissmann says<sup>108</sup>.

But theological orthodoxy is not a necessary pre-requisite for those involved in the process of preserving NT documents inside the closed class of sources, for if it was, the apostate Jews could never have preserved the Hebrew OT (Rom. 3:1-3; 11:29). This is an important point of distinction between Divine Inspiration and Divine Preservation. With respect to Divine Inspiration, it is true that in a rare and unusual instance, the Spirit of God took hold of an unsaved man (Num. 22:5,6; Deut. 23:4; Joshua 24:9), "Balaam the son of Beor," who prophesied with regard to the then coming Messiah, "there shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel" (Num. 24:15,17). But we

---

<sup>107</sup> This data with respect to disabling young lambs and calves is found in a 1990-1996 study of black vulture interaction with over 1,000 livestock animals in Virginia, USA. Avery, M.L. & Cummings, J.L., "Livestock Depredations by Black Vultures," *Sheep & Goats Research Journal*, American Sheep Industry Association, 2003 ("Livestock Depredation by Black Vultures – American Sheep Industry," [www.sheepusa.org/index.phtml?page=site/news\\_details](http://www.sheepusa.org/index.phtml?page=site/news_details)).

<sup>108</sup> Angus, S., *Essential Christianity*, *op. cit.*, p. 103; quoting Deissmann's *Mysterium Christi*, pp. 36f.

only know this because it was written down by the author of the Pentateuch, Holy Moses, who was theologically orthodox. Indeed, this is true of all Bible writers i.e., only the theologically orthodox wrote the Books of the Bible.

But this is not the case with Divine Preservation. Writing at a time when the Jews were apostate, and as a racial group, “broken off” from Christ (Rom. 11:17); even though a small number, like the Apostle Paul were still saved by grace (Rom. 9:3; 11:1,2); the Spirit of God speaking through St. Paul asks, “What advantage then hath the Jew?” And to this the answer is given, “much every way: chiefly because that unto them were committed the oracles of God” (Rom. 3:1,2). That is because, “the gifts and calling of God are without repentance” (Rom. 11:29), and to them “pertaineth” such things as “the covenants, and the giving of the law” (Rom. 9:2), i.e., this requires that they preserve the Old Testament oracles.

It does not matter that the Jews were apostate, since Divine Preservation rests upon God’s power, not man’s inadequacies. “For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: but the Word of the Lord endureth forever” (I Peter 1:25). So likewise therefore, theological orthodoxy is not a pre-requisite for Gentile Greeks preserving NT documents in the Greek textual tradition inside the closed class of sources. Hence it matters not that these Greek manuscripts were often copied out by Greek Orthodox heretics from 1054 (the time of *The Great Schism*), or between 607 and 1054 by Roman Catholics in the Greek speaking east. (In 607 Boniface III, Bishop of Rome, got a decree from the Eastern Emperor, Phocas, making him “universal bishop.” Boniface was thus the first Pope, and from this time till 1054, the Greek speaking eastern church centred on the Patriarchate of Constantinople was under Papal Rome<sup>109</sup>.) Nor likewise is theological

---

<sup>109</sup> The term “Pope” (meaning “Father”) was sometimes used from the third century on in a different way for a Diocesan Bishop. E.g., the Bishop of Rome from 523 to 526, John I, was called “Pope.” An example of this earlier usage of “Pope” survives with the Coptic Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria, presently Pope Shenouda III (Coptic Orthodox Pope of Alexandria since 1971), an Oriental Orthodox (monophysitist) church. The title was earlier used by e.g., Heraclius (Pope of Alexandria, 232-249). It also survives in the commonly used, though unofficial title of the Superior General of the Jesuits as “the black Pope,” since he is like a Diocesan Bishop to Jesuits. E.g., *Catholic News*, which describes itself as “the most visited [Roman] Catholic in Australia” for “daily news” among Romanists, have an article in their 6 Feb. 2006 edition entitled, “Jesuits to elect new ‘black pope’ in 2008” ([www.cathnews.com/news/602/30.php](http://www.cathnews.com/news/602/30.php)). But as the Bishop of Rome became “universal bishop” from 607, he thus claimed all the world as his Diocese, so that he alone came to take the official title “Pope” as a manifestation of this. It is in this sense of the formation of the Office of Roman Papacy i.e., as the term “Pope” came to denote, and which we now use it (other than in the limited and unusual contexts, *supra*), that I refer to when I say Boniface III was the first Pope. As part of the process resulting in the formation of the Roman Papacy from 607, in the 6th century Magnus Felix Ennodius (d. 521) had argued for the exclusive usage of the term “Pope” for the Bishop of Rome, but this practice did not in fact become firmly

orthodoxy a pre-requisite for Gentile Latins preserving NT documents in the Latin textual tradition inside the closed class of sources. I.e., it matters not that Latin manuscripts were often copied out by Roman Catholic heretics.

For notwithstanding the fact that some church writers were heretics, and known to corrupt the Word of God e.g., Origen; more generally those involved in manuscript copy did not so seek to deliberately corrupt God's Word. The Biblical doctrine of the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture thus demands this conclusion of us.

Nevertheless, this truth has come under attack by some well intentioned, but seriously misguided people. For instance, concerning the OT, the claim has been made that the vowels of the Hebrew Masoretic text could not, as is generally believed, have been added by the Jews well after NT times. I shall not now go through the details of the dates given, other than to say the date for the vowels being added may vary between writers from somewhere between the sixth or seventh century A.D. to the ninth, tenth, or eleventh centuries A.D. . The salient point for our purposes is that the date is well after NT times when the Jews of Judaism were far gone in apostasy.

Hence e.g., George Ella, like e.g., the earlier writers, John Owen and John Gill, considers the vowels were added in by the OT prophet Ezra, in c. 400 B.C.<sup>110</sup>. E.g., John Owen (1616-1683) was an English Puritan who favoured Congregationalist church government. Under the Puritan's revolutionary republic, he served as an Aide to Oliver Cromwell from 1653 to 1658. Owen was appointed by the Puritan regime as Dean of Christ Church Cathedral at Oxford in 1651, but he was ejected from that position at the time of the Caroline Restoration in 1660.

Of relevance to this issue of the date of the vowels in the OT text, among other things, John Owen said, "As the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament were immediately given out by God himself; ... so, by his ... providential dispensation ... his

---

established until the 8th century i.e., after the 7th century formed Roman Papacy had been established for over a hundred years. Calvin makes a similar distinction when he refers to "Gregory. Whom you may with justice call the last Bishop of Rome" (*Institutes* 4:17:49). Calvin here makes a slight error, as Bishop Gregory was actually the second last Bishop of Rome, and "the last Bishop of Rome" was Bishop Sabinian (Bishop of Rome 604-606). Yet in his commentary on Malachi 2:9, Calvin quotes Gregory and says, "This is what a Roman pope said" (Little, L., "Calvin's Appreciation of Gregory the Great, *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 56, 1962, pp. 145-157, at p. 152). I.e., in his OT Commentaries he refers to Gregory as "a Roman pope" in the same way one could formerly refer to "a Milan Pope," "an Alexandrian Pope" etc. i.e., a Diocesan Bishop; but in his *Institutes* he uses "pope" in the sense of the Roman Papacy formed in 607, and hence he stresses Gregory was a "Bishop of Rome" rather than a Pope of Rome.

<sup>110</sup> Ella, G.M., "The Antiquity of the Hebrew Vocalisation" (in two parts), *English Churchman* (EC) 2 & 9 February, 2007, p. 10 (EC 7707) & 16 & 23 Feb 2007, p. 10 (EC 7708).

whole Word, as first given out by him, is preserved unto us entire in the original languages ... ." Hence Owen rejects the idea "that the *points* or *vowels*, and *accents*, are a late invention of the ... Masorets." Thus Owen says "the *points* or *vowels*, and *accents*" "were completed by ... Ezra and his companions, guided therein by the infallible direction of the Spirit of God<sup>111</sup>."

Though Owen gives other reasons why he believes the vowelling had to occur by Ezra<sup>112</sup>, a core argument upon which he bases this belief is the idea that because the Jews are apostate, they could not possibly be trusted by God to add in such vowelling. On this basis, he also rejects e.g., any value in the Talmud, which (though admittedly containing much error,) is certainly a work inside the closed class of OT sources for use in constructing the OT *Textus Receptus*. Thus e.g., Owen says, "Let us, then, ... consider who or what these men were, who are the supposed authors if this work: - 1. Men they were ... *who had not the Word of God committed* to them in a peculiar manner, as their forefathers of old, being no part of his church or people ... . 2. Men *so remote from a right understanding of the Word*, or the mind and will of God therein, that they ... oppose his truth in the books which themselves enjoyed ... . 3. Men *under the special curse of God* ... upon the account of the blood of his dear Son. 4. Men *all their days feeding themselves with vain fables* ... . 5. Men *of a profound ignorance* in all manner of learning and knowledge but only what concerned their own dunghill traditions ... . 6. Men ... *addicted to such monstrous figments*, as appears in the Talmud's ...<sup>113</sup>."

*ENOUGH OF THIS PURITAN'S NONSENSE!!!*

---

<sup>111</sup> Goold, W.H. (Ed.), *The Works of John Owen*, 1850-3, Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, 1968, 3rd printing 1981, Vol. 16, pp. 350,368, 369-70, 371.

<sup>112</sup> E.g., Owen maintains that one cannot read the Hebrew without the vowels. He says, "vowels are the life of words; consonants without them are dead and immovable." So "let them be all taken out of the way," and "scarce a chapter" or "verse" "would be" then "left free from perplexing, contradicting, conjectures" (*Ibid.*, p. 373). So too Ella says, "it is a most difficult task ... to read a never-ending line of non-vocalised consonants" (EC 7707, *op. cit.*, p. 10). But as one who, by the grace of God, had the privilege of visiting Israel in February 2002, I can testify that e.g., all the road signs, place names, and other signs I saw there, did not have vowels. I also visited the *Shrine of the Book* at the Israel Museum in Jerusalem, where I saw a replica of the Dead Sea Scrolls in which the OT text of Isaiah *from inter-testamental times had no vowels*. It seems that to those for whom Hebrew is a living language of daily life, the vowels are simply not necessary. In saying this, like Owen and Ella, *I am very grateful for the Hebrew vowels*; but unlike them, I am happy to accept that they were added by the Masorites as part of the process of *Divine Preservation* that continued long after Divine Inspiration of the OT had ceased. Thus I consider the Masoretic vowels are authoritative, and may only be set aside if there is a good textual reason for doing so.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 381-2. See chapter 5, "Origin of the Hebrew Points," pp. 370-388; & chapter 6, "Arguments for the novelty of Hebrew Points refuted," pp. 388-401.

In the first place, Owen's unqualified view of the Scriptures being preserved in the original Hebrew and Greek, reminds me of some matters I discussed in the Preface of Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14); such as the civil war English Puritan's bursting into Laud's study and claiming the presence there of Latin Bible manuscripts i.e., a Roman Catholic Missal and other books of the Roman Liturgy containing Biblical passages in Latin, proved he was a secret Papist. So likewise, in 1643 Puritans started to vandalize the *Church of England* Cathedral of Peterborough, among other things, breaking into the Cathedral's Chapter House, and finding there some documents with Great Seals and Latin writing, they denounced them as Popish and started to destroy them. As far as these Puritans were concerned, anything in Latin was necessarily some kind of "Pope's Bull." Fortunately, the mortified Anglicans were eventually able to persuade the English Puritans that these were important legal property deeds, that English Law sometimes used Latin, and they really ought not to be madly destroying them.

*I do not say that all Puritans, either then or now, suffer from such Latin-phobia.* Indeed, there have been a number of Latin scholars among Puritans. Nevertheless, these English Puritan revolutionaries saw "a Papist under every bed," and regarded an interest in, or usage of Latin, as some kind of "secret identifier" of these "clandestine Romanists." If so, the presence in my own library of e.g., the Roman Catholic *Liber Comicus* Latin Lectionary (7th–9th centuries; Morin's 1893 edition), would presumably be enough to make similar "implications" about me. (And this is only "the tip of the iceberg" of the Latin works I possess!) They believe in the Received Text, but do not have the intellectual or spiritual gifts to understand how it is composed<sup>114</sup>. *Owen's general focus on the Hebrew (and Aramaic) and Greek is inadequate, since while Latin is not a Biblical language at the point of Divine Inspiration, it is a Biblical language at the point of Divine Preservation.*

But in the second place, Owen is trying to locate the vowelling of the Hebrew Old Testament *inside the time of the Divine Inspiration of the Old Testament* i.e., no later than about 400 B.C., *because he has an inadequate view of the Divine Preservation of the Old Testament* relative to the Biblical teaching of Divine Preservation found in Rom. 3:1,2; 11:29. Owen clearly endorses the idea that Divine Preservation of a text with respect to its correct vowelling requires theological orthodoxy. In fact, this clearly contravenes the New Testament teaching that to the Jews, though at that time in apostasy, "were committed the" Old Testament "oracles of God" (Rom. 3:1,2); even though "their minds were blinded: for unto this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament; which veil is done away in Christ" (II Cor. 3:14). That is because,

---

<sup>114</sup> While I can accept that the average kind of man generally keeps books in his library that he tends to agree with, or sees as directly instructional to him, one cannot judge an academic or intellectual type of man by the same criteria. E.g., my own library includes such bizarre and highly erroneous works as Charles Darwin's *Origen of Species* (1859 ed.) or Joseph Smith's *Book of Mormon* (combined edition also containing Smith's *Doctrine & Covenants* and *Pearl of Great Price*). These are crazy works for which I have no sympathy in any way, shape, or form.

“the gifts and calling of God are without repentance” (Rom. 11:29), and to them “pertaineth” such things as “the covenants, and the giving of the law” (Rom. 9:2), i.e., this requires that they preserve the Old Testament oracles.

Hence we can have confidence in the Hebrew vowels, and treat the representative Masoretic text as we do the representative Byzantine text i.e., as our starting point, and only move away from it with reluctance, if required to do so by an evident textual problem in the Hebrew i.e., including any problem in its vowelling, that can be resolved inside the closed class of providentially preserved OT sources. (Though the Hebrew Masoretic Text is not the OT Received Text, it is very much closer to it than the representative Byzantine text is to the NT Received Text.) It matters not that the Jews added the vowels after New Testament times when they were in deep apostasy, for even if they were added in e.g., in the eleventh centuries A.D., they are still covered under the Jews “gifts” (Rom. 11:29) and *the doctrine of Divine Preservation rests on God’s preserving power, not man’s inadequacies.*

Concerning the New Testament, we find the same issue in a different form emerges with David Cloud’s claims. Once again the man is rightly seeking to uphold the Received Text, in this case, the New Testament Received Text rather than the Old Testament Received Text, but once again, like Owen, “he has gotten the bull by the horns.” The (Arminian) Baptist Minister, David Cloud (b. c. 1950), is the Director of an independent American Baptist group’s organization, *Way of Life Literature*, USA. In his address, “Heresy of Textual Criticism” (2004)<sup>115</sup>, Cloud says that he upholds the King James Version and Received Text. While there is much that is good in his sermon, it is mingled with some serious error. The source of this error appears to be the *Dean Burgon Society* of New Jersey, USA; for Cloud speaks very favorably of, and in an unqualified manner about, its (Arminian) Baptist President and Founder, “Dr. Donald Waite.”

On the one hand, David Cloud is quite right to attack the two leading Alexandrian texts as unreliable. But on the other hand, his methodology wrongly includes an attack on the unorthodoxy of the places they were housed. With regard to *Codex Sinaiticus*, Cloud says of St. Catherine’s Greek Orthodox Monastery, Mt. Sinai, Arabia, “that’s not really where I’d be looking for the preserved Word of God;” and with respect to *Codex Vaticanus*, he also says of the Roman Catholic Vatican Library in Rome, that it’s “not where I’d want to look for the preserved Word of God.”

Put in simple terms, Cloud is here saying that his rejection of *Codex Sinaiticus* emanates from the fact that it came from a *Greek Orthodox Library* and *Greek Orthodox are not theologically orthodox*; and likewise his rejection of *Codex Vaticanus* emanates from the fact that it came from a *Roman Catholic Library* and *Roman Catholics are not theologically orthodox*. With Cloud’s view that neither Greek Orthodox nor Roman Catholics are theologically orthodox, I as a religiously conservative Protestant am in

---

<sup>115</sup> Available on Sermon Audio ([www.sermonaudio.com](http://www.sermonaudio.com)), under the topics, “Bible,” then “KJV Controversy,” then David Cloud’s “Why we hold to the KJV, Pt. 2.” (Preached Monday 1/5/2004).

complete agreement; but with Cloud's concomitant claim that this is the basis for our rejection of these two faulty Alexandrian manuscripts, I am in strong disagreement. If we were to endorse Cloud's sentiment that Greek Orthodox and Roman Catholic Libraries are "not" the kind of places "where I'd" be prepared to "look for the preserved Word of God;" then we would simultaneously have to jettison the vast majority of Byzantine Greek Texts, Latin texts, and writings of the ancient and mediaeval church writers as well. *In short, the building blocks of the Received Text could not survive Cloud's sentiment!*

On the one hand, *because the Alexandrian Text is clearly and aberrant text type with very little general support, and lacking general accessibility through time and over time*, IN CONNECTION WITH THESE IMPORTANT QUALIFICATIONS, some suspicion naturally attaches to the location of one of its two main representatives in Papal Rome. But on the other hand, where no such clearly distinguishing features apply, this is certainly not the case. *Cloud fails to make these type of important qualifications.* Cloud's type of approach, here stated by someone who seeks to uphold the Received Text and Authorized Version, nevertheless fails to understand the teaching of the Divine Preservation of Scripture as set forth in passages such as Rom. 3:1,2; 11:29. The reality is that the building blocks for the Received Text, by and large, come from places like of St. Catherine's Greek Orthodox Monastery, Mt. Sinai, or Roman Catholic Libraries like that in the Vatican. E.g., more than fifty of the generally Byzantine Text Greek Lectionaries, dating from the 10th to 16th centuries, Lectionary numbers 528 to 573, are all kept at the Vatican Library; as indeed are also Byzantine Text Greek Lectionaries numbers 607 to 616. Or more than 80 of the generally Byzantine Text Greek Lectionaries, dating from the 9th to 16th centuries, namely Lectionary numbers 845 to 894, and 896 to 920, are all kept a St. Catherine's Monastery in the Sinai, as indeed are yet others. *In fact, the vast majority of Greek manuscripts that come from St. Catherine's Monastery are Byzantine Text.* Other places that keep such Lectionaries include e.g., Greek Orthodox Libraries in Alexandria in Egypt, Jerusalem in Israel, Athos in Greece, and Athens in Greece. In fact, predominately Eastern Orthodox countries have most of the Greek Byzantine text Lectionaries in places like e.g., Sophia (Sofia) the capital of Bulgaria, or Moscow the capital of Russia.

The Vatican Library also contains e.g., the Byzantine Text S 028 Codex from the 10th century, also known as *Codex Vaticanus*; though not to be confused with the Alexandrian codex of the same name<sup>116</sup>. Many important Latin manuscripts are also to be found in Roman Catholic libraries, mainly in Western Europe. More than 50 of the generally Byzantine Text Greek Lectionaries, dating from the 9th to 16th centuries, namely Lectionary numbers 1 to 17, 63 to 101, and yet others, are all kept in the West's Paris, France, as indeed are yet others. So too one finds in London, from the 9th to 16th centuries, more than 20 Lectionaries with Lectionary numbers 316 to 340, and yet still others here and elsewhere in England. But the placement of Greek Byzantine

---

<sup>116</sup> Cf. my comments at Matt. 20:22,23, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," "The Third Matter."

Lectionaries in such Western countries as France, England, America, and Australia, is more generally unusual. Most are still in the East. And even where they are *now* housed in the West, such Byzantine Greek Texts generally still come from the East at a time it was in apostasy e.g., Lectionary 2378 from the 11th century, was sent to Bulgaria from Constantinople, and is *now housed at Sydney University*, and Lectionary 1968 from 1544 A.D. comes from Cyprus, and is *now housed at Sydney University*<sup>117</sup>. Although not all such Greek texts come from the East, for instance, *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century), featured in these commentaries comes from Rossano, Italy, in Western Europe. But since it comes from *a Roman Catholic Cathedral*, on Cloud's sentiment, this manuscript would also have to be rejected!

The Received Text or *Textus Receptus* is composed from the building blocks of the Greek Byzantine Text, which to this day is still predominantly to be found in Libraries of the East; and the Latin text, which to this day is still predominantly to be found in Libraries of Western Europe; and church writers, usually ancient, but sometimes mediaeval, if so, especially early mediaeval writers, in libraries of both the east and west. If one is going to criticize the Alexandrian Text on the basis that their faulty manuscripts come from places like St. Catherine's Greek Orthodox Monastery in the Sinai, or the Roman Catholic's Vatican Library in Rome, then one would have to make similar criticisms about the Received Text. But the reality is that it does not matter if the texts of Scripture are preserved by heretics, whether they be Greek Orthodox heretics, Roman Catholic heretics, or religiously liberal heretics like Sam Angus. While I uphold the theology orthodoxy of religiously conservative Protestantism, and thank God for the Reformation wrought under Luther and Calvin, and in England under Cranmer and others, the reality is that theological orthodoxy is not a pre-requisite for Gentiles preserving New Testament documents in the Greek textual tradition inside the New Testament closed class of sources; any more than it is for Jews preserving Old Testament documents inside the Old Testament closed class of sources.

Therefore, let us thank God that Sydney University's Byzantine Greek Lectionary 2378 (11th century) comes to us through the hands of two religiously liberal heretics, culminating in the great Presbyterian heretic, Sam Angus (d. 1943). That is because it reminds us that for the purposes of Divine Preservation, many heretics have been involved at many stages. It matters not. For the preservation is of the Lord, and even "the wrath of man shall praise" "God" (Ps. 76:9,10). "Consider the work of God: for who can make that straight, which he hath made crooked?" (Eccl. 7:13). Our God is an absolute monarch. He is not a republican. He is not a democrat. He does not need even "good men" to accomplish his purposes. If he wanted to, he could simply make

---

<sup>117</sup> Notwithstanding its geographical location, I classify Australia as "a Western country," since it was founded in 1788 as part of the white Protestant British Empire, still retains a predominantly white Caucasian population racially derived from Western Europe, and its main culture is still derived from the West in general, and Britain in particular. I consider Australia, like New Zealand, Canada, and the USA, were established by white Japhethite peoples in fulfilment of the prophecy, "God shall enlarge Japheth" (Gen. 9:27).

“the stones” “cry out” to his glory (Luke 19:40). Let us “not” “be” “high-minded, but fear” (Rom. 11:20). Let us “walk humbly with” our “God” (Micah 6:8).

**\*C) “Bonjour” to the Two Greek Lectionaries kept at Sydney University.**

In the Latin language of French, “Bonjour” is a greeting meaning, “Hello,” and so we now say, “Bonjour” to our two Sydney University Greek Lectionaries i.e., Greek Lectionary 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) and Greek Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*).

Our first Sydney University Lectionary is Greek Lectionary 2378 (11th century)<sup>118</sup>. This is a Constantinople Lectionary from the era of the Byzantine Empire. It was sent to the Greek Orthodox Church in Bulgaria. I.e., Greek speaking Eastern Orthodox in Bulgaria, as opposed to Bulgarian Orthodox, who are a Bulgarian speaking Eastern Orthodox Church. From Bulgaria, it was acquired by Professor (Gustav) Adolf Deissmann (1866-1937). Adolf Deissmann was a Lutheran theologian with some unorthodox views<sup>119</sup>. He was a Professor of Theology at Heidelberg University in Germany till 1908, and then a Professor of Theology at Berlin University, Germany. Among other things, he was known for his work on New Testament Greek<sup>120</sup>.

In 1935 Lectionary 2378 then passed to Sam Angus (1881-1943), who at the time was a Professor at St. Andrew’s College, Sydney University. Angus was a Presbyterian theologian with some unorthodox views, being a well known heretic, *supra*. He was Professor of New Testament, Greek, and Church History at St. Andrew’s College, Sydney University (1915-1943). Lectionary 2378 then passed from Angus to Sydney University Library.

---

<sup>118</sup> Fisher Library, Sydney University, Rare Books section, call number: RB [Rare Books] Add. [Additional] Ms. [Manuscript] No. 40.

<sup>119</sup> Deissmann developed certain “mysticism” views by an overemphasis on St. Paul’s Damascus Road experience, which he interpreted as being “in Christ.” His attempt to reduce Pauline theology to an over simplistic focus on this type of “light ethereal form of existence” was unBiblical and bizarre both in its methodology and results. See e.g., Ernst Best’s *One Body in Christ*, SPCK, London, UK, 1958, p. 9. Cf., Deissmann’s *St. Paul*, 1912; *Light from the Ancient East*, the NT illustrated, 1910; & *Bible Studies*, 1903; and Angus’s citation (*Essential Christianity*, p. 103) of Deissmann (*Mysterium Christi*, pp. 36f), *supra*.

<sup>120</sup> Deissmann, G. Adolf. (Professor of Theology at Heidelberg University), *Bible Studies*, Contributions from papyri & inscriptions to the history of the language, the literature, and the religion of Hellenistic Judaism & Primitive Christianity, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, 1903 (Sydney University Library, 220.88/5); Deissmann, A. (Professor of NT Exegesis at Berlin University), *Light From the Ancient East*, The NT illustrated by recently discovered texts of the Graeco-Roman World, Hodder & Stoughton, London, England, UK, 1910 (Sydney University Library, 225.93/9).

Lectionary 2378 originated from the Capital of the Byzantine Empire, Constantinople. Constantinople fell to the violent *sword of Islam* in 1453, and is now known as “Istanbul.” Lectionary 2378 was sent out from Constantinople to the Greek Orthodox Church in Bulgaria. Bulgaria includes parts of the old Roman Province of Moesia, Thrace, and Macedonia. The Bulgarian Empire (1185-1396 / 1422) was destroyed by the vicious and violent *sword of Islam* under the Ottoman Empire, as part of the larger war the Mohammedan Ottomans waged on Christendom. Following the Russo-Turkish War of 1871-1878 the Bulgarian State was formed in 1878, and declared its sovereignty in 1908. When World War Two ended in 1945, the God-hating atheistic Communists (Ps. 14:1) swept over Eastern Europe, and made Bulgaria one of their captive nations. With the collapse of Communism in Eastern Europe, Bulgaria was liberated in 1990. *Though we know God protected various texts inside the closed class of sources when they were in Communist captured lands, and we would like to think that this would have been one of them, nevertheless, we thank God that Lectionary 2378 was evacuated to the safety of Sydney University before those times of Bulgaria’s Communist capture.*

Greek Lectionary 2378 contains readings from the *Evangelion* (Gospels). It has Scripture selections from all four Gospels. It will thus be used in these textual commentaries from *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* to *The Gospel According to St. John*.

Our second Sydney University Lectionary is Greek Lectionary 1968 (16th century)<sup>121</sup>. It was acquired by Sydney University’s main Library in 1963 from the Stewart Collection of Professor James Stewart (1913-1962)<sup>122</sup>. Educated at Trinity Hall in Cambridge University, England, Stewart was appointed as a teaching fellow in the Sydney University Department of History in 1947. He thereafter became a senior lecturer in the Department of Archaeology in 1949, Acting Head of that Department in 1954, and from 1960 a Professor of Middle Eastern Archaeology. He was also Curator of Sydney University’s Nicholson Museum. A Presbyterian, he was known to regularly stay at St. Andrew’s (Presbyterian) College, Sydney University

James Stewart was particularly interested in the history of northern Cyprus where he undertook archeological research<sup>123</sup>. It was here, in northern Cyprus, that he acquired Lectionary 1968, which came from St. Paraskeve’s Greek Orthodox Church at Famagusta.

---

<sup>121</sup> Fisher Library, Sydney University, Rare Books section, call number: RB [Rare Books] Stewart Ms. [Manuscript] No. 1.

<sup>122</sup> Letter of S.J. Simpson (Rare Books & Special Collections) to Mr. James Stewart of Copenhagen, Denmark, 5 Feb. 1986 (*Stewart Collection Papers*, Rare Books, Fisher Library, Sydney University).

<sup>123</sup> *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, Stewart, James Rivers Barrington (1913-1962), (<http://adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A160375b.htm>).

The date of Lectionary 1968 is clearly 16th century, though *prima facie* I have 3 different dates for it. The Card in the Rare Books Reading Room of Fisher Library at Sydney University gives “1524.” Aland in *Kurzgefasste* gives 1544<sup>124</sup>. Polites says “1564,” *infra*.

A two-leaf loose handwritten note in the back of the Lectionary, signed by Professor Linos Polites (1906-1982) on 9 May 1979, says of the writing at the very back of the Lectionary (p. 337b), (the square brackets are those of Polites, who also writes in the standard Greek script rather than the cursive script of the Lectionary itself,) “τελος τω θω + αφμδ [=1564]: γεναριω ιδ” etc., means, “The end, and thanks to the god. αφμδ [=1564] January 14<sup>th</sup>, ... Ammochostos [Famagusta] in Cyprus, at the Church of Saint Paraskeve;” and “on the folios glued to the back board of the binding a note in Latin” is “indecipherable” but “we can discern the date: 1565.”

With regard to these three *prima facie* dates, I would have to agree with Aland that the correct date is 1544. That is because, in Greek, α = 1000, φ = 500, μ = 40, and δ = 4, so that “αφμδ” must therefore be 1544.

How then are we to explain these other two rival dates of “1524” and “1564”? Clearly the matter is speculative.

Firstly, the “1524” date. In the cursive script of Lectionary 1968, the μ is sometimes used for beta (β or “b”), and as in the standard Greek text, sometimes used for mu (μ or m). The Greek α can be used for the number “1” or “1,000” (and so as not to cause confusion, modern scripts may put a dash down on the left if it means 1,000); and the Greek beta (β or “b”) is used for the number 2. It looks to me as though someone with some general knowledge of Lectionary 1968, but not a very good understanding of Greek numbers beyond 500; knowing beforehand that this was a 16th century Lectionary, first (wrongly) took the Greek “α” to mean “1” (rather than 1,000), then (rightly) took the Greek “φ” to be “500,” and hence concluded this was how one arrived at the “15” of the 16th century. He then cross-applied this faulty methodology, and took the “μ” to be a “beta,” as this is how it is sometimes used in the Lectionary, (wrongly) attributing to it the number “2;” and (rightly) attributed to the “δ” the number “4.” This thus explains how he arrived at the date of “1524.”

The identity of this person who “dated” Lectionary 1968 to “1524” is conjectural. But he clearly had to know beforehand that this was a 16th century Lectionary; he clearly had to have some knowledge of the Lectionary to first form the erroneous view that the “μ” here was a beta; and he clearly had to have some level of Greek knowledge. Who was it that had these three qualifications and who gave rise to the erroneous date of

---

<sup>124</sup> Aland, K., *Kurzgefasste Liste Der Griechishchen Handschriften Des Neuen Testaments*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, Germany, and New York, USA, 1963, 2nd edition, 1994, p. 340.

“1524”? Was it James Stewart? Was it one of his assistants? Was it a Sydney University Librarian? Was it someone else?

Secondly, what of Polites date of “1564”? Again the matter is conjectural. Polites renders “τῷ θεῷ” (with a line on top, abbreviating τῷ θεῷ / *to Theo*) as “the god” in “The end, and thanks to the god;” whereas the more natural rendering for a Greek Orthodox scribe would have to be, “God” not “the god,” i.e., “The end, and thanks to God.” Does this tell us anything of importance? Most of Linos Polites writings are in modern Greek<sup>125</sup>, although some were translated<sup>126</sup>. Given that the rest of his 1979 note shows that he was clearly able to think at a reasonable level of competency, does his rendering, “thanks to the god,” therefore simply reflect an inadequate grip on English by him? Alternatively, Polites may not have been thinking too carefully, perhaps because e.g., he was in a rush for time, or perhaps because he had a head cold. In 1979 he was a Septuagenarian and only 3 years away from his death (d. 1982), and while some men have good and clear thought at that age, others, in varying degrees, do not. Therefore, does Polites rendering, “thanks to the god,” in fact reflect a lack of clarity in his mind, whether due to age, sickness, or a rush for time?

Irrespective of how one resolves the issue of Polites rendering, “the god,” it is also notable that in his note of May 1979, he further says, “on the folios glued to the back board of the binding a note in Latin” is “indecipherable,” but “we can discern the date: 1565.” Thus we know that Polites was thinking in terms of a “1565” date. It looks to me as though he then just assumed that this had been written when the book was very new, and reflected its age. He looked at the “αφμδ” date, and knowing that in Greek “αφ” is 1500, and “δ” is 4, he then thought in his head, “Oh, it’s not 1565, it’s 1564,” and then erroneously thinking it was “1564,” did not stop to carefully think about the matter further. Hence the probable origins of the “1564” date.

Therefore, for my purposes, I shall regard the 1544 date of the Lectionary itself as authoritative and correct.

---

<sup>125</sup> Linos Polites (Linou Polite), wrote many works, including e.g., *Synoptike historia tes neas Hellenikes logotechnias: vivliographia epimetro*, 3rd edition, Thessalonica, Greece, 1977 (copy at Sydney University Library). Or Konaros, Vitzentzos (17th century), *Erotokritos*, 3rd edition, Aster, Athens, Greece, 1976, 1983, with an Introduction by Professor Linos Polites. This is a reprint in Greek of Xanthoudides’ edition of Konaros’s poem, “Erotokritos.” (Copies at Flinders University Central Library & Monash University Library, both in Victoria, Australia.).

<sup>126</sup> In English, see Polite’s *A History of modern Greek literature*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, England, 1973 (copies at Sydney University Library & Melbourne University Library). Or Polite’s *Paleographie et litterature Byzantine et neo-grecque: recueil d’etudes*, Preface, de D. Zakythinos, Variorum Reprints, London, UK, 1975 (copy at Melbourne University Library).

Though Polites was clearly still intellectually competent in 1979, this lack of finer rigor resulting in his date of “1564,” was in all probability, an understandable consequence of his old age. No doubt he was very excited at being able to see this Lectionary on his trip to Australia and Sydney University. We share in his excitement and interest in this Lectionary, and we are grateful for the fact that he wrote this note, explaining e.g., that St. Paraskeve’s Church is in modern “Famagusta” in Cyprus.

We here see how the Lord’s hand prepares the way for his children in ways too great for us to comprehend at the time. If we choose to submit to his directive will, we end up in a different place than if we live under his permissive will. This is clear from the story of Abraham and Lot. As touching upon justification by faith, both Abraham (Rom. 4:3) and Lot (II Peter 2:6-8; cf. Luke 17:28,29) were saved men. But as touching upon sanctification, Abraham put himself under the directive will of God, placing a safe distance between himself and the men of Sodom; whereas Lot was attracted to “the cities of plain, and pitched his tent toward Sodom. But the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners before the Lord exceedingly” (Gen. 13:12,13). Before “the fire and brimstone” (Gen. 19:24) of God’s judgment fell on the homosexuals (Gen. 19:5; Jude 7) of Sodom, the Lord sent Abraham in to extract Lot, since in his goodness and mercy he was not prepared to destroy (what in relative terms, were) the righteous with the unrighteous (Gen. 18:23-33). But Lot paid a price for living his saved life largely under God’s permissive will, first losing his evidently ungodly wife (Gen. 19:17,26; Luke 17:31,32), and then falling victim to his ungodly daughters (Gen.30-38), whose sin in incestuously siring the Ammonites and Moabites continued to plague the godly for hundreds and hundreds of years (Deut. 23:3-6).

Had I chosen to live my life largely under God’s permissive will, though I would still have been saved, like Lot, I would be a much more worldly man than by the grace of God, I now am. Among other things, no doubt, I would be a neo-Alexandrian. And if the Lord comes in my life-time, I’d have been extracted from this world and caught up to meet the Lord in clouds, just like Lot was extracted from Sodom. But I certainly would not be now spending time on a neo-Byzantine textual commentary, much less, profitably using these two Sydney University Lectionaries that I now cherish.

And so it is that I reflect upon the goodness of God’s provision. For back in May 1979, when I was a young 19 year old College student studying New Testament Greek, the Lord, who knows the end from the beginning, so arranged things that he had a recognized Greek scholar, Linos Polites, take an interest in this Lectionary, and write this note which he put in the back of it; which some three decades later I could take up and read.

Polites interesting and informative note refers to the fact that “Amhochostos” (Lectionary 1968) is at “Famagusta” (Polites). Famagusta is on the east coast of Cyprus. It is the capital city of the larger Famagusta District. It was also known as “Amhochostos” (meaning, “hidden in the sand”), *supra*, and it is still also so known to this day. Cyprus is on the front line of old Mohammedan-Christian battles, and in 1570-1 was the last stronghold in Cyprus to hold out against the invading Ottoman Empire’s

*sword of Islam*. The Ottoman Turks continued their capture of Cyprus until 1878 when it was finally liberated from the Mohammedans by Christians when it became part of the glorious British Empire, (as a consequence of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-8,) a status it continued to enjoy until 1960. As legacy of these glory days in the British Empire, many on the island continue to speak English as a second language. Australia was also part of the British Empire, and so to some extent it was a fruit of these bright British Empire times that James Stewart of Sydney University acquired Lectionary 1968.

But as part of the moral decline of Western civilization, anti-racist fifth columnists in Britain tragically set about to dismantle the British Empire; as they put forth propaganda making no distinction between good and godly white supremacist Christian racists of the British Empire, and bad racists such as those of Nazi Germany. Their propaganda sought “the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination,” and issues of truth, goodness, and decency, meant nothing to them, as they sought to destroy the white Christian heritage of Britain. In 1960, Cyprus was cruelly flung from both the paternalistic internal security and external protection she had enjoyed under the British Empire. The Mohammedan Turks smelt blood. In 1974, harkening back to these earlier days when the *sword of Islam* had bloodied itself viciously and violently against the Christians, the Turks again invaded Cyprus. Turkey now occupies about two-fifths of the island, known as “The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus,” and Famagusta has the misfortune of being in part of the occupied area. Large numbers of the Greek Orthodox were pushed out of the north and into the south of Cyprus.

An idea of what is happening in this northern area of Cyprus i.e., the area where Lectionary 1968 comes from, is brought to us in a recent article written in 2008. The article from *Christian Post*, is entitled, “The Last Church Standing in North Cyprus: How the Christian History was erased<sup>127</sup>.” “The Last Church” here means the last Greek Orthodox Church, St. Mamas’ Church, Morphou. But seemingly for connected reasons of tourism, the Turks have also allowed one Anglican Church, St. Andrew’s Kyrenia, North Cyprus; and also one Roman Catholic Church in the north.

The *Christian Post* reports that in the intervening decades between 1974 and 2008, “under Turkish control, more than 530 churches and monasteries have been pillaged, vandalized or destroyed in the northern area.” The Ambassador to the USA from the southern part of predominantly Greek Orthodox Cyprus, is Andreas (Andrew) Kakouris. “I cannot say that it [the destruction of churches] is encouraged openly by the Turkish government, said Cyprus’s Ambassador to the United States, Andreas Kakouris, to *The Christian Post*. ‘All I can say is that it is taking place in the area that is under direct control of the Turkish military, and I leave you to make your own conclusions from that.’” “Ambassador Kakouris, who is ... Greek Orthodox ...” further said, “even though Turkey’s constitutionally secular government may not have given the

---

<sup>127</sup> Michael Avu’s “The Last Church Standing in North Cyprus: How the Christian History was erased,” *Christian Post*, Monday 28 April, 2008 ([www.christianpost.com/article/20080428/the-last-church-standing-in-north-cyprus/index.html](http://www.christianpost.com/article/20080428/the-last-church-standing-in-north-cyprus/index.html)).

‘green light’ for destruction of churches and artifacts, they have not given the ‘red light’ either.”

The *Christian Post* continues, “Starting in 2003, Greek-Cypriots were again allowed to cross the border” to “the area under Turkish control.” They discovered “About 133 churches, chapels, and monasteries have been converted to military storage facilities, stables and nightclubs. Seventy-eight churches have been converted to mosques, and dozens more are used as military facilities, medical storage facilities, or stockyards or hay barns ... . Agia Anastasia [St. Anastasia’s] Church in Lapithos was converted into a hotel and casino, while the Sourp Magar Armenian Monastery – founded in the mediaeval period – was converted into a cafeteria ... .” “St. Mamas Church in the northwest of Morphou is the only notable [Greek Orthodox] church that is known to be semi-active in Turkey controlled Cyprus ... . Turkish officials who rule the area ... give permission twice a year for remaining residents – who were there before the Turkish occupation – to worship in the church.”

Let the reader consider carefully that Lectionary 1968 originated at St. Paraskeve’s Greek Orthodox Church at Ammochostos Famagusta, and came to Australia as a fruit of Professor Stewart’s work in north Cyprus, just one to two decades before this wicked Turkish invasion of 1974. What would have happened to this priceless Byzantine text diamond if it had stayed in northern Cyprus? *Though we know God has protected various texts inside the closed class of sources when they have been in Mohammedan captured lands, and we would like to think that this would have been one of them, (even as it was for centuries between 1571 and 1878) nevertheless, we thank God that Lectionary 1968 was evacuated to the safety of Sydney University before these more modern times of Turkey’s 1974 invasion.*

Greek Lectionary 1968 contains readings from both the *Evangelion* (Gospels) and *Apostolos* (Acts to Jude). It is a Lectionary of Gospel and Epistle readings for the Saturdays and Sunday of the year, together with annual festival days. It has Scripture selections from all four Gospels, together with selected readings from Acts to I Thessalonians, and I Timothy to I John. It will thus be used in these textual commentaries from *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* to *The First Epistle General of John*.

*D) Some general matters with respect to the two Sydney University Lectionaries.*

Greek Lectionary 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) is *c.* 120 leaves, the pages are *c.* 19.5 cm (centimetres) wide by *c.* 26 cm tall, or *c.* 7¾" (inches) wide by *c.* 10¼" tall. There are two columns per page, column size minimally varies but each column is *c.* 6-6.5 cm wide and *c.* 18 cm tall or *c.* 2¼-2½" wide and *c.* 7" tall. All margin sizes minimally vary; but the top margin on each page above the columns is *c.* 3-4 cm or *c.* 1¼-1½" wide; the bottom margin on each page is *c.* 3-5 cm or *c.* 1¼-2" wide; the outer margins on the far right of each right page and on the far left of each left page are *c.* 3.5-4 cm or *c.* 1¼ -1½" wide; and the inner margins on both pages are *c.* 2 cm or *c.* ¾" wide. The margin between the two columns may vary between *c.* 1-2 cm or *c.* ½-¾".

Letters are generally smaller in Lectionary 2378 than Lectionary 1968, *infra*. While letter size varies, letters are often under *c.* 2 mm (millimeters) or *c.* 1/16" wide and e.g., the letter alpha or α (a) is under *c.* 2 mm long and *c.* 2 mm high or *c.* 1/16" long and just under *c.* 1/16" high, whereas the theta or θ (th) is *c.* 3 mm high or *c.* 1/8" high. Sydney University has the original copied onto two microfilm reels, one in photographic positive (black writing on white background) and the other in photographic negative (white writing on black background)<sup>128</sup>.

Greek Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*), is *c.* 340 leaves, the pages are *c.* 14.5 cm wide by *c.* 21 cm tall, or *c.* 5¾" wide by *c.* 8¼" tall. There is one column per page, column size minimally varies but each column is *c.* 8.5-9 cm wide and *c.* 15 cm tall or *c.* 3¼-3½" wide and *c.* 6" tall. All margin sizes minimally vary; but the top margin on each page above the column is *c.* 2.5-3 cm or *c.* 1" wide; the bottom margin on each page is *c.* 3-3.5 cm or *c.* 1¼-1½" wide; the outer margins on the far right of each right page and on the far left of each left page are *c.* 3-3.5 cm or *c.* 1¼-1½" wide; and the inner margins on both pages are *c.* 1-2 cm or *c.* ½-¾" wide. Letters are generally larger in Lectionary 1968 than Lectionary 2378, *supra*. While letter size varies, letters are often *c.* 2-3 mm or *c.* 1/16-1/8" wide and e.g., the letter alpha or α (a) is about 3 mm long and *c.* 2-3 mm high or *c.* 1/8" long and *c.* 1/16-1/8 high, whereas the theta or θ (th) may be *c.* 5 mm or *c.* 3/16" high. Sydney University has the original copied onto two microfilm reels, one in photographic positive and the other in photographic negative<sup>129</sup>.

In general I use a combination of the positive and negative microfilm copies available at Sydney University; which I have photocopied in full, and had placed in standard comb-binding with a hard back cover and clear plastic see through front cover. Both Sydney University Lectionaries are written in brown ink with colourful bright red illumination of key letters and section markers. I have also gone through every page of the original basic brown'n'white two lectionaries, comparing a number of relevant parts with my black'n'white microfilm copies; in a broad general way "touching up" my copies. E.g., I have added in the red colouration of the originals in both Lectionaries with a red pencil to my photocopied positive microfilm copies, so as to better recreate a copy of the original. E.g., in the Matt. 1:1-25 reading in Lectionary 1968 (pp. 269a-271a), we find a stylistic break at verse 18, in which the "*Tou* ('the,' untranslated in English)" of Matt. 1:18 is thus written with the "T" (tau) indented to the left, and coloured in red ink. By colouring this over in my black'n'white photocopy with a red pencil, I am able to better appreciate this and other such instances, in both Lectionaries

Generally I find the positive microfilm copy is sufficient, although I sometimes require clarity from the negative microfilm copy. E.g., in Lectionary 2378 (p. 35b), for the "*Ti* (Why) *me* (me)" and "*me*" of "*ei me* (but)" at Matt. 19:17, I required the greater

---

<sup>128</sup> Fisher Library, Sydney University, Rare Books section, call number: RB Add. Ms. No. 40, Micro 015 positive & Micro 015 negative.

<sup>129</sup> Fisher Library, Sydney University, Rare Books section, call number: RB Stewart Ms. No. 1, Micro 017 positive & Micro 017 negative.

clarity of the negative microfilm copy to read this. While I have gone over all of both Lectionaries in a general perusal, to date I have mainly looked in greater detail at the readings containing Matt. 1-20 and used in Volumes 1 & 2 of these textual commentaries. To date, more generally, I find that this combination of looking at the positive and negative microfilm copies is sufficient for the detailed analysis of both Lectionaries in more than 95% of instances. However, I have sometimes found it necessary to go back to the original two lectionaries held at Sydney University Library, e.g., where there are partial paper fades in the original.

With respect to the issue of pagination. Both Lectionaries have had page numbers written on them in historically modern times, I would guess the 20th century, by anonymous persons whom I shall simply call “librarians.”

The pagination in Lectionary 2378 is in ink and uses a hand-crossed “7” at pp. 7,17,27, etc. . Since this is historically normative in Germany, I would conjecture that the pagination “librarian” of Lectionary 2378 may well have been either Adolf Deissmann (d. 1937) of Berlin University or an assistant of his, after he procured it from Bulgaria.

Lectionary 2378 has 122 numbered double pages, with each number covering both the pages to the left of the binding column and the right of the binding column. Each of these two pages in turn has two columns. I have called the first two columns on the page to the left of the binding “a,” and the next two columns on the page to the right of the binding “b.” Thus while the librarian numbered page reads only e.g., p. “67” for all four columns, I have divided this into “67a” for the first two columns to the left of the book’s binding, and “67b” for the last two columns to the right of the book’s binding.

Lectionary 2378 is physically detached into three pieces, with pages missing between parts 1 and 2, and parts 2 and 3. The first part starts with the front cover and ends at p. 9a where the reading of John 4:5-54a is abruptly interrupted part way through the verse. The separate and detached p. 9b then continues with a reading that abruptly starts part way in John 15:19b and goes to John 16:2. It is clear that at least one page, and possibly more, have been lost between what is now pages 9a and 9b. If, as seems likely, the pagination “librarian” was either Deissmann or an assistant of his, it therefore seems likely these pages were already missing when the Lectionary came from Bulgaria to Germany.

The second part, thus starts on p. 9b at John 15:19b-16:2 and goes to p. 15a. Since this page is written on the other side as p. “14,” it can be so numbered by me as, “15a.” This page ends when the reading is abruptly interrupted. What has been labeled p. “16” i.e., what I am calling “16b,” then starts abruptly part way into John 10:9b; and then continues in the third physical part of the Lectionary on what is clearly part of the original scribe’s intention, from John 9:17 to 28. If he was guessing, and the librarian was correct to guess this is page “16” that so starts with John 10:9b,17-28, then only one page is here missing; or if when this was first numbered there was no missing page, and the page containing p. 15b and p. 16as was subsequently lost, then only one page is here

missing. If however, this page was missing when the librarian numbered it “16,” then it is possible that more than one page is here missing.

To assume that there is only one page missing between 15b and 16a, and when the librarian first numbered this Lectionary that missing page was present, is a notion more consistent with the fact that at p. 9 there is no such jump in numbers to distinguish the break between p. 9a and p. 9b. But of course, this is not conclusive since the librarian may have acted inconsistently on these two occasions. But if there is in fact only one missing page, and it was present when the librarian numbered the lectionary, then “What happened to the missing page?” Answering this question is pure supposition and could well be very wrong. But if, as seems likely, the pagination “librarian” was either Deissmann (d. 1937) or an assistant of his, then is it possible that he, or someone else close to him in Germany at the time, deliberately detached this page to keep it as “a souvenir,” i.e., just before custody of the Lectionary passed to Angus (d. 1943) “and our Aryan brothers in Australia”?

Part 3 is then joined as one from the reading of John 10:9b,17-28 to the end of the Lectionary, and so no other pages are missing. However, p. 21 (my pp. 21a & 21b) was originally misnumbered as “18,” which was then crossed out and “21” written above it; and p. 22 (my pp. 22a & 22b) was originally misnumbered as “19,” which was then crossed out and “22” written above it. The “0” of p. “40” looks like 46,” but context requires it is p. 40; and the same is true of p. 108 which looks like “168;” but in both instances, context requires that it was simply written in a sloppy manner. Other hand sloppiness occurs with a relatively small number of other page numbers, which appear to have been written in a rush (pp. 46,47,64,67,69, & 74). Notwithstanding any criticisms that might be made of the pagination librarian, as a package deal we should be grateful to him for his work, since by formally numbering these pages, we can now quickly reference a given page in a way that previously was not possible. The benefit that the librarian gave us thus greatly outweighs any criticism we might make of the way he did it.

On the final back cover double-page after p. 122b, we find that someone did some “doodling.” Among other things, an animal of some form, real or fictional, was drawn.

Lectionary 1968 is fully intact. It is not broken or missing any pages. It is written in one column per page, and is numbered in lead pencil by a librarian to page “337” followed by a back cover. While these numbers appear just once in the top right hand corner of each page, once again I shall divide these into “a” for the first one column page to the left of the book’s binding, and “b” for the second one column page to the right of the book’s binding.

The number “7” is not crossed on these pages, and the numbering, being by appearances a modern addition, may have been done either by e.g., Professor Stewart or a Sydney University librarian. Page numbering is not always neat’n’tidy, or easy to read e.g., p. “157” looks something like “1C7;” or at p. 172 the “2” looks something like “v.” Some pagination error occurs. Specifically, page 72 is followed by a first page “73,”

then a second page “73,” then page “74.” To distinguish these, I shall refer to the first page “73” as “73(1)” divided as per normal into “73(1)a” and “73(1)b,” and the second page “73” as “73(2)” divided as per normal into “73(2)a” and “73(2)b.” Likewise, because the page between p. 171 and 172 is not numbered, I shall distinguish between page “171(1)” which is the Lectionary’s page “171,” and the following unnumbered page which I shall call page “171(2).” The pagination jumps from page “225” to page “227,” i.e., there is no Lectionary p. “226” (or my pagination, “226a” and “226b”). But there is no missing text or missing page where one would expect to find p. “226,” and so this appears to have been a librarian’s error, as he was probably counting out the numbers quickly in his head, and having said in his mind, “226,” then said “227,” without realizing he had forgotten to first write down “226.”

Once again, notwithstanding any criticisms that might be made of the pagination librarian, as a package deal we should be grateful to him for his work, since by formally numbering these pages, we can now quickly reference a given page in a way that previously was not possible. The benefit that the librarian gave us thus greatly outweighs any criticism we might make of the way he did it.

Where Lectionary readings citations in this commentary start later than the beginning of a verse, they are obviously not referred to. Therefore, if the reader finds a reference to a verse in my readings charts for the Lectionaries and then nothing in the commentary at that verse, he can take this to mean that the relevant part of the verse is not in the Lectionary reading. E.g., in the reading for Matt. 17:14-23, both Lectionaries 2378 and 1968 start their reading after the “*auton* (they)” of Matt. 17:14a referred to in Appendix 3; or for the Matt. 17:24-18:4 readings, both Lectionaries 2378 and 1968 start their reading after the “*Kapernaoum* (Capernaum)” of Matt. 17:24a referred to in Appendix 3. Thus no reference is made to either of these Lectionaries in such instances. The same will occur e.g., in the revised Volume 1 at Matt. 13:44-54 where the “*Palin* (Again),” of Matt. 13:44a is not included in Lectionary 1968<sup>130</sup>.

When I started work on these textual commentaries, I was accustomed to the neatly typed Greek scripts with standard Greek spellings and forms; with words separated; and with clear statements as to what is the book, chapter, and verse one is looking at. This is the type of thing one finds in e.g., the Trinitarian Bible Society’s edition of Scrivener’s Text or the NU Text of Nestle-Aland and UBS. *I never realized “how easy I had it.”*

First came (a photocopied photolithographic copy of) Codex W 032, which I was excited to have procured from a copy at Sydney University. It was both continuous script and capital letters (unicals), and had revowellings with an interchange of “*e*” and “*ai*” common (see Commentary Vol. 2, at Matt. 16:8b), which were not uniformly adopted (see Commentary Vol. 2, at Matt. 16:2,3; compare my comments on these two

---

<sup>130</sup> God willing, the Revised Volume 1 is scheduled for Dedication to Almighty God on *Charles I’s Day*, 30 January, 2010 i.e., exactly 2 years after the original Volume 1 on *Charles I’s Day* 2008.

Lectionaries in “Preliminary Textual Discussion,” “The First Matter,” with those at “Principal Textual Discussion,” for Variant 2, in W 032’s spelling), and of which I had no prior knowledge. But at least the copy of W 032 has stated from the modern Editor, Henry Sanders, at the bottom of each page the Book, chapter, and verses covered on that page.

... Then came (a photocopied photolith copy of) A 02 which I was very pleased to have obtained from Flinders University in Adelaide, South Australia. Due to missing pages (folios) of the original codex, its text does not start till Matt. 25. Once again, continuous script and capital letters (unicals). ... But “Oh no!,” unlike W 032, nothing on a page to state what chapter and verse one was at. ... Well, at least one knew the Book of the Bible from its statement at the beginning, and the rest is thereafter in sequential Biblical order.

... Then came the Sydney University Lectionaries. These were in cursive scripts I was unfamiliar with. They were in continuous script and in minuscules (lower case letters), though containing some majuscules (upper case letters). These sometimes had an interchange of “e” and “ai” vowels, and sometimes did not. These were selected readings from the NT, jumping all over the NT from Lectionary reading to Lectionary reading. They usually stated the book at the beginning, but sometimes the scribe gave the wrong book.

Believe me good Christian reader who is accustomed to reading Greek from the neatly type written scripts, with standard Greek spellings, words separated, and clear statements as to what verse, chapter, and book of the NT you are at, *You do not know how good life is for you!* For while I greatly enjoy learning the information in e.g., these Lectionaries, they are nowhere as easy to decipher as something like the TBS’s edition of Scrivener’s Text.

*In my old College Greek classes we were never told about anything like this!* How was I to decipher the strange cursive script of these two Sydney University Lectionaries? Fortunately, I learnt of a Lectionary page held at the New South Wales State Library. This was stated on the internet catalogue of the State Library to be a “Facsimile of cursive manuscript AD 1023. In Greek. St. Luke’s Gospel iv. 13-30. Evangelistarion 348<sup>131</sup>.” Thus I knew that if I could see this, I could compare it directly with Luke 4:13-30 in the standard Greek script that I was familiar with.

At the State Library, I was able to obtain a photocopy of this one page facsimile. Written by ink pen in the top left hand corner, it states that it is a “copy of photograph from Cursive MS [manuscript] A.D. 1023. Evan: No 348” of “S. Luke iv. 13-36<sup>132</sup>.”

---

<sup>131</sup> NSW State Library Shelf mark, RB (Rare Books) Richardson / 044.

<sup>132</sup> The manuscript actually states it is to verse “36,” but the top part of the “6” is in lighter ink as the fountain ink pen (that one dips in an ink-well) was evidently running out of ink. When this manuscript came to be catalogued, the librarian, not looking at it

Putting together what is written both here and on a second page, it was “given” to “Wilson Moore Richardson” from the area “near Weymouth,” in Dorset England, by “Mr. Burgon” on “Mar. 19<sup>th</sup> 1876.” It is said to be of interest because of the “quotations marked by asterisks” i.e., the OT quotes in Luke 4 are marked by an “X” with four dots in each side of the “X” all down the side of the page in the two columns where there is a quote, thus showing that the idea of “quotation marks” are found in this Lectionary.

As to what this Lectionary called “No. 348” is in Gregory numbers I am not sure. Is this a Scrivener Lectionary number? Caspar Gregory says that Scrivener’s Lectionary “348” is his Lectionary “496.” But he dates it to the 13th century<sup>133</sup>. If this is it, then the “A.D. 1023” date is wrong. But given the precision of “1023” as opposed to “11th century” or even “early 11th century,” means that possibly this Lectionary was somehow more accurately dated, in which instance it either is not Caspar Gregory’s 496, or if it is, Gregory (like Aland) has the wrong date. Nothing in Aland’s *Kurzgefasste* has the precise date of “1023.” Was this date actually a guess, or is it one of Aland’s 11th century Lectionaries? Therefore, I am unsure about what the Gregory number or date of this Lectionary “348” said to be from “A.D. 1023” actually is. *But a little bit of mystery does not matter.*

The value of Lectionary “348” lay in the fact that with very clear parameters of a reading starting at Luke 4:13, I was able to work through and get a grip on the cursive script. Having done so, I realized enough to see that Lectionary 2378’s first reading started at John 1:1 (pp. 1b-2a); and I found the same reading (John 1:1-17) near the beginning of Lectionary 1968 (pp. 3a-3b). Though the script of neither Sydney University Lectionary is identical with either each other nor the script of NSW State Library Lectionary “348,” this was enough for me to work through and get a basic understanding of the cursive scripts of these Lectionaries; which I then later improved upon by further reading of them.

I then built up a chart for each Lectionary, showing what their readings were, and what pages these readings were at. This was quite a long process. On a relatively small number of occasions a Lectionary says it is from one Book of the NT, and it is in fact from another Book. Moreover, some readings jump around from one passage to another. The results of this work shall be published in the front of each volume e.g., in this volume under the title, “Selections potentially relevant to Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20) from Sydney University Greek Lectionaries 2378 & 1968.”

*The preliminary work necessary before one can use a Lectionary is quite substantial.* This helps explain why only 100 to 200 have ever been looked at in greater detail. First, if like myself one likes to mark a manuscripts, one needs a usable printed copy on paper that one can so mark etc., which may be obtained by e.g., microfilm

---

very carefully, took the “36” to be a “30,” which is why library catalogue has “St. Luke’s Gospel iv. 13-30.”

<sup>133</sup> Caspar Gregory’s *Textkritik*, Leipzig, Germany, 1900, Vol. 1, p. 431.

camera or digital camera, and in my instance this had already been done by Sydney University; although I still had to go through the laborious process of photocopying this off, one page at a time, to get this into a usable “hardcopy” form. Moreover, I have at times had to inspect the original, and / or get limited photocopy scans of certain pages by the university librarian of selected pages that are not clear (at least in part) in the microfilm copy.

Secondly, one must then get this Lectionary copy into a binding (in my instance, loose-leaf comb-binding). Next, one must number the pages in some form, so as to cross-reference readings to them, and easily know where one is at. Once again, this had been already done for me on the two Sydney University Lectionaries. Fourthly, one must get some familiarity with the scribe’s cursive script. And fifthly, one must work out what lectionary readings are where, and build up a chart showing where the different reading are. Only when this formidable job is first done, can one then begin to use it. *Having done the preliminary work twice, I would not much relish the prospect of having to do it thrice!*

We know that von Soden’s team of about 40 research assistants worked for about 15 years collating the data on Codices and Minuscules in his work, the textual apparatus of which is used for determining the majority texts of both Hodges & Farstad (1983 & 1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (1991 & 2005). Von Soden completed his work in 1913, just one year before his death (by accident in an underground train station) in 1914. It is clear to me, that if in addition to these *c.* 2500 manuscripts, von Soden’s research assistants had been asked to also collate the data on *c.* 2,300 to 2,400 Lectionaries, that this would have more than doubled the time since Lectionaries are much harder to work through than Codices or Minuscules. Thus von Soden would have needed about another 20 years or so, together with associated funding. Whether or not von Soden could have obtained the extra funding I do not know. But being born in 1852, and so in 1913 being 61 years of age, and having died in 1914, we know that he certainly did not have the time for this!

The neo-Alexandrians make much of their 19th century “discovery” of Rome Vaticanus and London Sinaiticus, although Rome Vaticanus was more a “rediscovery” since it was known from the 16th century e.g., Erasmus rightly rejected it as an unreliable text. Personally, as a neo-Byzantine in Australia, I am a lot more excited about Sydney University Lectionaries 2378 & 1968. These are the only two Greek Lectionaries inside the closed class of sources to be found anywhere in the Land of the Southern Cross. While I would hardly claim to be the “discoverer” of Lectionaries 2378 & 1968 since they were never “lost,” and the existence of these two lectionaries at Sydney University has been public knowledge for years; there is nevertheless a sense in which I feel the excitement of what *for me* is a *personal* “discovery” of these two Lectionaries. But there is also *a* public element to this “personal discovery.” That is because no-one before has ever gone through them to itemize their readings and variants in the way that I am doing for these textual commentaries. That I have been able to so access them is thus quite exciting to me.

For the purposes of considering the majority and minority Byzantine readings in them, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968 are thus a great Byzantine text bonus bonanza. If I were given the free choice between either access to these two Lectionaries or the two leading Alexandrian Texts, then as a neo-Byzantine my answer would have to be unequivocal. It would be for these two Lectionaries. That is because both are Byzantine Text Lectionaries, both are from the 16th century or earlier, and therefore both are inside the closed class of sources providentially protected by God to form the building blocks of the Received Text. Thus whereas I would consider texts like the neo-Alexandrian's Codices Vaticanus and Alexandrianus to be "the booby prize," by contrast, I would consider Lectionaries 2378 & 1968 to be "the real thing."

In the 15th and 16th centuries, men went out from Western Europe to discover and explore the world, and there was so much of it still unknown to the civilized Western Europeans, that there was a sense in which any new explorer would probably find something new and name it for the first time. We today are also on the threshold of discovering exciting new information in presently uncharted waters with respect to over 2,000 Byzantine Lectionaries. As with the two Sydney University Lectionaries that I am now studying, the vast majority of these Lectionaries have never been studied in detail, with collations made of their relevant readings and variants.

E.g., my Appendix 3 comments on Matt. 17:6, state that in Lectionary 1968, we find "a minority Byzantine reading, '*prosekopsan* (<they beat upon,> indicative active first aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *proskoptō*).' The four preceding words before the '*kai* (<and,> word 5)' preceding ... '*prosekopsan*' (Lectionary 1968 *et al*) are, '*kai* (<and,> word 1) *epneusan* (<blew,> word 2) *oi* (<the,> word 3) *anemoi* (<winds,> word 4).' But in Lectionary 1968, due to ellipsis, the eye of the scribe jumped from the '*kai*' of word 1 to the '*kai*' of word 5, thereby omitting words 2, 3, & 4."

Or at Matt. 19:21c in Appendix 3, with respect to "*ourano* (heaven)" or "*ouranois* (heavens)," I state, "Of notable interest, Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.) first abbreviates the '*ouran*' to '*ouno*' with a line over the '*un*,' and then on the main line reads '*ois*' and in the space above this reads '*o*.' This means that the scribe of Lectionary 1968 is giving both readings, and allowing the Lectionary user to select which of the two he prefers. *This is thus an example of variant New Testament Greek readings being shown inside the Byzantine textual tradition some years before Stephanus's 1550 edition showing variants from over a dozen manuscripts!*"

It is exciting to me to consider that this type of work at e.g., Matt. 17:6 and Matt. 19:21 in Appendix 3, and other such details in my textual commentaries on these two Sydney University Lectionaries, have never before been academically recorded. In doing so, I am reminded of the scenes of a tall ship I saw at Whitby, England in October 2008. At that time, a replica of a tall ship stood in dock, behind which one could see on a green hill across the waters, both St. Mary's *Church of England* to the left, and to the right the remains of Whitby Abbey (where a synod met in 664 that settled the date for Easter in accordance with general Western Church tradition). Among other things at Whitby, I visited a Captain Cook Memorial at the "Khyber Pass," and also inspected the

house in Grape Vine (now a Captain Cook Museum,) where the explorer who discovered Australia in 1770 undertook his apprenticeship with a ship owner. *The Age of Discovery is not over, it is still just beginning!*

Thus for those who are prepared to select one or more lectionary, and do some work on the more than 2,000 Greek Byzantine Text Lectionaries, which to date have only been looked at in general way, there are still new exciting discoveries to be made. In our yet largely unmapped details of these Byzantine Text Lectionaries, we are thus like the great explorers of the 15th and 16th centuries, or Captain James Cook (1728-1779) in the 18th century, in that whoever selects any hitherto not studied in detail Lectionary for these purposes of detailed analysis, will be the first to do so, and thus the first to map out and record some fascinating new discoveries. I thus thank God that in this exciting and momentous age of discovery, I have been privileged to become one such explorer after I learnt of Sydney University Lectionaries 2378 and 1968, and pray God that what I document from them in my textual commentaries may be used to his honour and glory.

***\*Robinson & Pierpont's (1991) new edition Byzantine Textform (2005).***

While we neo-Byzantines of the holy Protestant faith do not consider that Latin is a Biblical language at the point of the Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture (II Tim. 3:16), we most assuredly do consider that it is a Biblical language at the point of the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture (I Peter 1:25). Thus for we Protestants who recognize and uphold the Received Text of Holy Scripture, the Latin stands with the Greek as one of the two New Testament languages of importance to us. This compares and contrasts with the Burgonites like Robinson & Pierpont or Hodges & Farstad, who like us, also recognize that Greek is a NT Biblical language; but unlike us, consider that Greek is the only NT Biblical language that matters.

In this, their sentiment reminds me of some of the old Latin-phobic revolutionary English Puritans who used to come against their fellow Protestants in Anglicanism, and claim they were "Popish" because they used Latin. (I do not say that all Puritans, either then or now, suffer from such Latin-phobia.) But in saying this, I would hasten to add that both Robinson & Pierpont and Hodges & Farstad strike me as far more benign figures than these old (mainly) English revolutionary Puritans. E.g., unlike these old civil war Puritans, Pierpont studied Latin, *infra*; but like such Puritans, he still did not think it relevant to the construction of the NT Text. Thus though they are much more friendly, educated, and civilized types of Puritans than the old English Puritans of civil war times, nevertheless, they still seem to retain something of their sentiment, i.e., the sentiment that says that with the NT, *all that matters is the Greek, not the Latin*, not just for the issue of Divine Inspiration - where we would agree with them, but also for the issue of Divine Preservation - which is where we would disagree with them. Although unlike the old Latin Papists, we give the priority to the Greek. Hence the maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, is only ever used as a servant maxim where it is justified on textual analysis *of the Greek* i.e., subject to the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. I would also make this same criticism of the neo-Alexandrians, which is why one will never find either a Burgonite nor neo-Alexandrian who recognizes the TR's and

AV's reading of e.g., Acts 9:5,6 or I John 5:7,8. Nevertheless, we neo-Byzantines of the *Textus Receptus* (TR) can still find some value in these works. E.g., for the purposes of determining the representative Byzantine text of the New Testament, which is always our starting point, Robinson & Pierpont's work is a very useful and time saving device that I appreciatively employ.

In 2009, I learnt from the internet that Robinson & Pierpont's Text (1991) has been replaced by a new edition of 2005; and I then procured a copy of this work. While their 2005 edition is still a majority text, unlike their earlier edition, *The New Testament ... According to the Byzantine / Majority Textform* (1991), their new edition has dropped the word "Majority" so that it is simply, *The New Testament in the ... the Byzantine Textform* (2005)<sup>134</sup>. It is dedicated "In Memoriam" to William Pierpont (d. 2003). However the cover-jacket says that before Pierpont died, "he had jointly approved the final text and most of the prefatory material for this edition."

The cover-jacket also refers to Maurice Robinson as Senior Professor of New Testament and Greek, at the *Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary*, in Wake Forest, North Carolina, USA. The matter is of some further interest to me because the author of *Genesis Unbound*, (Multnomah Books, Sisters, Oregon, USA, 1996), John Sailhamer, has been Senior Professor of Old Testament at this same Seminary. Sailhamer is a member of the *North Suburban Evangelical Free Church* at Deerfield, Illinois; and Pierpont was a member of the *Evangelical Free Church*. Though I agree with neither of their respective works entirely (in the case of Sailhamer, I locate Eden under the waters of the present Persian Gulf, not in Israel; and in the case of Robinson, I follow the Received Text, not the representative Byzantine Text), nevertheless, I consider both *Genesis Unbound* (1996) and *The New Testament in the ... the Byzantine Textform* (2005) to be useful works, in broad terms pointing people in a more accurate direction than most contemporary academics have done on the issues these books address<sup>135</sup>. I.e., Sailhamer

---

<sup>134</sup> ISBN-10: 0-7598-0077-4 or ISBN-13: 978-0-7598-0077-9. I was able to purchase a new copy of this work from Amazon Books, USA (amazon.com).

<sup>135</sup> With regard to one of the great issues of our times, *creation verses macroevolution*, my emphasis is on the twin issues of *creation not macroevolution* and *the authority of the Bible*. Beyond this I maintain that with regard to the issue of what model of creation one adopts, i.e., one's more detailed understanding of Gen. 1 & 2, that this is a matter of private judgement. I am thus tolerant on the issues of old earth creationism or young earth creationism; and if the former, whether one follows the Global Earth (Gen. 1:2b-2:3) Gap School, or Local Earth (Gen. 1:2b-2:3) Gap School, or Day-Age School. Therefore while I uphold *creation not macroevolution* and *the authority of the Bible* as fundamentals of the faith, and thus e.g., man's common descent from Adam and Eve, and a historical fall by Adam resulting in sin and human mortality; within these parameters, I regard the third issue i.e., what creationist model one adopts, to be a matter of private judgment. It is in this context that the reader should understand my endorsement of the local creation gap school of Pye Smith *et al*, which applies Gen. 1:1 to the universe and globe, with a succession of multiple "worlds" created by God (Heb. 1:2; 11:3) spanning many "generations" (Gen. 2:4) in between Genesis 1:1 and

follows Pye Smith with an old earth creationist view of Genesis 1 that sees an undisclosed gap in time between the first two verses of Genesis, followed by a local creation of Eden in six 24 hour days<sup>136</sup>; and Robinson recognizes that the representative Byzantine Text is superior to a neo-Alexandrian text.

On the one hand, we live in an era when for decades the best brains have been locked out of the formal world of “academia” since “politically correct” notions on a range of issues are formulated by inter-mediate “intellectuals” and then used as “lock-out” devices against both their intellectual inferiors and their intellectual superiors alike (e.g., allocation of marks, publication of material in academic journals, academic appointment selection criteria and panels replicating their own power structures). This is seen by e.g., the general absence of (old earth) creationists in geological and other scientific departments from the latter part of the 19th century. But on the other hand, though I know very little about *Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary*, it appears to have attracted and helped to facilitate the academic careers of two men who have produced above average academic works in our times i.e., *Genesis Unbound* (1996) and Robinson & Pierpont’s majority text *New Testament in the ... the Byzantine Textform* (2005). In saying this, I do not wish to endorse either the work of Sailhamer or Robinson uncritically; I merely say that both works are *a step in the right direction* on much longer paths than neither of them have fully trodden. *But something in the right direction is better than nothing!*

I have only used Robinson & Pierpont’s 2005 edition for Matt. 20 onwards, i.e., for Matt. 1-19 the Robinson & Pierpont text I consulted is that of their 1991 edition; and I

---

Genesis 1:2, followed by a six 24 hour day local creation of Eden in Gen. 1:2b-2:3. See Commentary Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” section, “a) Preliminary Qualifications & Remarks,” with regard to the excellent and brilliant work on Genesis 1 by the Westminster Divine, John Lightfoot.

<sup>136</sup> As an old earth creationist, I consider that both the macroevolutionary Darwinist and young earth creationist theories are too man centred (anthropocentric) rather than God centred (Theocentric). The Darwinists are so anthropocentric that they consider e.g., the satyr beast Habilis (c. 1-2 million years ago) and the satyr beast Erectus (c. ¾-1 million years ago), are “related to man” in “a macroevolutionary path;” whereas young earth creationists are so anthropocentric, that they cannot conceive of “generations” (Gen. 2:4) of “worlds” (Heb. 1:2; 11:3) on this globe *without man and made by God with no specific reference to man*, or of an Eden that was not global (if so, two human beings must have needed a very large space indeed!), so they consider creatures like the satyr beast Erectus must be in some way “devolved” or “ill” or “different races” of man, destroyed in a “global flood.” But if one has a Theocentric perspective that recognizes that the “One that inhabiteth eternity” (Isa. 57:15) created various “worlds” (Heb. 1:2; 11:3); then he could e.g., make creatures like Neanderthal in one world, and this has nothing to do with his later creation of man and segregation of him in the local world of Eden, with its inner sanctum of the Garden of Eden (Gen. 2:10-15).

do not intend to generally review this element in my Revised Volume 1 (due for Dedication on 30 Jan. 2010), which *unless otherwise specified* in some limited context, shall therefore still generally be based on this 1991 edition (together with the consultation I made of Hodges & Farstad). But given the importance to my neo-Byzantine work of determining the representative Byzantine text as my starting point, and given the importance in this process of both Hodges and Farstad's majority text and Robinson & Pierpont's majority text, I undertook a study to compare and contrast Matt. 1-28 in Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). My general practice is to consult both Hodges & Farstad's and Robinson & Pierpont's majority texts, and only where there is some textual disagreement of substance, to then scrutinize them further. This is usually done through reference to Green's Textual Apparatus (1986). All three of these works are based on the source book of von Soden's data. Only if such an approach proves unfruitful for some reason, would I then be prepared to directly consult the source book of von Soden myself.

Hence where I know from these two majority texts, and possibly also Green's Textual Apparatus that the representative Byzantine text is fairly evenly divided, textual analysis is then required. Both Hodges & Farstad's and Robinson & Pierpont's majority texts are composed on different methodological usages of von Soden's textual apparatus. Robinson & Pierpont use only von Soden's "K" group which is more than 90% Byzantine, whereas Hodges & Farstad have a methodology focusing on two of von Soden's three groups, namely the "K" and "I" groups, and the "I" group which is more than 2/3rds Byzantine. Thus like Green's Textual Apparatus which is also based on von Soden's work, these von Soden based works deal primarily with a count of Byzantine manuscripts. That the overwhelming majority of von Soden's manuscripts were Byzantine, has the practical effect that notwithstanding the different methodological uses of von Soden by Robinson & Pierpont focusing on the "K" group" as opposed to Hodges & Farstad focusing on the "K" and "I groups," in practice, both have produced very similar texts, which approach to, though do not quite attain to, a standard von Soden based majority text for St. Matthew's Gospel. Hodges & Farstad's methodology uses about 1,500 of von Soden's manuscripts, of which more than 85% are Byzantine text, so that they have produced what *in substance, though not in theoretical form, is a Byzantine Text*. Robinson & Pierpont's methodology uses about 1,000 of von Soden's manuscripts, of which more than 90% are Byzantine Text, so that they have produced what *in both substance and theoretical form is a Byzantine Text*. That in Matt. 1-28 I have found these two texts to be in general agreement with regard to substance, other than where the Byzantine Text is fairly evenly divided, is thus quite understandable. While I have not looked at these two works in the same detail for Mark to Jude, from what I can see on a general perusal, this *prima facie* appears to be the same as for Matthew.

In St. Matthew's Gospel, most of the differences between the main text in the majority texts of Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005) are of a cosmetic nature. Hodges & Farstad do not use optional letters whereas Robinson & Pierpont do on e.g., *egennese / egennesen* (begat) in Matt. 1 and elsewhere. Or Hodges & Farstad prefer the shorter form *outo* (so, thus), whereas Robinson & Pierpont prefer the

longer form *outos* (so, thus) (Matt. 2:5; 3:15; 5:19,47; 7:12; 17:12; 18:35; 19:8,12; 23:28; 24:33; 26:54). Or they may employ different forms of vowelling *hades* (hell), either putting the iota (i) under the alpha (a) (Robinson & Pierpont), or putting the iota (i) after the alpha (a) on the same line (Hodges & Farstad) (Matt. 11:23; 16:18). Hodges & Farstad prefer unravelling a continuous script with *inati* (why?) whereas Robinson & Pierpont prefer “*ina ti* (why?)” (Matt. 9:4,17; 27:46); or Hodges & Farstad prefer “*ei me ge* (otherwise)” whereas Robinson & Pierpont prefer “*ei me ge* (otherwise)” (Matt. 6:1). Sometimes there is a minor difference in the way they stylistically conceptualize a variant (Matt. 23:37; 24:27; 26:9,33).

There are also differences of punctuation in the Gospel According to St. Matthew. For instance, commas or capitalizations of the first letter of a word (e.g., Matt. 9:2,35,36); stylistic indentation of passages and usage of quotations by Hodges & Farstad (e.g., Matt. 1:23); or capitalization of “JESUS” (Matt. 1:23) or “THIS IS JESUS THE KING OF THE JEWS” (Matt. 27:37) by Hodges & Farstad, but not by Robinson & Pierpont; paragraphing (e.g., Matt. 10:1,21,24). There is also a preference by Hodges & Farstad for the English question mark (“?”) and by Robinson & Pierpont for the Greek question mark (“;”) (e.g., Matt. 12:10); or Robinson & Pierpont may use dashes (-) where Hodges & Farstad use brackets (Matt. 24:15). There is a clear preference by Hodges & Farstad for the exclamation mark (Matt. Matt. 7:5; 8:10,25; 9:3,33; 10:15,25; 12:12,34,49; 14:26,30; 15:7,28; 16:22,23; 17:5; 18:7 – twice, 18:28; 20:30,31; 21:9,20; 23:13,14,15,17,19,23,24,25,26,33 – thrice, 37 – twice; 24:19,23,26 – twice; 25:6; 26:24,49,65,68,72,74; 27:4,22,23,29,40,54; 28:6,9). As for the name sometime abbreviated as “DAD” or less commonly “DD” (with a line across the top where I have a line underneath these letters), Hodges & Farstad prefer the spelling, *Dabid* (David), whereas Robinson & Pierpont prefer the spelling *Dauid* (David) (Matt. 1:1,6,17; 9:27; 12:3,23; 15:22; 20:30,31; 21:9,15; 22:42,43,45).

Sometimes there is a difference of interpretation in Matthew’s Gospel. Are Matt. 6:23 and Matt. 21:20 exclamations (Hodges & Farstad) or questions (Robinson & Pierpont)? Or where does a particular verse begin (Matt. 26:61)?

Were this the end of the matter, I would be prepared to refer to both Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005) as constituting a standard von Soden based majority text for St. Matthew’s Gospel. Indeed, they appear to have come quite close to this anyway. While I have not as yet compared and contrasted Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont in such detail for the rest of the NT, if their work on Matthew is representative of their majority texts on Matthew to Jude (von Soden is not used the same way for Revelation), then indeed one might, if these were the only differences, refer more generally to such a von Soden based standard majority text for Matthew to Jude. However, there is one other matter of greater substance that emerges from this detailed study of St. Matthew’s Gospel, to wit, the issue of when the majority text is or is not split in a significant way.

Hodges & Farstad have two apparatuses on most of their pages, and their first apparatus is for where “there is a significant division within the” “manuscripts.” For my

purposes of determining the majority Byzantine text, it is only where they regard the split in the text to vary with “substantial evidence from the rest of the majority representatives” as indicated by the symbol, “M pt” (part Majority Text)<sup>137</sup>, that the matter is of potential interest to me in terms of whether or not the Byzantine text may be fairly evenly divided at that reading (which may or may not be the case if it is “M pt”). Likewise Robinson & Pierpont place in “angle brackets [ ]” in their main text word(s) with the “alternate Byzantine reading” “in the side margin” where “the Byzantine Textform” is “significantly divided<sup>138</sup>,” and once again such readings are of interest to me for the issue of determining the representative Byzantine text. Moreover, if textual analysis favours a minority Byzantine reading, such data may also be of interest to me if it indicates that the variant is a stronger minority reading.

In Matthew, there are times when both Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005) agree that the majority text is significantly divided (Matt. 5:39,45; 9:3,27; 10:28; 11:16a; 13:3,15; 17:2,27; 19:5 – twice; 21:33; 22:9,13,23; 23:36,37; 24:2,27,33; 26:15,17,33,35; 28:10). But at other times, Pierpont & Robinson show a major manuscript split whereas Hodges & Farstad show a less significant manuscript split (Matt. 11:8;21; 19:26; 21:22). At other times, Hodges & Farstad show no split whatsoever when Robinson & Pierpont do (Matt. 22:39). And at yet other times, more commonly Hodges & Farstad consider there is a significant manuscript split, whereas Robinson & Pierpont do not (Matt. 3:1; 4:13; 5:20; 9:5,36; 10:25; 11:20,21a,23; 12:13,29,40; 13:14,24,52; 14:22,34; 15:32; 16:20; 18:15; 20:15,26,27; 21:28; 22:37 – twice; 22:46; 23:10,14; 24:18,49 – twice; 25:9,32; 26:29,43,48,50,75; 27:4,12,64; 27:65). And while the main text in their respective majority texts are generally the same, very occasionally, when both agree there is a significant manuscript split, Hodges & Farstad place one of the readings in their main text, whereas Robinson & Pierpont place the other reading in their main text (Matt. 5:39; 10:25; 11:16b; 15:39; 21:30; 26:11). In all such four instances, I scrutinize the text further, in the first and usually final instance by reference to textual apparatuses, especially Green’s Textual Apparatus (which must be used critically in that it gives upper range figures which may be up to *c.* 10% lower e.g., the “Level 2” given as 80-94% would in fact be a range starting at *c.* 72-80% and going up to *c.* 85-94%), although sometimes UBS (e.g., Matt. 11:23, see “Byz pt” = “one part of the Byzantine text when its witness is divided i.e., in contrast to another part”<sup>139</sup>). But if I reluctantly think it advisable, then I make direct consultation of the source book of von Soden (see commentary at Matt. 20:15c “The First Matter” in “Preliminary Textual Discussion”).

Thus for determining the representative Byzantine text (for the purposes of Matthew to Jude), I primarily make usage of both Hodges & Farstad’s and Robinson & Pierpont’s von Soden based majority texts, as well as the von Soden based Green’s

---

<sup>137</sup> Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xiii, xxi.

<sup>138</sup> Robinson & Pierpont (2005), p. xviii.

<sup>139</sup> UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993), p. 19\*.

Textual Apparatus. Since Hodges and Farstad's majority text is based on more than 85% Byzantine texts from *c.* 1,500 manuscripts (codices and minuscules), and Robinson and Pierpont's majority text is based on more than 90% Byzantine texts from *c.* 1,000 manuscripts (codices and minuscules), I regard both of them *in practice* as majority Byzantine texts, notwithstanding the fact that *in theory* only Robinson & Pierpont consciously adopted what they called a "Byzantine priority" methodology. Hence even though I give a theoretical priority to Robinson & Pierpont over Hodges & Farstad because of Robinson & Pierpont's "Byzantine priority" methodology, this is more of an ideological commitment on my part to using the representative Byzantine text as my starting point, than it is a practical difference between these two majority texts at the point of what that starting point looks like.

In using Hodges & Farstad, Robinson & Pierpont, and Green's Textual Apparatus, let me say that I think it is wonderful to see that von Soden's excellent storehouse of data is being used; and it is also interesting to see how in St. Matthew's Gospel *et al*, the two different methodological approaches of Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont generally yields the same main text in their majority texts, other than where both agree there is a major split in the text. There is thus a sense in which von Soden's *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (1913), has achieved something of the type of acclaim that von Soden no doubt had always hoped it would, but not till about seven decades or more after his death (d. 1914). That acclaim is highly qualified, namely, it is his excellent manuscript data, not his faulty textual theory or main text, that has proven of value to neo-Byzantine, Burgonite, and neo-Alexandrian alike. Thus the fact that in addition to these Burgonite majority texts, the neo-Alexandrian's contemporary NU Texts have also now integrated this type of information with Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) using the "R" symbol for the Majority Text<sup>140</sup>, or UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) using "Byz" for the Byzantine text<sup>141</sup>, is also noteworthy. Hence e.g., Kurt Aland says, "von Soden's edition" contains "a vast quarry of information that is unavailable elsewhere<sup>142</sup>." Certainly notwithstanding any criticisms that I as a neo-Byzantine make of von Soden's 1913 work, it should be borne in mind that I have a tremendous respect for the manuscript data in it, most especially the data on the *c.* 1900-2040 Greek Byzantine manuscripts that von Soden consulted i.e., about all the Byzantine Codices and Minuscules that we have.

As part of my fifth trip to London, between September 2008 and March 2009 I circumnavigated the globe by traveling westwards (landing / taking off in Sydney-Singapore-London-North America-Sydney), stopping off on the way home to Australia to see several cities in North America, including New York and San Francisco. In March 2009, I took a United Airlines flight from New York on east coast USA to San Francisco

---

<sup>140</sup> Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993), p. 55\*.

<sup>141</sup> UBS's 4th revised edition (1993), p. 19\*.

<sup>142</sup> Aland, K., *et unum, The Text of the NT*, translated by E.F. Rhodes, 2nd ed., Eerdmans, Michigan, USA, 1987, p. 23.

on west coast USA. With a window seat in the plane, the flight path flew me over 11 USA States, 1) New York (city), New York (State), to 2) Pennsylvania, 3) Ohio, 4) Indiana, 5) Illinois 6) Missouri, 7) Kansas, 8) Colorado, 9) Utah, 10) Nevada, landing at 11) San Francisco (city) California (State). *Thus the third state I flew over on this flight was OHIO, and the seventh state I flew over was KANSAS*<sup>143</sup>.

The third state I flew over, Ohio, was the state of birth of Hermann Freiherr von Soden (1852-1914), a man of German descent born in the City of Cincinnati in this State, who then moved to Germany. He was educated in the German University of Tubingen, and he lived, worked, and died in Germany. He was a Professor of Divinity at Berlin University. A member of the State *Lutheran Church*, he is buried in the Protestant Cemetery of Berlin's *Jerusalem Church*, the church he was the Lutheran Minister of from 1887/8 (having formerly been the Lutheran Minister at Dresden-Striesen from 1881, and after that being appointed to St. Archidiakonus Jacobi in Chemnitz)<sup>144</sup>.

Men are sometimes inconsistent in what they believe. E.g., Luther's clarity of thought on justification by faith was inconsistent with his belief in baptismal regeneration, although he never consciously recognized this inconsistency, and continued to correctly believe in justification by faith while inconsistently holding to baptismal regeneration. Or men sometimes intermingle elements of religious conservatism with elements of religious liberalism. Such a man was Hermann von Soden.

On the one hand, von Soden upheld religiously conservative Protestant views on justification by faith. Thus in discussing St. Paul's teaching in the Book of Galatians, he said, "Jews" or Judaizers "had crept into the community" of "Galatian Christians and made them rebellious." The Judaizers said "he that wishes to be a Christian must become a Jew, that is, must take upon him the sign of the covenant, must observe Sabbath and feast day, and keep the Law, at least its chief commands ([Gal.] 5:2; 4:10; 3:2-5)." But "St. Paul" teaches that "the 'offence of the cross' [Gal. 5:11] ... is to be simply accepted. The cross first gains for him its complete significance and justification when he is assured that the Law was intended only to bring consciousness of sins, that it even tends to the multiplication of transgressions, and that it must thus under all circumstances be abolished now that Christ has made atonement for sins and has imparted the Spirit to mankind. Only those therefore are Christians who make a

---

<sup>143</sup> I procured this information on the USA States from an air hostess who rang the pilot while I was standing at the back of the plane in her presence, and she wrote down the names of the States as he advised her. A general flight map I was shown by the air hostess also showed that the expected flight path would go over both the Chicago capital of Illinois and the Colorado capital of Denver.

<sup>144</sup> "Hermann Freiherr von Soden," *Wikipedia* (English) (2009) ([en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hermann,\\_Freiherr\\_von\\_Soden](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hermann,_Freiherr_von_Soden)); "Hermann von Soden" *Wikipedia* (German, automatically translated into English) (2009) ([de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hermann\\_v](http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hermann_v)).

complete breach with all idea of merit gained through the works of the Law, and trust themselves absolutely to the grace of God offered to them in Christ<sup>145</sup>.”

But on the other hand, von Soden inconsistently held to religiously liberal views on how Scripture was composed, and in this context denied the verbal inspiration of Scripture (II Tim. 3:16). E.g., he says “it may be conjectured that” the data St. Matthew used in the Gospel was first “written down” “in the Aramaic tongue,” and that “verbal differences found” in the Gospels of “St. Luke and St. Matthew suggest” “that the two evangelists had used different Greek translations of this compilation<sup>146</sup>.” He also thinks a Gospel writer might take it upon himself “to revise the style” of what was said<sup>147</sup>. Sadly these type of religiously liberal views were an integral part of the text von Soden produced in the main text of his Greek NT, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (1913), since his “reconstruction” theory also denies the Divine preservation of Scripture (I Peter 1:25).

I do want to claim biographical immunity from such dreadful inconsistencies in my own life. When I look at this type of thing, I am reminded that as a young man of 18 to 20 years, I was enrolled in a four year USA Californian College *Bachelor of Arts* degree undertaken at an affiliated Australian College in New South Wales<sup>148</sup>. But before I left my first College in 1980 at the beginning of my third year, at the age of 18 I had in 1978 been a religiously conservative College Freshman; but then as a 19 year old sophomore and a 20 year old senior College student in my penultimate year, I had come to a comparable mix of religiously conservative belief in justification by faith on the one hand; while on the other hand, inconsistently holding to some religiously liberal views in other areas.

E.g., as a second and third year College student, I held such religiously liberal views as a belief in the second century B.C. dating of the Book of Daniel and associated preterism; rather than my matured religiously conservative view of a sixth century B.C. dating of Daniel and historicism. Or I used a neo-Alexandrian text in my NT Greek studies, namely, the UBS 3rd edition of 1975; as opposed to my matured religiously conservative view upholding the Received Text. Indeed I still have a copy of the UBS 3rd edition which I kept as a memento but did use as my working copy, which was presented to me as a gift from the United Bible Societies as part of their general practice of giving a free UBS Greek NT to all College / University students undertaking *Koine*

---

<sup>145</sup> Von Soden, H., *Books of the New Testament*, in Morrison, W.D. (Editor) of the *Crown Theological Library*, Vol. 13, Translated by J.R. Wilkinson, Williams & Norgate, New York, USA, 1907, pp. 63,69-70.

<sup>146</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 140.

<sup>147</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 166.

<sup>148</sup> See Commentary Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), “Background Story to Commentary,” at section on “15-20 years old.”

Greek studies. Or I used the Revised Standard Version as my principle Bible translation<sup>149</sup>; as opposed to my matured religiously conservative view upholding the Authorized (King James) Version of 1611. Thus by the grace and goodness of God, I was in time purged of these and other horrible religiously liberal views, and I thank God for being now liberated from them. It is thus as a rebuke to my own youthful folly (“O Lord,” “remember not the sins of my youth,” Ps. 25:6,7), that I say with sadness that von Soden maintained such an inconsistent union of religious conservatism and religious liberalism. “I have hated the congregation of evil doers; and will not sit with the wicked. I will wash my hands in innocency; ... that I may publish with the voice of thanksgiving, and tell of all thy wondrous works” (Ps. 26:5-7). “I will walk in mine integrity” (Ps. 26:11), for “what communion hath light with darkness?” (II Cor. 6:14).

I nevertheless consider that it is necessary to cover this sad element of von Soden’s theological inconsistencies because unfortunately one cannot understand his very useful textual apparatus, without understanding something of his religiously liberal theory of textual transmission, and religiously liberal concept of how to “reconstruct” the NT text i.e., his main text is needed to understand his apparatus. *Thus I think the good Christian reader needs to be very clearly warned that like von Soden’s wider theology, his NT text and textual apparatus is a mix of good and bad.*

In specific terms, the American born German, Herman von Soden, compiled a Greek New Testament (1913), in which he expressed his belief that in the fourth century A.D., there were three “revisions” (“recensions”) of the New Testament text, which he designated as his “K” group, “I” group,” and “H” group. (Where manuscripts are not

---

<sup>149</sup> The Greek Grammar we used gave examples of English translation of the Greek from the Revised Standard Version (RSV), Revised Version of 1881 (RV), and New English Bible (NEB) (Whittaker’s *New Testament Greek Grammar*, SCM, UK, 1969, 1975, p. 27, RV, RSV, NEB; p. 34, RV & NEB; p. 37, RV & NEB; p. 86, RV; p. 98, RV & NEB; p. 141, RV & NEB; p. 142, RV & NEB; p. 144, RV; p. 146, NEB; p. 150, RV & NEB). In Greek classes the “accuracy” of the RSV was extolled, and we generally used the RSV to consider English translations of the Greek (Dr. Young of the Theology Department). In a Chapel Service I remember how the RSV was promoted as the “most accurate” (Dr. Clapham of History, Chairman of the Humanities Dept.), and it had also been used during the 1978 “Week of Prayer” in the College Chapel (Pastor Bambury); and in English the RSV was extolled for its “literary qualities” (Dr. Cox of the Humanities Dept.). Although some teachers (lecturers) were promoting the AV (Pastor Tolhurst & Pastor Fletcher), even they did not argue that the NT Received Text was the better text. Thus the basic philosophical sentiment that I picked up went thus something like, “the RSV is the best translation; but if you want a second opinion on the Greek look at the RV or NEB; and if you want a general reader or second general version, use the NEB.” While my usage of the NEB was always minimalist, for I never liked its overly free and interpretative style relative to the Greek, I was seduced by such promotion into a general usage of the RSV.

specifically itemized in his apparatus, von Soden's readings for his three main "K," "I," & "H" groups represent a 90% + of the manuscripts in them i.e., they are generalist rather than absolute statements of the group reading.) Of note to we neo-Byzantines, he thus maintained that the antiquity of the Byzantine text found in more than 90% of his "K" group and more than 2/3rds of his "I" group (e.g., A 02, *Codex Alexandrinus*, 5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, in the Gospels, von Soden's δ4 in his I ka group; or Sigma 042, *Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century, Byzantine, von Soden's ε 18 in his I π group), cannot, as generally claimed by neo-Alexandrians, reasonably be said to have come later in time than the "H" group favoured by the neo-Alexandrians (e.g., Aleph 01, *London Sinaiticus*, 4th century, Alexandrian, von Soden's δ2; and B 03, *Rome Vaticanus*, 4th century, Alexandrian, von Soden's δ1).

In general terms, von Soden considered that where two or three of these "K," "I," or "H" groups were in agreement, then *prima facie* there was a good chance that this was the "original" text. Given that one of the two groups is K group, which is more than 90% Byzantine, and another is "I" group which is more than 2/3rds Byzantine, this theory produced a text that was *too Byzantine* for the liking of most neo-Alexandrians; but when also combined with von Soden's other "textual analysis reconstruction" work, it was decidedly *too non-Byzantine* for Byzantines, and *too non-Received Text* for neo-Byzantines. *He thus raised just about everybody's ire.* I say, "just about," since in fairness to von Soden, this "crazy hotchpotch" methodology rang a sympathetic cord in the "crazy hotchpotch" mind of James Moffatt, who "could not get enough of it" for his "crazy hotchpotch" *Moffatt Bible*.

But paradoxically, because von Soden considered virtually all the Codices and Minuscules (except in the Book of Revelation), his textual apparatus is regarded by everyone as having a lasting value (although Hoskier is also used for the Book of Revelation). While von Soden's text has had a small number of supporters, of which the religiously liberal Moffatt is the most notable, in broad terms (for Matthew to Jude) it seems *nobody likes von Soden's text or textual theory, but everybody likes the information von Soden stores in his textual apparatus connected with his faulty text.* E.g., while I consult mainly his Latin textual apparatus (and revised Latin text), Merk's Latin & Greek *Novum Testamentum* found von Soden's work a useful tool<sup>150</sup>.

Von Soden's "K" or Koine group is generally Byzantine Text, and this is the group upon which Robinson & Pierpont base their Byzantine Text (1991 & 2005). I use Robinson & Pierpont's text (together with Hodges & Farstad and Green's Textual Apparatus) as my starting point for determining the representative or majority Byzantine text, and as a neo-Byzantine I only move away from the representative Byzantine text to alternative readings inside the closed class of sources, if there is a clear and obvious textual reason problem with it. (Or if the representative Byzantine text is fairly evenly divided, textual analysis will also be required to determine the better reading). *I.e., von Soden's K group of about 1,000 manuscripts is more than a large enough sample for us*

---

<sup>150</sup> Merk's *Novum Testamentum*, pp. 9ff; Metzger, B., *The Text of the NT*, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

*to in turn project from it the reading of the representative Byzantine found in thousands of Byzantine texts.*

Von Soden's "H" or Hesychian / Egyptian group is of most interest to neo-Alexandrians. The "I" or Jerusalem / Jerusalem group is an artificially constructed group mixing manuscripts of diverse and distinct text type that ought in no wise to be put together, e.g., though more than 2/3rds of the "I" group texts are Byzantine text type, the non-Byzantine element of the "I" group includes the leading Western Text (D 05), as well as (if one considers there is such a text type,) the leading "Caesarean" Texts, both "pre-Caesarean" texts (W 032 in Mark 5:31-16:20, which is "I" in Mark; the *Family 1 Manuscripts* of 1, 1582, 209, and the *Family 13 Manuscripts* of 788, 346, 543, 826, 828, 983, 13) as well as "Caesarean Proper" texts (Theta 038, 565, & 700). The great neo-Byzantine textual analysts of the 16th and 17th centuries rejected the Western Greek Text as a clearly corrupted text form. Who but von Soden would e.g., put a Byzantine Text and a Western Text in the same group?

Von Soden filtered his idea that where his three groups, "K" (a generally Byzantine group liked by Byzantines and neo-Byzantines), "I" (a fictional group, lacking any fundamentally distinctive unifying textual integrity), and "H" (a group liked by neo-Alexandrians), through a number of "porous holes." One such "porous hole" was his belief that that the "original" text had been in the hands of Origen (d. 254); which though broadly correct, *must be qualified by the fact that the man is an infamous example of them "which corrupt the Word of God"* (II Cor. 2:17). Von Soden also considered the heretic Marcion (d. 2nd century) (who denied the Old Testament) had corrupted the text, and here he may have been on safer ground, *although one must determine the matter on a verse by verse basis.* Another of Von Soden's "porous holes" was the idea that this "original text" had been earlier corrupted by Tatian (d. 2nd century). I have formerly noted that in "von Soden's text" of "1913," "he thought highly of the Arabic Diatessaron<sup>151</sup>" (Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron; Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century) i.e., for his purposes of textual reconstruction. Thus in his "reconstruction" of the Gospels, he gives a great deal of weight to Arabic 12th-14th centuries documents outside the closed class of sources (von Soden's "Ta a" = "Tatian's Diatessaron Arabic"), as first composed in their present (controversial and disputed) form in the 19th century by Ciasca, for understanding what he thinks Tatian did in the 2nd century (von Soden's "Ta" = "Tatian's Diatessaron). (He also consulted the Syriac of Ephraem, d. 373; von Soden's "Ta e" = "Tatian's Diatessaron Ephraem.) *Who but von Soden (and Moffatt) would think this was methodologically sound?*

Of course, the controversial and disputed nature of Ciasca's composition in no way affects my usage of it in my commentary, since like e.g., the Ethiopic Version of Dillmann, I cite is an example of a text *outside the closed class of sources.* And to be perfectly frank about the matter, none of the documents outside the closed class of sources have the integrity to compose a valid text from i.e., *none of them would be "safe" documents to rest anything on, ... other than a tea-pot!*

---

<sup>151</sup> Commentary Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), section 2), "The Diatessaron."

Interestingly, except for the fact that the neo-Alexandrian Kurt Aland thinks highly of von Soden's H group and poorly of his K group, whereas I as a neo-Byzantine think highly of von Soden's K group and poorly of his H group, Aland has some similar ambivalence about von Soden as myself. Put bluntly, his textual theory is not generally liked by Aland or the neo-Alexandrians. E.g., as a neo-Byzantine I must concur with the neo-Alexandrian, Aland, when he describes Von Soden's "I" group text type as belonging "to the world of ... fantasy." But also of note, Aland concedes, "von Soden's edition is a necessary tool for textual critics" which contains "a vast quarry of information that is unavailable elsewhere. Von Soden's studies in the Koine text constitute pioneering research ... . The text volume with its wealth of variant readings is ... a useful source of information<sup>152</sup>." Both neo-Alexandrian (Aland) and neo-Byzantine (myself) alike, are thus forced, somewhat reluctantly, to recognize the lasting value of von Soden's work, and our need to use the information in his textual apparatus.

With the financial support of a wealthy patroness, the generous lady, Elise King, Hermann von Soden was able to send out a bee-hive of about 40 research assistants to collate data over 16 years from manuscripts all over Europe and the Mediterranean world. Spanning a period of about 1½ decades, his research assistants went to locations in Europe such as: England; Paris in France; Belgium; Austria; Spain; Italy; Greece, for instance, Athens and Athos; and Albania; to Russia which straddles the Eurasian Continents; to locations in West Asia such as: Turkey, for instance, Constantinople (now Istanbul); as well as Damascus (Syria), and Jerusalem; and to locations in North Africa such as: Cairo in Egypt, and Mt. Sinai on the Arabian Peninsula<sup>153</sup>. On statistical

---

<sup>152</sup> Aland, K., *et unum*, *The Text of the NT* (1987), *op. cit.*, pp. 22-3; cf. pp. 40-3,66,307-11.

<sup>153</sup> Von Soden's *Die Schriften*, Vol. I, I, pp. iii, vi,vii; Vol. II, p. vii. The name of "Fraulein Elise Koenigs" (Miss Elise King) is honoured by von Soden in his Vol. I, I, p. iii. Those 40 researchers specifically named by von Soden in his final volume and some of their locations include: 1) Lic. H. Lietzmann; 2) Lic. Teichmann; 3) Dr. Schafer; 4) Lic. Paul Glaue (Paris in France, Italy, Athens in Greece, Jerusalem, Cairo in Egypt, Mt. Sinai on the Arabian Peninsula); 5) Lic. Rudolf Knopf (Jerusalem & Mt. Sinai); 6) Dr. Th. Messerschmidt (died before Feb. 1913); 7) Lic. Edward Frhr. von der Goltz; 8) Lic. G. Wobbermin (Italy, Greece, Athos in Greece, & Constantinople); 9) Hans Frhr. von Soden (England & Italy); 10) R. Pott (England); 11) R. Wagner (Russia); 12) A. Schmidtke (England, Paris in France, Spain, Italy, Greece, Athos in Greece, Turkey); 13) W. Felmy (England, Belgium, Austria, Italy); 14) Lic. Br. Violot (Damascus in Syria); 15) Dr. S. B. Kougeas (Greece, Athos in Greece); 16) Lic. P. Eberhardt; 17) P. Meichssner; 18) G. Kerner; 19) Lic. W. Schneemelcher; 20) Cand. Haffa; 21) Rettig; 22) Gebhard; 23) O. Munch; 24) G. Fraedrich (Fradrich); 25) Lessing (Florence in Italy); 26) Haupt (Venice in Italy); 27) Pochhammer; 28) E. Veit (Manchester in England); 29) Wedemann (Cairo in Egypt); 30) A. Keller (Cairo in Egypt); 31) Professor Paul Seeberg (Russia); 32) Dr. K. Grass (Russia); 33) Deacon Kosmas (Athos in Greece); 34) J. Leipold; 35) L. Tscharnack; 36) O. Matthes; 37) B. Grossmann; 38) A. Heepe; 39) J.

average, each of about 40 researchers had to deal with about 4 or 5 complete (Matt.-Rev) or near complete (Matt.-Jude) NT manuscripts, about 45 fragmentary or partial NT manuscripts, and 11 or 12 church writer commentaries<sup>154</sup>.

From the German Baron's centralized office in Berlin, this bee-hive of "busy bee" research assistants brought back the precious nectar of manuscript data to Baron von Soden, that made the sweet honey of the information in his textual apparatus, albeit upon the honeycomb of errors that formed von Soden's textual theory and associated main text. Of the 2440 von Soden manuscripts itemized, *infra*, c. 83.5% are Byzantine in part or whole (2035 manuscripts) i.e., c. 78.9% are completely Byzantine (1924 manuscripts), c. 4.6% are Byzantine only in specific parts (111 manuscripts), and 16.5% are outside the closed class of sources (406 manuscripts). This phenomenal feat of Lutheran German organized research involving the collation of thousands of New Testament manuscripts, including virtually all codices and minuscules, and totaling in number c. 2500 manuscripts (c. 10 lectionaries, c. 180 manuscripts covering the NT, c. 1400 Gospel manuscripts, c. 400 Acts to Jude manuscripts, and c. 500 church writer commentaries), has never been rivaled, or even come close to, either before or since.

Thus the great abiding value of von Soden's work lies in the large number of manuscripts he collated, and which are referred to in his textual apparatus. His textual apparatus, discussed in more detail below, underpins the Majority Byzantine Text of Robinson & Pierpont which is based on his "K" (Koine) group, and also the Majority Text of Hodges & Farstad which is based on his "K" and "I" groups. Though it was Herman Freiherr, Baron<sup>155</sup> of (= von) Soden who was born in Ohio, having *flown in the air* over his USA State of birth in March 2009, I am reminded of one of his German Baron contemporaries, the air ace Manfred Freiherr, Baron of (= von) Richthofen (1892-1918), made famous in World War One (1914-1918) for the brightly coloured red aircraft that he always flew in. In 1918 Baron von Richthofen was shot down from the sky in his famous red flying machine by Australian and / or Canadian ground fire. While the importance of the famous German "Red Baron" air pilot of World War I, Baron von Richthofen, is now a thing of the past; the importance of his contemporary German

---

Chardin; and 40) R. Schutz. However, all up he names more than these in his acknowledgements found in Vol. I, I, & Vol. II.

<sup>154</sup> On one level such a "statistical average" may be criticized since in reality e.g., one research assistant may have worked on e.g., 7 complete NT manuscripts, and another 0 complete NT manuscripts. Or one research assistant may have done more manuscript work than another. But on another level, the value of such a "statistical average" is that it gives us a rough idea of the type of workload expected from each man.

<sup>155</sup> For a history of Baron von Soden's aristocratic line, see "Soden (nobility)" *Wikipedia* (2009) (click-linked to "Hermann von Soden" *Wikipedia, de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hermann\_v* , *op. cit.*), which refers to the German Lutheran theologian, Hermann von Soden, as one of five "name makers" in the von Soden nobility. The aristocratic line came from Patriziat city in Hanover, before they moved to Franken.

baron, Baron von Soden (1852-1914), is thus still ongoing. Unlike Baron von Richthofen, the work of Baron von Soden “still flies.”

The seventh state I flew over in March 2009, Kansas, was the home state of William Pierpont (1915-2003), who was born, lived, and died, in the City of Wichita in this State. Pierpont was a research engineer at *Beech Aircraft* in Wichita, and so it was with some thematic appropriateness that I *flew over* his home state of Kansas in an *aircraft*.

Pierpont studied Latin at High School and Greek at Friends University in Wichita. Though after two years of an uncompleted degree he withdrew from Friends University due to illness, he continued private studies in Greek, and Maurice Robinson says, “William Pierpont was mostly self-taught. He learned ancient, Biblical, and modern Greek from ... textbooks;” and first acquired a copy of von Soden’s work in the mid 1960s<sup>156</sup>. Pierpont was brought up as, and remained a Baptist for most of his life, although in the 1970s he and his wife became members of the *Evangelical Free Church*. Pierpont first learnt Greek in his 1930s College days at Friends University under Professor Langenwalter, where he was taught from the neo-Alexandrian Westcott-Hort text, and at that time, and for many years thereafter, accepted this neo-Alexandrian textual view. But Robinson records that after about 30 years, “in the mid-1960s his views regarding textual criticism began to change,” and by the 1970s he had moved to a Burgonite Majority Text view.

William Pierpont from Kansas, USA, chiefly through reference to von Soden’s work (also using Hoskier for Revelation<sup>157</sup>), first singly produced Green’s Textual Apparatus (1986), which though not without methodological error, is nevertheless sufficiently accurate for generalist usage, and I have found to be a most useful apparatus that I employ critically<sup>158</sup>. Pierpont then went on to be co-editor of a Majority Text

---

<sup>156</sup> The son of Grover and Helen Pierpont, William’s father was a jurist. The books William largely learnt Greek from were old textbooks that had belonged to his father. His first mid 1960s copy of von Soden’s four volumes was in microfilm form, though Robinson records that this was “replaced during the 1970s by the last available copy of the printed edition from the original publishers.” He further says (Obituary, *infra*) that both he and Pierpont undertook “detailed study of Hoskier’s ... *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*.”

<sup>157</sup> Robinson & Pierpont (1991), “Introduction,” p. 1; Robinson & Pierpont (2005), “Preface,” p. ix.

<sup>158</sup> After working though much of the intricate detail of von Soden’s apparatus, Pierpont made an understandable error in mastering this complex textual apparatus. He failed to recognize that the generalist nature of von Soden’s group symbols means that one must allow a safety factor of about 10% as an error bar. This occurs both when von Soden gives no variants to e.g., a K group reading, and even when von Soden gives the reading of some variants, this may be a sample of a wider minority group inside the range of *c.* 10% of the figures he gives, and quite possibly much lower than this upper figure of

(1991), of which over 95% was prepared from Pierpont's notes, and he was not wrong to join with Maurice Robinson in titling their co-edited work as a "Byzantine" "Textform" i.e., Robinson & Pierpont's *The New Testament ... According to the Byzantine / Majority Textform* (1991), and then calling their revised edition *The New Testament in the ... Byzantine Textform* (2005)<sup>159</sup>. However, they in some sense classify themselves as Burgonites, referring in their 1991 edition to Burgon's *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels* (1896), and saying "the editors have followed the critical canons of John W. Burgon throughout the entire Greek New Testament"<sup>160</sup>.

Unqualified, I do not think this is an entirely accurate classification; and the fact that in both their 1991 and 2005 editions they have used the term, "Byzantine Textform," highlights this fact. The scribes of the historic *Byzantine School* did not, like Robinson & Pierpont, determine their text by doing a numbers count of many hundreds of Byzantine manuscripts. Moreover, the many Byzantine textual variants attests to the fact that they did not as a School of scribes share Robinson & Pierpont's Burgonite idea of how to determine the NT text in absolute terms (although like neo-Byzantines, they would no doubt agree that the representative Byzantine text is *generally* the correct text). Thus Robinson & Pierpont have clearly taken a key idea from Burgon. Moreover, Robinson says that one of his principles is, "a reading shared among differing text types is more strongly supported than that which is localized to a single text type or family group." He then says, "there are far more instances wherein an Alexandrian-Byzantine or Western-Byzantine alignment exists than an Alexandrian-alignment"<sup>161</sup>. Once again, even though unlike Burgon, Robinson supports a "Byzantine priority," this idea that support from other texttypes *outside the closed class of sources* acts to enhance a reading is clearly Burgonite in thinking.

Robinson truly sounds like Burgon when he says things like, "A reading preserved in only a single MS [manuscript], version or father is suspect," or "readings

---

10%. E.g., Pierpont's "Level 1" in Green's Textual Apparatus is given as, "61-79% of all manuscripts," when in fact it would have a range starting in the vicinity of *c.* 55-61%, reaching up to a range of *c.* 71-79%. But this in no way invalidates the usage of Green's Textual Apparatus as a general guide. Nevertheless, while I generally cite Pierpont's figures as there given in Green's Textual Apparatus, the reader should bear in mind this 10% error bar that Pierpont overlooked in this still generally very good and very useful work.

<sup>159</sup> Maurice Robinson's "Obituary" on "William Grover Pierpont (26 January 1915 – 20 February 2003)" (TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism, 2003, <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/vol08/Pierpont20003obit.html>); and cover jacket on Robinson & Pierpont (2005).

<sup>160</sup> Robinson & Pierpont (1991), "Introduction," p. xiv.

<sup>161</sup> Robinson & Pierpont (2005), "Appendix: The Case for Byzantine Priority," pp. 533-586, at 555-6.

preserved in a small group of witness are suspect<sup>162</sup>.” This is very different to the neo-Byzantine view that if one has a textual problem in the majority Byzantine reading, the matter hangs on textual analysis of the readings inside the closed class of sources. Indeed, neo-Byzantine methodology appears lost on Robinson, who makes the staggeringly incorrect claim, “the faulty *Textus Receptus* editions which stemmed from Erasmus’ or Xiemenes’ [i.e., Cardinal Francisco Jimenez de Cisneros, organizer of the Complutensian Bible],” were based on the “uncritical selection of a small number of late manuscripts.” And in further so criticizing the TR, he says, “the *Textus Receptus* had its problems, not the least of which was its failure to reflect the Byzantine Textform in an accurate manner.”

Robinson also rejects “the various factions which hope to find authority and certainty in a single ‘providentially preserved’ Greek text or English translation” which he says is “usually the KJV,” further claiming, “It need hardly be mentioned that such an approach has nothing to do with actual text-critical theory or praxis<sup>163</sup>.” In fact, the great work of neo-Byzantines like the Complutensians or Erasmus, is nothing if it is not textual analysis where the representative Byzantine text is perceived to have a textual problem, and resolving it from inside the closed class of Latin and Greek sources. Textual analysis is always present, either in determining there is not a textual problem, or determining that there is, and then resolving the issue.

Robinson adopts an anti-supernaturalist methodology for his “Byzantine priority” text. He thus rejects what he calls, the “fallacy of the ‘theological argument’,” i.e., “questionable appeals to ‘providential preservation’<sup>164</sup>.” This type of statement is presumably calculated to appeal to neo-Alexandrians who share this anti-supernaturalist presupposition i.e., even if they reject Robinson’s “Byzantine priority” thinking, he presumably hopes that “they will still respect him as an academic.” By contrast, as one who stands unapologetically for the Church Establishment Principle and Christian State, I have no such cravings for “acceptability” with anti-supernaturalist secularists. Put simply, we neo-Byzantines believe in miracles, including the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture. We are not religious liberals opposed to miracles, but religious conservative who recognize miracles. And we make no apology for that! We do not accept the secularist dichotomy of “*rational* reason” as opposed to “*irrational* faith” in Divine Preservation. We regard both such faith and reason to be rational, and see them working together as God preserves a closed class of Greek and Latin New Testament sources, focusing in the first instance on the representative Byzantine text, by which mechanism he preserved the Received Text.

---

<sup>162</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 555. Cf. p. 564.

<sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 533.

<sup>164</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 567. Cf. e.g., pp. 568, para 2 (by contrast, we neo-Byzantines could not care if there were “a thousand” Alexandrian texts discovered, we would still reject them all).

Our belief in miracles is not, as the anti-supernaturalists claim, some kind of “irrational” appeal, quite to the contrary, we consider miracles are the most rational and explanation for a number of things, such as creationism (I would say on an old earth model,) as opposed to Darwinism, or the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture. We seek our praise from God, not man, and we pay whatever price it costs us for that. (The present cost includes the fact that these “halls of learning” are a “closed shop” to us in terms of post-graduate thesis work, articles in academic journals, or academic careers.) Those who control the halls of learning in tertiary colleges and universities may be able to create the semblance of intellectual superiority in a formal way that works as a control mechanism for the many “programmed puppets” who believe it, including the many academics who “live up to” the “academic stereotype” of e.g., anti-supernaturalism; but the truth is this larger group of intellectually intermediate controllers of universities *et al*, have not had the humility to submit to their numerically much smaller intellectual superiors and spiritual betters. And at a fundamental level, they have not submitted themselves unto the directive will of God as set forth in the Holy Bible. Of course, this is a much wider problem of the present evil age in which we live; so that to some extent, it might be said that these academics are “hyper-normative” in their ungodliness. But in the absence of a Christian State, we are simply not in a position “to put the cleaners” though these universities and colleges. Hence I thank God that in the era of the 16th and 17th centuries things were a lot better this way, and so great neo-Byzantines of that era, such as Beza or Elzevir, were able to enjoy a formal recognition in the “halls of learning” of their day, simply not possible in our day.

Robinson’s antisupernaturalist argument still contains some valid points in spite of itself, even though they would not, for we neo-Byzantines, be the deciding points that they are for him. E.g., he refers to “two major ... ‘copying revolutions’.” The first, when Christianity became the established religion under Constantine in the early 4th century. This saw the movement from NT Scriptures being written on the “cheap and fragile papyrus to costly and durable vellum.” Thus the earliest extant vellum manuscripts from this time include e.g., A 02 and W 032, and “would have been copied directly from papyrus exemplars.<sup>165</sup>” The “second ‘copying revolution’” then “occurred in the ninth century” with the transference to minuscules. A “change” that Robinson says, “likely was initiated or at least endorsed by Theodore of Studium<sup>166</sup>.” This change

---

<sup>165</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 559-560.

<sup>166</sup> Also known as Theodore Studites, or Theodore of Studios / Stoudion (759-826). The Greek Orthodox Church that became independent from Rome at the time of Great Schism, was inside the Roman Catholic Church for about 450 years from 607 to 1054 A.D. . Theodore was the Abbot of a monastery in Asia Minor. Opposing the idolatrous practice of venerating icons is known as iconoclasm i.e., an iconoclast destroys idolatrous icons; whereas those involved in the idolatrous worship of such images are iconodules / iconophiles / iconolaters (the latter joins the words icon and idolaters, much like Mary and idolatry is joined in the word, Mariolatry). Some good and godly Byzantine Emperors were iconoclasts, i.e., opposing icon idolatry, namely, Leo III, Constantine V, and Leo IV of *The First Iconoclasm* (730-787) and Leo V, Michael II, and Theophilus of *The Second Iconoclasm* (814-842). This idolatry was condemned by

meant the codices in use i.e., those with the Byzantine text, were copied out onto minuscules, and then discarded. Robinson thus says with regard to antiquity, that a Byzantine manuscript first copied to vellum in the 4th or 5th century, preserved till the 9th or 10th centuries when it was copied onto a minuscule, means that the 9th and 10th century minuscule may be only one or two generations removed from the 4th century<sup>167</sup>.

For Robinson, the idea that various Byzantine rubrics such as e.g., Minuscules 461 (9th century), 1080 (9th century), 1862 (9th century), 2142 (9th century), 2500 (9th century), and 399 (9th / 10th century), may have been copied from 4th century vellum Codices which were then destroyed, so that they may be but one or two generations removed from codices contemporary with the Alexandrian's two major texts, is a fundamentally pivotal point in rejecting neo-Alexandrian claims, which put a premium on age of manuscripts. This transmission view forms an integral part of Robinson's anti-supernaturalist reason for regarding Byzantine Minuscules from around the 9th, 10th, or 11th centuries, as being as textually ancient as any from the 4th to 6th centuries. (If so, the existence of diverse minority Byzantine readings must be regarded as either a rapid feature at the hands of one or two scribes, or regarded as largely existing by the time of the 4th to 6th centuries.)

At this point, i.e., the better texts were better preserved over time, Robinson's argument has some similarities with Burgon's. Of course, from the neo-Byzantine perspective, we are not concerned with a fundamental corruption inside the closed class of sources due to the effects of "Chinese whispers." Whether various Byzantine rubrics such as e.g., Minuscules 461 (9th century), 1080 (9th century), 1862 (9th century), 2142 (9th century), 2500 (9th century), and 399 (9th / 10th century), are one or two generations removed from the 4th century, or whether they are 10 or 20 generations removed from the 4th century, makes no fundamental difference to we neo-Byzantines. We consider

---

the *Council of Hieria* (also known as the *Council of Constantintople*) (754) under *The First Iconoclasm*, reversed to idolatry by the *Nicea II Council* (787), in turn reversed against idolatry under *The Second Iconoclasm*, and then again reversed back to the idolatry of the *Nicea II Council* (787). The two biggest names opposing the anti-idolatry periods of *The First & Second Iconoclasm*, were the iconodule idolaters, John of Damascus (d. before 754) and Theodore of Studios. But theological orthodoxy is not a pre-requisite for Gentiles preserving NT documents in the Greek textual tradition inside the closed class of sources, for if it was, the apostate Jews could never have preserved the Hebrew OT (Rom. 3:1-3; 11:29). Under Theodore of Studios his monastery had a library and a scriptorium constructed. It became a major scholarly centre, and it continued to engage in the important work of copying out of manuscripts after his departure. His works are in Migne's Greek series (Vol. 99). Iconoclasm and the excellent work of Leo III, Constantine V, and Leo IV is referred to in the Anglican 39 Articles, Article 35, Book 2, Homily 2, "Against peril of idolatry," Part 2, as is the Pope's wicked opposition to these godly Byzantine emperors.

<sup>167</sup> Robinson & Pierpont (2005), "Appendix: The Case for Byzantine Priority," pp. 533-586, at p. 558-563.

that God has providentially preserved the Received Text so that it can be composed at any time, with the representative Byzantine text as one's starting point.

A related argument, with overlapping points of intersection with Robinson's view, is put by e.g., the *Church of England (Continuing)* Bishop David Samuel. Bishop Samuel says, "the manuscripts of the later period contain faithful copies of the original text, because they were the standard ... text ... and were carefully valued and preserved as such. This would account for their much greater numbers ...<sup>168</sup>." With regard to this associated point, Robinson also fairly argues that the higher regarded and better texts in the Byzantine textual tradition were copied out because they were recognized as being of a superior standard, whereas the Alexandrian text type was not, because they were recognized as inferior. Thus the neo-Alexandrian argument of "older is better" is incorrect. Indeed, their readings are not always older anyway, since church writers can sometimes be shown to support a TR reading over them, and both of the two Alexandrian Texts disagree with each other quite a lot, as demonstrated by Hoskier<sup>169</sup>. (Of course, I also make reference to what on this terminology would be a third "copying revolution" in the transition from handwritten to printed texts, from the mid 15th century to end of the 16th century, ending the closed class of Byzantine Greek manuscripts in 1599.)

Robinson quotes favourably from Zane Hodges on a matter of note, Hodges says, "No one has yet explained how a long, slow process spread out over many centuries as well as over a wide geographical area, and involving a multitude of copyists, who often knew nothing of the state of the text outside of their own monasteries or scriptoria, could achieve this widespread uniformity out of the diversity presented by the earlier [Western and Alexandrian] forms of text. ... An unguided process achieving relative stability and uniformity in the diversified textual, historical, and cultural circumstances in which the New Testament was copied, imposes impossible strains on our imagination<sup>170</sup>." Unlike Robinson, I would see the process as broadly "guided" by the Holy Ghost who was preserving the Byzantine Greek in a closed class of three sources (i.e., together with the Latin, and church writers, especially, although not exclusively, ancient ones).

After having first criticized the TR in a very Dean Burgon type manner, Robinson is then very much like Burgon in trying to bolster his theory on the basis of its more general similarity to the TR and AV than the neo-Alexandrian texts. E.g., he says, as

---

<sup>168</sup> Samuel, D.N., *The Church in Crisis, op. cit.*, p. 61; cf. p. 58.

<sup>169</sup> Herman Hoskier's *Codex B [Rome Vaticanus] & its Allies, A Study & an Indictment*, Bernard Quaritch, London, UK, 1914 (2 volumes).

<sup>170</sup> Robinson & Pierpont (2005), "Appendix: The Case for Byzantine Priority," pp. 533-586, at pp. 579-580, quoting Hodges, Z.C., "The implications of Statistical Probability for the History of the Text," Appendix C in Wilbur Pickering's *The Identity of the NT Text*, Revised Edition, Thomas Nelson, Nashville, Tennessee, USA, 1980, p. 168.

“Colwell noted, by an ‘*a priori* possibility’ Westcott and Hort could ‘demolish the argument based on the numerical superiority urged by adherents of the Textus Receptus;” and he then adds in his commentary on this, “and for all practical purposes, the Byzantine Textform<sup>171</sup>.” I.e., he wants the reader to consider that the Westcott-Hort attack on the TR is the same as the attack on the representative Byzantine text when it suits him, but once he gains such TR supporters, he then wants to attack the TR himself. Is not this the classic methodology of Burgon?

But unlike Burgon, Robinson and Pierpont “advocate a ‘Byzantine-priority’ rather than a solely ‘Majority Text’ hypothesis<sup>172</sup>.” This “priority” means that to a much greater extent than Burgon, they support the *Byzantine School* which produced the representative Byzantine Text, and though they are still interested in manuscripts from other text types as was Burgon or are Hodges & Farstad, *in general* they regard them as less important than did Burgon or Hodges & Farstad. Yet their textual theory is not necessarily born out in their textual praxis (practice) given their usage of the von Soden “K” group, even though a small number of non-Byzantine manuscripts are in von Soden’s “K” group, *not that this really make much difference to their final text given the much greater number of Byzantine manuscripts to all others*. Thus to the extent that a majority text will always be a Byzantine text due to the much higher numbers of Byzantine texts, they have still stayed within Burgon’s basic idea, albeit revising it in a desirable direction. They are thus still clearly Burgonites, since they argue that a majority count should be used to determine their text, and they will not accept any textual analysis that favours a minority reading (other than with a split representative Byzantine text). They have thus, in their own words, “followed the critical canons of ... Burgon.” But they have also clearly revised elements of Burgon’s ideas, since their focus is on von Soden’s “K” group (for Matt. to Jude), i.e., a more specifically Byzantine group of manuscripts (even though the “K” group contains a small percentage of non-Byzantine texts).

Having now learnt of this revised edition of Robinson & Pierpont’s Text (1991 & 2005) in 2009, I shall use this 2005 edition in my commentary for Matt. 20 onwards. Looking over it, I note it has an expanded reference to divisions inside the Byzantine text e.g., it now includes the variant at Matt. 11:23a that I say in Volume 1 is absent from Robinson & Pierpont’s Text (1991). Gone too is the 1991 format which has no punctuations, no breathings, and is all in lower case Greek letters; with the 2005 edition containing all of these. The 2005 edition also contains a textual apparatus showing variation from their representative Byzantine text with the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS 4th revised edition (1993). Certainly this is a new edition, but in saying this, I do not mean that the 1991 edition was a bad edition, and indeed it is the one I have used for Matt. 1-19 (and in general my revised Volume 1 will not much change this); with my usage for the text of their 2005 edition generally starting with Matt. 20.

---

<sup>171</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 536.

<sup>172</sup> Robinson & Pierpont (1991), “Introduction,” p. xli.

In my discussion of “Determining the representative Byzantine Text” in the next section, I shall generally make reference to this 2005 edition of Pierpont & Robinson rather than their earlier 1991. In Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), I state that, “References to the Majority Byzantine Text (MBT) are generally drawn from Robinson and Pierpont’s *The New Testament ... According to the Byzantine / Majority Textform* (1991); although I may also consult one or more textual apparatuses<sup>173</sup>.” I also state with regard to “the text of ... Robinson and ... Pierpont. Even though the Majority Text is a count of all Greek manuscripts, not just the Byzantine Text ones (i.e., in Robinson & Pierpont’s K group selection taken from von Soden), because all others are a slim percentage well below five per cent of the total, in practice, the Majority Text equates the Byzantine Text. And where the Byzantine Text is split, the Majority Text will always follow a sizeable Byzantine reading. Hence in practice it is thus clearly a Byzantine text. Thus if the Byzantine Text is fairly evenly divided between two readings, it will likewise be fairly evenly divided in their Majority Text. Hence Robinson & Pierpont’s work is fairly entitled, *The New Testament ... According to the Byzantine / Majority Textform ...1991*<sup>174</sup>.”

These comments are also valid for Robinson & Pierpont’s 2005 edition, since while their Majority Text is a count of all Greek manuscripts i.e., in von Soden’s “K” (Koine) group, (where not specifically itemized, von Soden’s readings for his “K” group represent 90% plus of the manuscripts in them,) and while that includes non-Byzantine ones which I calculate to be c. 3.5% of the total in the “K” group, the fact that c. 96.5 % are Byzantine (including c. 3.5% which are Byzantine in specific parts), means that on a count of all their Greek manuscripts (or 90% + of them), their majority text will in practice be the majority Byzantine text; and where their Byzantine Text is split, their Majority Text will always follow a sizeable Byzantine reading. (They also give special attention to the Kx subgroup inside the wider K group if there is a division in the K text. Kx comprises just over 52% of von Soden’s K group, i.e., 513 Kx manuscripts out of 983 K group manuscripts; and just over 51% of the K group’s Byzantine texts. As discussed, *infra*, Kx is c. 98% Byzantine, i.e., c. 94% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine, c. 4% are Byzantine only in specific parts, and c. 2% (2.1%) are manuscripts that are outside the closed class of sources).

I have also continued to consult Hodges & Farstad’s Majority Text (1985), and while the percentage of Byzantine texts in their count is not as high as Robinson & Pierpont, they are still a majority, and the two majority texts are more commonly in agreement with each other than in disagreement. But there are exceptions. E.g., at Matt. 20:15b a footnote by Hodges & Farstad shows a substantial part of their text does not follow their majority text, whereas Robinson & Pierpont find no such qualification necessary (see commentary in Volume 2 at Matt. 20:15b). I thus use Robinson &

---

<sup>173</sup> “Introduction,” to the “Appendices to St. Matthew’s Gospel Matt 1-14.”

<sup>174</sup> Preface Section 5, “Greek and Latin Texts,” Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14).

Pierpont's majority text in conjunction with Hodges & Farstad's majority text and Green's Textual Apparatus; and if these (or if necessary, my view formed after direct consultation of von Soden,) indicate there is a fairly even split in the Byzantine texts, then textual analysis will be required to determine the better Byzantine reading (see commentary in Volume 1 at Matt. 9:27 and Matt. 11:16,17; and my comments on this, *infra*). It should also be remembered that even though I more commonly refer to "Green's Textual Apparatus" on the basis that this very useful work is published in an Appendix to Green's Interlinear Bible (Hendrickson, USA, 1986), since this apparatus was composed by William Pierpont, this means that it is in the first instance Pierpont's position, but in the second instance Green's position since Jay Green Sr. has adopted and promoted it as an integral part of his Interlinear Bible.

It should also be noted that Hodges & Farstad have also revised Burgon's ideas, since they do not follow a simple numbers count of manuscripts, and they only use Greek manuscripts. Thus with respect to von Soden's "K" and "I" groups, they look to the concurrence or otherwise of certain groups or subgroups in von Soden's textual apparatus, to affect how they rate certain readings in their majority text. Yet notwithstanding this revision, this is once again clearly a text based on Burgon's basic ideas, and thus they are Burgonites. That the Burgonites Robinson & Pierpont revised elements of Burgon's majority text idea in a different way to how Hodges & Farstad revised elements of Burgon's majority text idea, thus in no way detracts from the fact that both are clearly Burgonites who uphold the idea of a "majority text" as their preferred text for the New Testament. E.g., I would remind the reader that when Burgon formulated this idea, von Soden's work of *c.* 2,500 manuscripts had not been undertaken, and so only a relatively small sample could be used for the simple text count *majority text* of e.g., Burgon's *Textual Commentary* on Matt. 1-14 (1899)<sup>175</sup>. Hence though *c.* 94% of Hodges & Farstad's Majority Text agrees with that of Burgon's in Matt. 1-14, there are some differences flowing from the differences in methodology between them. Nevertheless, both Burgon & Miller (1899) and Hodges & Farstad (1985) are clearly in broad agreement on the idea of a majority text based NT Greek text. And even after von Soden's work, though Hodges & Farstad can now generally base their majority text on *c.* 1,500 manuscripts, i.e., *c.* 1,000 from von Soden's "K" group and *c.* 500 from von Soden's "I" group, they still must generally omit specific reference to *c.* 2,300 Lectionaries. And of course, Robinson & Pierpont focus on von Soden's "K" group of *c.* 1,000 manuscripts, and so this too is a selection of Greek manuscripts only, and more than this, basically of Byzantine Text Greek manuscripts. Hence Burgonite references to a "majority text" are in practice always to a sample only; however, they make that sample as large as they possibly can, so that through reference to von Soden's work, Robinson &

---

<sup>175</sup> Burgon, J.W. & Miller, E., *A Textual Commentary Upon the Holy Gospels*, Largely from the use of materials, and mainly on the text, left by the late J.W. Burgon, Part I, St. Matthew, Division I, i-xiv [Matt. i.6 - xiv.19], by Edward Miller, George Bell & Sons, London, England, & Deighton Bell & Co. Cambridge, UK, 1899; British Library microfilm copy Mic. A.1081 3 (2); Microfilm reel A. 10813, Item 2; microfilm copied from an original held at Bodleian Library, Oxford University, England, Shelfmark 1044 e11.

Pierpont's (K group based) "majority text" is based on *c.* 1,000 manuscripts (of which *c.* 950 are Byzantine text including those that are Byzantine text only in parts, or *c.* 915 are completely Byzantine text), and Hodges & Farstad's (K & I groups based) "majority text" on *c.* 1,500 manuscripts (of which *c.* 1,360 are Byzantine text including those that are Byzantine text only in parts, or *c.* 1,300 are completely Byzantine text). Thus more than 85% of the texts used for Hodges & Farstad's Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and more than 90% of the texts used for Robinson & Pierpont's Majority Text are Byzantine Text.

Thus notwithstanding the fact that both the majority texts of Robinson & Pierpont (2005) and Hodges and Farstad (1985) are Burgonite revisionist texts, they both are sufficiently close to the methodological principles and majority text produced by Burgon & Miller on Matt. 1-14 (1899), to be fairly called Burgonites. For this section on Burgon & Miller I shall place "TR" or "Received Text" in inverted commas, since while most of these readings are indeed "TR," a small number may be disputed where English translation is not affected, but for my generalist purposes here this does matter. E.g., Burgon & Miller, like Hodges & Farstad, consider that at Matt. 12:35, the definite article, "*ta* (the)," is present in the "TR" before "*ponera* (evil things);" but e.g., Scrivener's Text of 1894 & 1902 lacks this definite article, and it makes no difference to English translation either way. Similar dispute may exist as to the "TR" reading of spellings not affecting either the Greek or English e.g., at Matt. 12:42 Burgon & Miller, like Hodges & Farstad, consider the majority text spelling for "Solomon" is "*Solomonos*," which they prefer over the "TR" reading of "*Solomontos*." While the spelling "*Solomontos*" is found in e.g., Erasmus's Text of 1522, the spelling "*Solomonos*" is found in e.g., Erasmus's Text of 1516. Which is the correct "TR" reading here at Matt. 12:42, and why? In comparative analysis of these texts in Matt. 1-14, we find that in 53 places where Burgon & Miller differ from what they call the "Received Text," their readings are followed without qualification by both Robinson & Pierpont and Hodges and Farstad in 40 of these<sup>176</sup>.

---

<sup>176</sup> From Matt. 1-14 without qualification, Robinson & Pierpont (R & P) & Hodges & Farstad follow the same majority text reading as Burgon & Miller in the places itemized in this footnote. In this and the following eight footnotes, if a reading is marked with a "+," then this means the textual apparatus of Hodges & Farstad (1985) shows the same "TR" reading with which Hodges & Farstad (H & F) disagree with as Burgon & Miller (B & M) disagree with. Thus H & F may thus be consulted for this information. 1) + Matt. 2:11; 2) + Matt. 3:8; 3) + Matt. 3:11; 4) + Matt. 4:10; 5) + Matt. 4:18; 6) + Matt. 5:23; 7) + Matt. 5:27; 8) + Matt. 5:28; 9) + Matt. 5:44; 10) + Matt. 5:47; 11) + Matt. 6:18; 12) + Matt. 7:2; 13) + Matt. 7:14; 14) + Matt. 8:5; 15) + Matt. 8:13; 16) + Matt. 8:15; 17) + Matt. 8:25; 18) + Matt. 9:17; 19) + Matt. 9:18; 20) + Matt. 9:36; 21) + Matt. 10:8; 22) + Matt. 10:10; 23) + Matt. 10:28a (H & F fn. 1); 24) + Matt. 10:28b (H & F fn. 2); 25) + Matt. 11:16a (H & F fn. 2); 26) + Matt. 12:6; 27) + Matt. 12:8; 28) + Matt. 12:21; 29) + Matt. 12:28 (word order difference with "TR" only); 30) + Matt. 12:32a (H & F fn. 1); 31) + Matt. 12:32b (H & F fn. 2); 32) + Matt. 12:35a (H & F fn. 3); 33) + Matt. 12:35b (H & F fn. 4); 34) + Matt. 12:42 twice (H & F fns. 2 & 3) but not counted in the 53 readings as like Matt. 1:6 (H & F fn. 1, "TR"), B & M are non-

There are two instances where though both Robinson & Pierpont and Hodges and Farstad may follow Burgon & Miller in their main text, one or both may indicate the text is significantly divided with the “TR” reading referred to by Burgon & Miller<sup>177</sup>. This thus still brings our tally to 42 out of 53 readings in agreement.

There are four disagreements with Burgon & Miller in ways not affecting English translation. In unravelling the abbreviation “DAD,” Burgon like Robinson & Pierpont have “*Dauid*,” whereas the “TR” and Hodges & Farstad have “*Dabid*”<sup>178</sup>. Or both Robinson & Pierpont and Hodges & Farstad agree with Burgon & Miller’s spelling of “Bethsaida” as “*Bethsaida*,” but whereas Hodges & Farstad simply show the “TR” spelling of “*Bethsaidan*,” by contrast, Robinson & Pierpont consider the text is fairly evenly divided and show it as a sidenote alternative<sup>179</sup>. Similar issues exist with Burgon & Miller’s spelling of “Moses” as “*Mouses*,” and both Robinson & Pierpont and Hodges & Farstad following the “TR” spelling of “*Moses*”<sup>180</sup>. There are some other matters e.g., different word order<sup>181</sup>. This brings our tally to 45 Robinson and Pierpont readings (adding Matt. 1:1; 5:20 11:21) and 46 Hodges & Farstad readings (adding Matt. 5:20; 11:21) out of 55 readings agreeing with Burgon & Miller.

There is one instance where both Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont agree the text is fairly evenly divided, and a division results between Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont, in which one agrees with the Burgon & Miller reading and the other does not<sup>182</sup>. This brings our tally to 45 Robinson and Pierpont readings and 45

---

committal on what is the TR’s reading; 35) + Matt. 13:15 (H & F fn. 5); 36) + Matt. 13:27; 37) + Matt. 13:28; 38) + Matt. 13:30; 39) + Matt. 13:33; 40) + Matt. 13:40; & 41) + Matt. 14:19.

<sup>177</sup> 42) + Matt. 9:5a (H & F fn. 2), H & F show the B & M “TR” reading in a fn with “part” of their “Majority” support, and R & P show the “TR” reading in a sidenote. 43) + Matt. 11:8, R & P show the “TR” reading in a sidenote.

<sup>178</sup> 44) Matt. 1:1.

<sup>179</sup> 45) + Matt. 11:21 (H & F fn. 3). Cf. Matt. 5:48b.

<sup>180</sup> 46) Matt. 8:4.

<sup>181</sup> 47) Matt. 5:20, R & P and H & F have the word order B & M show as the “TR” in their main texts; although H & F show “part” of the “Majority” text agreeing with both readings. 48) + Matt. 10:25 (R & P follow the TR).

<sup>182</sup> 49) + Matt. 11:16c (H & F fn. 4); H & F main text agrees with B & M, though their fn. 4 says “part” of their “Majority” text agrees with this reading and “part” of their “Majority” text agrees with the “TR” reading; but by contrast, R & P have the “TR” reading in their main text, and a side note showing the H & F and B & M reading as an alternative.

Hodges & Farstad readings (adding Matt. 11:16b) out of 53 readings agreeing with Burgon & Miller.

On one occasion Hodges & Farstad disagree with Burgon & Miller's reading, but Robinson & Pierpont agree with Burgon & Miller<sup>183</sup>. This brings our tally to 46 Robinson and Pierpont readings (adding Matt. 5:39), and 46 Hodges & Farstad readings out of 53 readings agreeing with Burgon & Miller.

On a further four occasions, both Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont disagree with Burgon & Miller as to what is the "majority text" reading, and support in their main text a reading that Burgon & Miller dismiss as "TR"<sup>184</sup>. But in all four instances, this difference has no impact on English translation (Matt. 5:21; 9:5; 12:3; 12:13).

Let us consider just one of these instances where the majority texts of Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont disagree with the majority text of Burgon & Miller. At Matt. 12:3 we find that on the basis of a majority text comprising of about 160 manuscripts, which includes in its count such unreliable manuscripts as e.g., the Syriac

---

<sup>183</sup> 50) + Matt. 5:39b; H & F's main text disagrees with B & M and follows the "TR" reading dismissed by B & M, and shows "part" of the "Majority" text agreeing with their "TR" reading (which includes "thy" / *sou* in "thy right cheek"), and "part" of their "Majority" text reading agreeing with the B & M reading; but by contrast, R & P show the B & M reading in their main text, and the "TR" reading as a sidenote alternative in a fairly evenly split text.

<sup>184</sup> 51) Matt. 5:21, both H & F and R & P follow "*errethe* ('it was said,' indicative passive first aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *lego*)," which B & M dismiss as "TR" in favour of "*errethe*;" this is a spelling variant only, with no impact on Greek or English meaning. 52) + Matt. 9:5c, in their main texts both H & F and R & P follow "*egeirai* ('to rise up,' infinitive active aorist, from *egeiro*)," which B & M dismiss as "TR" in favour of "*egeire* ('arise thou,' imperative active present, from *egeiro*)" (although this may be a revowelling issue of synonyms; see my discussion of this variant as Matt. 9:5c in Appendix 3 of revised Vol. 1, as a difference that has no impact on English translation as "Arise"); H & F show "part" of the "Majority" text agreeing with their "TR" reading they follow in the main text, and "part" of the "Majority" text reading agreeing with the B & M reading; but by contrast, R & P show the "TR" reading as their majority text reading, and make no reference to the alternative reading favoured by B & M. 53) + Matt. 12:3, both H & F and R & P follow in their main text the "TR" dismissed by B & M; although Hodges & Farstad have a footnote stating that "part" of their "Majority" text supports the "TR" reading, and "part" of the "Majority" text does not. This has no impact on English translation. 54) + Matt. 12:13, both H & F and R & P follow in their main text the "TR" dismissed by B & M, "*apokatestathe* (it was restored)," not the spelling variant regarded as correct by B & M, "*apekatestathe*;" but as discussed in Appendix 3 of Vol. 1 at Matt. 12:13, this variation has no impact on English translation.

Curetonian and Harclean Versions, and Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; that the Burgon & Miller text omits “*autos* (himself),” over the TR’s reading. The Burgon & Miller text does so on the basis of about 130 of its manuscripts omitting it, and in doing so refers favourably to its omission in such texts of its “majority” text count as e.g., the two leading Alexandrian texts, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus, the leading Western Text, D 05, the Coptic Bohairic Version, and the Ethiopic Version. This is then contrasted with about 30 manuscripts in its “majority” text count that include this word e.g., reference is disparagingly made to “Most Old Latin” versions<sup>185</sup>. By contrast, the Hodges & Farstad majority text based on von Soden’s “K” and “I” group of c. 1,500 Greek manuscripts, or the Robinson & Pierpont majority text based on von Soden’s “K” group of c. 1,000 mainly Byzantine Greek manuscripts; both consider the TR’s “*autos* (himself),” is the majority text reading, and so both support it in their main texts; although Hodges & Farstad have a footnote stating that “part” of their “Majority” text supports the TR’s reading, and “part” of the “Majority” text does not.

Both Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005) agree with the broad-brush results obtained in Burgon & Miller (1899). 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. The “majority” text counting methodology of Burgon & Miller was different to both the majority text counting methodologies of Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). E.g., the “majority” text of Burgon & Miller used less than 200 manuscripts; and it included non-Greek manuscripts, for instance, the “remains of [the] Fayoumic” (Fayyumic) Egyptian Version; the “Gothic Version,” the “Slavonic” version, the “Ethiopic” version, and some “Arabic Versions<sup>186</sup>.” Moreover, while some church writers were consulted by Burgon & Miller, this was selective e.g., while reference was made to three of the four Western doctors, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine; no reference was made to the fourth Western doctor, St. Gregory<sup>187</sup>. By contrast, Hodges & Farstad’s majority text is based on von Soden’s “K” group (983 manuscripts, of which c. 949 are Byzantine, i.e., c. 914 are exclusively Byzantine and c. 35 are Byzantine text in parts only,) and “I” group (c. 530 manuscripts, of which c. 410 are Byzantine i.e., c. 370 completely Byzantine text, and c. 40 are Byzantine in parts only,) of Greek manuscripts, and Robinson & Pierpont’s majority text is based on von Soden’s “K” group of Greek manuscripts.

While it is true that both Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont are Burgonite revisionists, i.e., they both do their “majority counts” differently to Burgon, nevertheless, it is clear that in broad terms they are Burgonites in their methodological

---

<sup>185</sup> Burgon, J.W. & Miller, E., *A Textual Commentary Upon the Holy Gospels*, *op. cit.*, p. 90. As I discuss in Appendix 3 of Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), whether or not one includes this “*autos* (himself)” at Matt. 12:3 has no impact on English translation.

<sup>186</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. xix-xx.

<sup>187</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. xx.-xxiv.

idea of “a majority” text count. *It might be here remarked that the criticism of the Dean Burgon Society of Hodges & Farstad’s Text, infra, i.e., that it only considers SOME of the manuscripts, which in its instance is about 1,500 manuscripts, looks rather silly when one considers that their “great hero” Burgon, only had about one-tenth of this number available to him before von Soden’s later work of 1913. Thus e.g., the von Soden based majority text of Hodges & Farstad at Matt. 12:3, supra, uses about 9 or 10 times more manuscripts than does the majority text of Burgon & Miller! It is also clear from the text of Burgon & Miller, that contrary to the claims of the Dean Burgon Society, infra, Burgon’s theotics broadly support the type of changes to the Received Text found in Hodges & Farstad’s and Robinsons & Peirpont’s majority texts.*

For my purposes of first determining the majority Byzantine text, I thus consider that all three von Soden based works, Robinson & Pierpont (1991 & 2005), Hodges & Farstad (1982 & 1985), and Green’s Textual Apparatus (1986) are very useful tools. With regard to Green’s Textual Apparatus (1986) it must be said that Pierpont failed to factor in an allowance of *c.* 10% in recognition of the generalist nature of von Soden’s group symbols. Thus Pierpont’s ratings in Green’s Textual Apparatus e.g., “Level 3” being “95-100% of all manuscripts,” in fact represent maximum upper limits, so that the range should more safely be stated in terms of *c.* 90% to 100% of these figures i.e., Pierpont’s Level 3 would really have a lower figure of *c.* 86-95% reaching to an upper figure of 90-100%. Thus while I cite the figures in Green’s Textual Apparatus as I find them, the reader should bear in mind the fact that Pierpont used von Soden’s textual apparatus in a way that was too precise for its generalist nature in arriving at these figures. Nevertheless, for my generalist purposes, I still use, and regard as valuable, this work done by Pierpont in Green’s Textual Apparatus.

Given that all three of these works are based on the data in von Soden’s textual apparatus (even though the Byzantine text focused methodological principles used in taking the relevant information from von Soden’s textual apparatus are better in Pierpont & Robinson than in Hodges & Farstad), some may ask, “Why not simply go directly to von Soden for this information?” To this I reply with a question, “Why try to reinvent the wheel?” The reality is, that (for Matthew to Jude) these are *great time saving devices*. Anyone who has ever used von Soden’s textual apparatus would know that to e.g., extract the information that Robinson & Pierpont or Hodges & Farstad have in their Majority Texts, or to calculate the percentages Pierpont has put in Green’s Textual Apparatus (albeit without Pierpont stating a 10% error bar), would take a very long time indeed. (See e.g., my “unpacking” of Matt. 1:6 from von Soden’s textual apparatus, *infra*). *So why try to reinvent the wheel?* Thus while I directly consult von Soden on a first hand basis from time to time, this is relatively rare. However, I am indirectly consulting von Soden on a second hand basis all the time, through reference to these works based on von Soden’s textual apparatus.

On the one hand, for determining my starting point of the representative Byzantine text, I like the ideological Byzantine text focus of Robinson and Pierpont’s *The New Testament in the ... the Byzantine Textform* (2005), even though I use it in conjunction with Hodges & Farstad and other textual apparatuses. But on the other

hand, I am not uncritical of Robinson & Pierpont or Hodges & Farstad. E.g., Robinson & Pierpont say in their Preface, “The New Testament book titles are not part of the inspired canonical text.” This reflects a religiously liberal view that leads people to say things like, “the four gospels have no stated authors;” when in fact, the manuscripts clearly show that they put their name at the very start of the Gospel! This attitude is also clearly adopted by Hodges & Farstad. E.g., on the first Gospel they simply read, “*Kata* (According to) *Mathaion* (Matthew),” whereas the majority text reading is, “*Euaggelion* (The Gospel) *kata* (according to) *Mathaion* (Matthew)” i.e., “The Gospel according to Matthew<sup>188</sup>.”

As stated in Volume 1 of the Commentary at the “Title” to St. Matthew’s Gospel, I regard as authoritative the representative Byzantine reading, “The Gospel (*euaggelion*) according to (*kata*) Matthew (*Mathaion*),” which is thus part of the inspired text and proof of Matthean authorship. But I also consider that it is perfectly valid for the King James Version translators to stylize this by adding “St.” before “Matthew.” Such a usage of the honourific titular prefix “Saint” manifests a Protestant usage, historically found especially among Lutherans and Anglicans, but also to a lesser extent, Presbyterians, of using the honourific titular prefix “St.” / “S.” / “Saint” so as to particularly “mark them which walk as ... an ensample” (Philp. 3:17; cf. I Thess. 1:7; II Thess. 3:9; Heb. 11; I Peter 3:6). It is so used for New Testament figures e.g., St. Andrew, the national motif saint of Scotland; prominent figures from the Church Father’s Era, e.g., St. Augustine and St. Jerome; and also other members of the universal sainthood of all believers, but only in a localized context, for instance, a church named after one of them as e.g., St. George’s Church, or a cross e.g., St. Patrick’s Cross (the red X found on the Union Jack, representing Northern Ireland). In the context of the King James Version, it further represents part of the grandeur of the literary qualities of the AV, since it creates alliteration and assonance (see commentary at Title to St. Matthew).

This tradition does not start with the AV translators. E.g., Erasmus’s 1516 Greek and Latin edition of the NT reads in the left hand Greek column, “*Evangelion* (The Gospel) *kata* (according to) *Mathaion* (Matthew),” and in the right hand Latin column, “*Evangelium* (The Gospel) *secundum* (according) *Matthaeum* (Matthew),” etc. . Yet Tyndale (1526) has for the Gospels, “S. Mathew,” “S. Marke,” S. Luke” and “Sancte Jhon<sup>189</sup>.” Somewhat similar in form is the *Geneva Bible* (1560), which e.g., titles the first gospel, “The Holy Gospel of Iesus Christ, according the Mattheue,” but then at the

---

<sup>188</sup> Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993), pp. 55\* & 1, states that this inscription is the reading of the “Majority text, including the Byzantine Koine text,” i.e., “the majority of all manuscripts” consisting of “the witness of the Koine [/ Byzantine] text type, together with the witness of all consistently cited manuscripts” “which agree with it,” other than those cited in the apparatus as minority readings disagreeing with it.

<sup>189</sup> Tyndale (1526) also has uses in his *Table of Contents* “S.” for the Epistles by “S. Paul,” “S. Peter,” and “S. James;” and refers to “The Acts of the Apostles, written by saynct Luke.” He also uses “sanct” for Jude, and “The revelacion off sanct Jhon the devine.”

top of each double page of the Gospel reads “S. Mattheue;” and likewise for the other three gospels, “S. Marke,” “S. Luke,” and “S. Iohn.” The King James Version’s usage of the honourific titular prefix “St.” for the Gospel writers thus stands in a longer line of English Protestant translations.

However, some Puritanized revised editions of the King James Version, especially from the USA, like to remove the honourific titular prefix “St.,” or other things from the KJV. E.g., I once came across a Puritan (Arminian) Baptist Minister from the USA, (Larry Harris of *Shoalhaven Baptist Church*, Nowra,) who removed every AV from his New South Wales church that had the Dedicatory Preface in it to King James. This was due to various objections he had relating to his Futurist prophetic views, and the fact that the Dedicatory Preface is Historicist since it refers to the Pope as “that man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3). The Puritan (Reformed) Baptist Chairman of the *Trinitarian Bible Society*, Malcolm Watts, now says in 2009 he is happy to join such Puritan cultural vandals of our King James Version, in removing “the abbreviation ‘St.’” Watts says, in “the new Windsor Text Bibles,” “the abbreviation ‘St.’, as in ‘St. Matthew,’ etc., ... has no Biblical authority,” and has “already been removed<sup>190</sup>.” Such Puritans who now smash and bash the literary beauty of the King James Version, remind me of the old civil war English Puritans who used to smash Anglican stained-glass windows on similar types of grounds. For whereas the Anglican usage of natural law (godly reason) holds that a practice may be used which the church has found useful and good, and which *is not contrary to Scripture*, the Puritan says there must be a specific Scriptural command for something.

Of course, the Puritans are not entirely consistent in this matter, and so the idea is more of a general sentiment than an absolute rule. In which instance, though the Puritans will not generally admit this, it is really an Anglican-Puritan disagreement about line drawing. E.g., looking at the average Puritan Church, I ask, Where is a Scriptural command to have a pulpit in a church? Or a microphone with a speaking system? Does the Bible say a church should have windows, or electricity, or even pews? Or, Where does the Bible say to have a Board put up that shows which Hymns and / or Psalms are to be sung, etc.? Are not these practices derived from an Anglican type logic which says that they have been found to be useful and good, and are not contrary to Scripture?

And with respect to the English civil war, the revolutionary Puritans went in the opposite direction, for they claimed on the basis of Rutherford’s *Lex Rex*, that if certain “natural law” criterion for sedition and murder were met, that such “natural law” overrides the Divine Law found in the Bible which prohibits “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:20,21) and requires that we “Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17). Of course, for obvious Biblical reasons the vast majority of Scottish Puritans (who in most instances were Presbyterians,) did not support the English Puritans in the formation of their revolutionary republic. But when e.g., travelling around England in December 2008, I visited Lincoln Cathedral in Lincolnshire (opposite Lincoln Castle). In addition to

---

<sup>190</sup> *TBS Quarterly Record*, April-June, 2009, No 587, Trinitarian Bible Society, London, p. 14.

viciously smashing most of its stained-glass windows, Oliver Cromwell removed the brass plaques on its floor in order to melt down and re-use the brass for canon shells in his Roundhead army's seditious fight against the King's Cavaliers under Charles I. Royalist Anglicans were thus killed by the brass stolen by vandals of one of their Cathedrals. "Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk" (Deut. 14:21).

It is with such thoughts coming into my mind, that I think about extremist Puritanized revised editions of the Authorized Version which like to remove the honourific titular prefix "St.". In doing so, I also remind the good Christian reader that in Volume 1 of this Commentary (Matt. 1-14), I have used positive examples of this as a limited practice among Puritans of the Presbyterian tradition derived from Scotland, e.g., St. Jude's *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland*, Glasgow in Scotland, St. George's *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia*, Sydney in Australia (a Free Presbyterian Church historically derived from the Free Church of Scotland), and St. Giles' *Church of Scotland Cathedral*, Edinburgh in Scotland. Moreover, I know that both St. Jude's Glasgow and St. George's Sydney are AV using Presbyterian churches, and so traditionally have "St. Matthew" etc. for the Gospels in the Bibles that they use.

In the section on the Title to St. Matthew's Gospel in Volume 1 of this Commentary (Matt. 1-14), I refer to the fact that, "translators may to some extent stylise such titles, providing they are not thereby unfaithful to the basic meaning of the original." To this I give the example of both the minority Byzantine reading, and Latin reading, "The Holy Gospel of Jesus Christ according to Matthew." I now return to a similar example, namely, "Holy" before "Gospel," to also give further clarification to the matter raised by both Robinson & Pierpont and Hodges & Fartsad in their denial of the titles of NT books on manuscripts, and also the issue of Lectionaries, raised by Moorman, *infra*. While I firmly reject the proposition that the representative Byzantine text changes as a consequence of Lectionaries, *infra* (although I allow that it may yield better attestation for some non-majority readings), there is a *prima facie* exception, which upon closed inspection is not an exception, that I think should be first covered in this context.

The mediaeval church writer, Theodore Hagiopetrites, was a Byzantine scribe. He is cited in von Soden's textual apparatus as one of von Soden's mediaeval church writers<sup>191</sup>. He dated 16 of 17 manuscripts, and hence he is known to have been active for c. 30 years from c. 1277 to c. 1307<sup>192</sup>. In a work on him, Robert Nelson provides a reproduction of Hagiopetrites' script of the first page of St. Mark's Gospel, and this reads, "TO (The) KATa (according to) MAPKON (Mark) AΓiON (Holy) EYAIΓEAIION

---

<sup>191</sup> Von Soden's "Theodorus Hagiopetrita," referred to in his "Hag" group.

<sup>192</sup> Nelson, R., *Theodore Hagiopetrites*, A late Byzantine scribe & illuminator, Verlag, Vienna, Austria, 1991, pp. 15-16. Nelson argues that Hagiopetrites was from the Biblical Thessalonica, which is now the second largest city in Greece. The precise range of his dated manuscripts is from 1277 or 1278 to 1307 to 1308.

(Gospel)<sup>193</sup>,” i.e., “The Holy Gospel according to Mark.” This example of “Holy” before “Gospel” can be multiplied by reference to the Lectionaries.

The concept of one lectionary which contains all readings is largely, though not entirely a Western Church tradition, e.g., the lectionary in the 1662 Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*. It is certainly found in Eastern Church tradition, e.g., Lectionary 1968 (from Cyprus, 1544 A.D., Sydney University) contains both Gospel and Epistle readings. But while some Eastern Church Lectionaries contain both Gospel (Matt.-John) and Epistle (Acts to Jude) readings, it is more normative in the Eastern Church tradition to have two lectionaries, one for the Gospels, *The Evangelion*, and one for Acts to Jude, *The Apostolos*. Greek Orthodox Lectionaries that date from or before the 16th century, are inside the closed class of sources with respect to their Biblical readings in Greek. So too we may use Roman Catholic Latin Lectionaries with respect to their Biblical readings.

Sydney University Lectionary 2378 is a Gospel (*Evangelion*) Lectionary, and on its first Lectionary page, it reads at the top in large red upper case letters (in a slightly different script to the one I here use), fading near the end, but reconstructed by me in square brackets, “EK (From) TOY (the) KATA (According to) IΩANNHN (John) AΓΙΟΥ (Holy) E[YAΓΓΕΛΙΟΥ] (Gospel)” i.e., readings taken “from the Holy Gospel according to John.” Thereafter the common introductory form used in this Lectionary for a Gospel reading is (often with abbreviations I shall not here trouble the reader with,) in lower case letters, “εκ (from) του (-) κατα (according to)” followed by the name of the Gospel writer e.g., “ματθεου (Matthew)” or “λουκα (Luke)<sup>194</sup>” i.e., “from According to Matthew” or “from According to Luke” respectively. Sydney University’s Lectionary 1968 is a *Lectionary of Epistles and Gospels for the Saturdays and Sundays of the year with annual festival days*. In this Lectionary one finds e.g., before a reading of the fourth gospel the similar prefatory words, “Ευαγγελιον (Gospel) εκ (from) του (-) κατα (according to) ιω (John)” i.e., “from the Gospel according to John.”

These type of title words, “from the Holy Gospel according to John” (Lectionary 2378, 11th century, Sydney University) or “from the Gospel according to John” (Lectionary 1968, 1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*), in these Eastern Greek Lectionaries, find a sequel in the Western Latin Lectionary. E.g., the Bible readings from *Liber Comicus* are also inside the closed class of sources. This is a Latin Lectionary dated variously at the 7th to 9th centuries A.D. . It is the oldest known Lectionary from the Iberian Peninsula, a section of south-western Europe now occupied by Spain and Portugal. We find that before its gospel readings there is a similar terminology. E.g., “*Lectio* (A reading) *Sancti* (of the Holy) *Evangelii* (Gospel) *Secundum* (according to) *Iohannem* (John)” i.e., “A reading from the Holy Gospel according to John,” or “*Lectio* (A reading) *Sancti* (of the Holy) *Evangelii* (Gospel)

---

<sup>193</sup> *Ibid.*, cover-jacket.

<sup>194</sup> Lectionary 2378, *op. cit.*, p. 34 (Matthew, lower left column) p. 52 (Luke top left column).

*Secundum* (according to) *Marcum* (Mark)” i.e., “A reading from the Holy Gospel according to Mark<sup>195</sup>.”

As further discussed, below, I reject the claim of Moorman *et al* that a count of the Lectionaries would fundamentally change the representative Byzantine text (subject to only one qualification, *infra*). Nevertheless, while I have not inspected anything like enough Lectionaries to know how representative of them the words of these two Lectionaries held at Sydney University are, it seems likely that a careful count of Lectionaries would quite probably increase this number, and that further support for this type of terminology is also found in the Latin Lectionaries. Nevertheless, I do not, in an unqualified manner, regard these prefatory words as inside the closed class of sources. That is because as is made clear by the prefatory Greek, “*ek* (from)” or Latin, “*Lectio* (A reading),” these words have been clearly stylized to fit a lectionary format. (Occasionally they also give the wrong Book for a reading.) In this sense, they resemble the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), where at *The Communion Service*, the Minister says, “The holy Gospel is written in the --- Chapter of --- [name of Gospel writer] beginning at the --- verse.”

Therefore, while I can accept that the Gospel readings of these Greek and Latin Lectionaries are inside the closed class of sources, I can only accept that those parts of these introductory words which accord with the representative Byzantine reading as determined from the Byzantine Codices and Minuscules are quotations from the title, i.e., quotations from e.g., “*Euaggelion* (The Gospel) *kata* (according to) *Mathaion* (Matthew).” Thus I would accept *as a derivative conclusion* from this, that in Greek Lectionary 2378 (Byzantine Text, 11th century, Sydney University), from the words, “*EK* (From) *TOY* (the) *KATA* (According to) *IΩANNHN* (John) *ΑΓΙΟΥ* (Holy) *Ε[ΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΥ]*,” that e.g., the “*KATA*” and “*IΩANNHN*” are precisely quoting the Received Text, and that the “*Ε[ΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΥ]*” is derived from the TR’s “*ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ*;” whereas “*EK* (From)” is added as part of Lectionary style. Or in the Latin Lectionary, *Liber Comicus* (7th to 9th centuries), from the words, “*Lectio* (A reading) *Sancti* (of the Holy) *Evangelii* (Gospel) *Secundum* (according to) *Iohannem* (John),” that the words, “*Evangelii* (The Gospel) *Secundum* (according to) *Iohannem* (John)” are from and support the Received Text, whereas the words, “*Lectio* (A reading) *Sancti* (of the Holy)” are added as part of Lectionary style. Hence I would not consider the addition of e.g., “Holy” (Greek, *Agiau*; Latin, *Sancti*) in these two lectionaries as being inside the closed class of sources (nor any other words sometimes added in lectionaries at the beginning of a reading).

This means that e.g., the ascription of the relevant NT books in these Lectionaries when they cite various authors in harmony with the Received Text are inside the closed class of sources. I.e., since they are clearly quoting them from the source, e.g., “Matthew” or “Mark;” even though the precise titles they use have clearly been

---

<sup>195</sup> Morin, D.G. (Editor), *Liber Comicus*, Maredsoli in Monasterio S. Benedicti, 1893, p. 8 (Mark) p. 60 (John).

*contextually* modified. Hence with regard to these Lectionaries titles, I have *some area* of overlapping agreement with Hodges & Farstad or Pierpont & Robinson; although I would still have *some area* of disagreement with Hodges & Farstad or Pierpont & Robinson, since I find some qualified value in them. I.e., because I think they are clearly quoting from a NT source, the element of the author e.g., “Luke” or “John” is clearly a Scriptural quote and so that part is inside the closed class of Greek and Latin sources.

As already indicated, it should be understood that while both Robinson & Pierpont (1991 & 2005) and Hodges & Farstad (1982 & 1985) use von Soden’s textual apparatus to produce Burgonite Majority Texts, they do so in different ways for Matt. to Jude. E.g., while I leave the reader to look at the greater detail of Hodges & Farstad’s Majority Text method which they explain in the “Introduction” to their work, Hodges & Farstad (1985) use a large German “M” (Majority) for a concurrence of all their Majority Text subgroups; and so this includes von Soden’s “I” group (Hodges & Farstad’s M I). But when the support of von Soden’s “I” group is not so great, this is reduced to Hodges & Farstad’s normal dark “M” (Majority) group. Hodges & Farstad use the normal non-darkened “M” (Majority) for von Soden’s K (Koine Group)<sup>196</sup>.

By contrast, Robinson & Pierpont (1991 & 2005) employ von Soden’s textual apparatus with a more focused usage of his K (Koine) group. In their 1991 edition, they say that they “advocate a ‘Byzantine-priority’ rather than a solely ‘Majority Text’” view. Hence their 1991 “edition does not deliberately mingle the Byzantine, Western, or Caesarean witness – i.e., does not combine the testimony of von Soden’s K and I groups” as does Hodges & Farstad (1985), “to produce the preferred text.” Rather, their 1991 “edition attempts to avoid ... pitfalls by maintaining a basic affinity with only the manuscripts comprising von Soden’s Byzantine (K) groups, concentrating upon the most numerous K-group (Kx) whenever the Byzantine evidence is divided.” Thus “the term ‘Textform’ is utilized specifically to distinguish the Byzantine text from other competing text types, such as the Alexandrian, Western, and Caesarean<sup>197</sup>.”

When we come to Robinson & Pierpont’s 2005 edition, we find the same basic Byzantine-priority principles are being used. Their general, though not absolute rule for Matthew to Jude, is fourfold. Firstly, “when a reading in von Soden’s apparatus is identified by a bold **K**, that reading becomes the main text in the” 2005 “edition (**K** = Koine = the Byzantine Textform)” (this statement that von Soden’s “**K**” is “the Byzantine Textform” is true in general, and by virtue of their numbers true in practice as applied by Robinson & Pierpont, but in fact von Soden’s K group contains some non-Byzantine manuscripts as well). Secondly, “When von Soden makes no statement regarding bold **K**, his main text represents the Byzantine reading, and is reproduced without change.” Thirdly, “Where” von Soden’s “bold **K** is divided, the Kx subgroup is followed (Kx represents the dominant component within bold **K**).” Fourthly, “Where Kx is divided, the readings of lesser K subgroups are included in the evaluation. When Kx and the

---

<sup>196</sup> Hodges & Farstad, “Introduction,” pp. xv, xxi.

<sup>197</sup> Robinson and Pierpont (1991), “Introduction,” pp. xli & liii.

various K subgroups are closely divided, alternative readings are displayed in the side margin ... .” To these general rules are made the qualifications, “At all times, pertinent transmissional, transcriptional, external, and internal factors are considered as component elements of weight. In the relatively few instances where von Soden’s main text or apparatus has been confirmed to be in error, other pertinent sources have been used for correction” (Robinson and Pierpont’s *The New Testament in the ... the Byzantine Textform*, 2005, Preface, p. x).

Given the importance in their methodology to what Robinson & Pierpont call, “the dominant component within bold **K**,” i.e., von Soden’s Kx group, let us consider this sub-grouping in some greater detail. There is some doubt as to what grouping a small number of von Soden’s manuscripts are meant by him to belong to, with regard to the Kx subgroup<sup>198</sup>. In von Soden’s Kx subgroup, there are 228 manuscripts that are otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden’s system. But 285 manuscripts that are also classified outside of von Soden’s system, are to be found in von Soden’s Kx group manuscripts. Of the 285 Kx group manuscripts that are classified outside of von Soden’s system, 279 manuscripts or *c.* 98% (97.89%) are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, i.e., 268 Kx manuscripts or *c.* 94% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine (i.e., in the Kx parts)<sup>199</sup>, 11 Kx manuscripts or *c.* 4% (3.85%) are Byzantine only in specific parts<sup>200</sup>, and

---

<sup>198</sup> Aland (Aland, K., *Kurzgefasste Liste Der Griechishchen Handschriften Des Neuen Testaments*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, Germany, and New York, USA, 1963, 2nd edition, 1994,) asks if von Soden includes 1448 (δ 256) (Byzantine outside General Epistles), 1782 (von Soden’s ε 1502) (unclassified outside of von Soden’s system), and 1989 (von Soden’s ε 1170) (unclassified outside of von Soden’s system) in his Kx group?

<sup>199</sup> Minuscules (in Gregory numbers) e2, 3 (Kx in Gospels), 14, 45, 47, 49, 54, 58, 60 (Kx in Gospels), 73, 76 (Kx in Gospels), 78, 84, 89, 99, 105, 107, 109, 121, 123, 126, 132, 133, 134, 135, 140, 144, 148, 149, 150, 156, 159, 183, 190, 193, 198, 202, 204 (Kx in Gospels), 207, 208, 212, 226 (Kx in Gospels), 227, 231, 247, 260, 275, 278b, 282, 283, 284, 293, 309, 324, 335, 342, 343, 347, 351, 352, 359, 364, 367, 371, 375, 380, 384, 388, 390 (Kx in Gospels), 396, 401, 405, 407, 409, 410, 411, 413, 414, 417, 439, 445, 465, 466, 475, 492, 493, 501, 502, 504, 505, 506 (Kx in Gospels), 507, 512, 516, 519, 523, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 533, 535, 538, 541, 548, 550, 554, 559, 564, 571, 574, 577, 585, 587, 597, 601, 651, 657, 663, 669, 672, 677, 680, 698, 705, 707, 712, 714, 717, 724, 725, 750, 759, 762, 764, 765, 768, 774, 777, 778, 779, 782, 783, 784, 785, 793, 794 (Kx in Gospels), 797, 798, 799, 801 (Kx in Gospels), 825, 830, 831, 839, 843, 844, 852 (the subject of a dating dispute, von Soden’s ε 406 = 14th century as so allows a range of 1300-1399; although in Vol. I.I., p. 192 von Soden refers to the “1300” date; though Gregory in Tischendorf’s Prolegomena regards as erroneous the date of “1300;” but even if the exact date is disputed, it is clearly earlier than the 17th century and so inside the closed class of sources), 864, 877, 900, 937, 943, 950, 967, 971, 973, 977, 991, 999 (Kx in Gospels), 1000, 1013, 1018, 1019, 1031, 1033, 1050, 1052, 1053, 1057, 1060, 1065, 1068, 1073, 1074, 1076, 1081, 1089, 1094, 1110, 1149 (Kx in Gospels), 1168, 1169, 1173, 1174, 1186, 1190, 1197, 1203, 1206, 1208, 1217, 1218, 1221, 1226, 1232, 1235, 1238, 1240, 1248 (Kx in Gospels), 1277, 1285, 1296 (undated by Aland, von Soden’s date for ε 3032 = 13th century), 1297, 1298, 1300, 1305, 1309, 1310, 1315,

6 Kx manuscripts or *c.* 2% (2.1%) are manuscripts that are outside the closed class of sources<sup>201</sup>. Applying these as projections to the 228 manuscripts of the “Kx” subgroup, which are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden’s system<sup>202</sup>, means we can extrapolate that of the otherwise unclassified 228 Kx

---

1316, 1317, 1318, 1320, 1324, 1328, 1340, 1341, 1343, 1345, 1350, 1351, 1356, 1357, 1358, 1417, 1438, 1452, 1476, 1483, 1504, 1517, 1520, 1539, 1540, 1577, 1597, 1626, 1662, 1668, 1683, 1693, 1714, 1860, 2119, 2126, 2133, 2140, 2141, 2181, 2199, 2236, 2266, 2275, & 2295.

<sup>200</sup> Minuscules (in Gregory numbers) 61 (Byzantine in Gospels & Acts), 180 (Byzantine outside Acts), 398 (Byzantine outside General Epistles), 522 (Byzantine outside Acts & General Epistles; Kx in Gospels), 922 (Kx in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 1292 (Byzantine outside General Epistle; Kx in Pauline Epistles), 1359 (Byzantine outside General Epistles), 1505 (Byzantine in Gospels), 1642 (Byzantine outside Acts), 2147 (Byzantine outside General Epistles; Kx in Gospels), & 2200 (Byzantine in Gospels & Revelation; Kx in Gospels).

<sup>201</sup> Minuscules 289 (17th century or later Byzantine text type, it is too late in time as the closed class of sources closes with the 16th century in 1599), 956 (17th century or later Byzantine text type), 963 (17th century or later Byzantine text type), 1063 (17th century or later Byzantine text type), 1352 (1352a is Byzantine, what is 1352?), & 1563 (non-Byzantine). Though 4 of these 6 minuscules are a Byzantine text type (289, 956, 963, 1063), 1 is uncertain (1352), and only 1 is definitively non-Byzantine in its text (1563), because they are outside the closed class of sources, I shall for my purposes refer to them as “non-Byzantine text,” *infra* i.e., they are non-Byzantine for the purposes of determining the representative Byzantine text.

<sup>202</sup> Minuscules (in Gregory numbers) 43 (Kx in Gospels), 51 (Kx in Gospels), 56, 59, 96, 130, 145, 158, 173, 175 (Kx in Gospels), 176, 191, 228, 242 (Kx in Gospels), 258, 274, 294, 296 (Kx in Gospels), 308, 312, 338, 340, 341, 400, 403, 433, 447, 464, 503, 532, 542, 561, 562, 563, 609, 613, 653, 654, 658, 678, 681, 682, 710, 751, 795, 803, 805, 823 (Kx in Gospels), 871, 873, 875, 895, 923, 925, 929, 930, 932, 935 (Kx in Gospels), 939, 982, 985, 996, 1001, 1022, 1034, 1035, 1039, 1041, 1042, 1051, 1086, 1097, 1098, 1114, 1120, 1122, 1125, 1134, 1135, 1136, 1138, 1141, 1143, 1152, 1155, 1204, 1258, 1269, 1280, 1286, 1288, 1294, 1322, 1326, 1333, 1335, 1349, 1353, 1361, 1363, 1379, 1385, 1390, 1395, 1399, 1404, 1413, 1414, 1415, 1416, 1418, 1425, 1426, 1428, 1429, 1431, 1432, 1433, 1436, 1442, 1450, 1453, 1456, 1459, 1460, 1464, 1467, 1471, 1472, 1473, 1474, 1477, 1479, 1485, 1486, 1494, 1497, 1499, 1509, 1512, 1519, 1532, 1538, 1541, 1544, 1549, 1553, 1558, 1564, 1567, 1568, 1569, 1571, 1581, 1585, 1586, 1589, 1590, 1592, 1595, 1598, 1603, 1608, 1623, 1629, 1632, 1635, 1639, 1641, 1643, 1645, 1647, 1651, 1652, 1654, 1655, 1660, 1661, 1664, 1665, 1666, 1669, 1670, 1671, 1676, 1679, 1687, 1696, 1697, 1709, 1712, 1716, 1783, 1787, 1788, 1789, 1790, 1791, 1792, 1794, 1823, 1966, 2095, 2099, 2112, 2117, 2118, 2120, 2134, 2146, 2198, 2201, 2216, 2220, 2224, 2226, 2229, 2230, 2234, 2247, 2249, 2250, 2252, 2263, 2268, 2282, 2292, & 2297.

manuscripts, 223 or 98% are Byzantine, of which 214 manuscripts or *c.* 94% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine (i.e., in the Kx parts), 9 manuscripts or *c.* 4% may be regarded as Byzantine only in specific parts; and 5 or *c.* 2% may be regarded as non-Byzantine.

Adding these two lots of figures together, means that von Soden's Kx group contains 513 manuscripts (285 classified outside of von Soden's system + 228 otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden's system), of which 502 manuscripts are Byzantine i.e., Byzantine text (279 classified outside of von Soden's system + 223 otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden's system) i.e., 482 manuscripts are exclusively Byzantine (in Kx parts) (268 classified outside of von Soden's system + 214 otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden's system), 20 manuscripts are Byzantine only in specific parts (11 classified outside of von Soden's system + 9 otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden's system), and 11 manuscripts are outside the closed class of sources (6 classified outside of von Soden's system + 5 otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden's system). This compares with von Soden's larger "K" group, *infra*, of 983 manuscripts, of which 949 are Byzantine i.e., 914 are exclusively Byzantine (539 classified outside of von Soden's system + 375 otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden's system), 35 manuscripts that are Byzantine only in specific parts (21 classified outside of von Soden's system + 14 otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden's system), and 34 are non-Byzantine (20 classified outside of von Soden's system + 14 otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden's system).

Let us compare these figures for von Soden's Kx subgroup of 513 manuscripts, of which 502 are Byzantine i.e., 482 manuscripts are exclusively Byzantine, 20 manuscripts are Byzantine only in specific parts, and 11 manuscripts are outside the closed class of sources; with von Soden's "K" group in general, which includes, but is obviously larger than his Kx subgroup. The wider "K" group contains 983 manuscripts, of which 949 are Byzantine i.e., 914 are exclusively Byzantine, 35 manuscripts that are Byzantine only in specific parts, and 34 are non-Byzantine. This means that von Soden Kx subgroup comprises just over 51% of his manuscripts in the K group (502 Kx out of 983 in K group), and if we consider just the Byzantine part of the K group, the Kx group have *c.* 53% (52.89%) of the Byzantine manuscripts in the K group (502 Kx out of 949 in K Group), breaking down into *c.* 51% (50.79%) of the exclusively Byzantine manuscripts in the wider K group (482 Kx out of 949 in K group), and *c.* 2.1% of the manuscripts that are Byzantine only in specific parts in the wider K group (20 Kx of 35 such K group manuscripts out of 949 K group manuscripts). Overall in the K group, the Kx group also has *c.* 1% (1.12%) of the manuscripts that are non-Byzantine (11 Kx of 34 such K group manuscripts out of 983 K group manuscripts). *Clearly then the Kx subgroup is the single most important subgroup inside the wider K group.*

But where von Soden's Kx subgroup is itself divided on a reading, Pierpont & Robinson also include the readings of lesser K subgroups in their evaluation. If the Kx subgroup and other K subgroups are closely divided, then according to their methodology they place the alternative reading (s) in their side margin. If this is the case, it follows that the K group must be fairly evenly divided, and so the representative Byzantine text,

based on these 983 manuscripts, of which 949 are Byzantine (914 of which are exclusively Byzantine), must also be fairly evenly divided. Therefore the broad methodology used by Robinson and Pierpont for Matthew to Jude in their *The New Testament in the ... the Byzantine Textform* (2005) is basically sound for determining a majority or representative Byzantine Text from these c. 1,000 manuscripts in von Soden's "K" group.

Thus on the one hand, in following these subgroups when the K group is divided, Robinson & Pierpont are following the largest unified Byzantine group(s), and the Kx subgroup when unified will still be a majority of von Soden's "K" group manuscripts. But on the other hand, if the Kx group is just over 51% of von Soden's manuscripts, then if the Kx group stands alone, or only has a fairly small amount of additional support, then the overall Byzantine text is still going to be fairly evenly divided. If this is the case, as also indicated by Hodges & Farstad and Green's Textual Apparatus, then for my purposes of determining the representative Byzantine text, textual analysis will still be required to determine the better reading, since the count is too close to confidently call it. (E.g., see commentary at Mt 20:15b, "Preliminary Textual Analysis.")

Given that Hodges & Farstad (1985) have a focus on both von Soden's "K" and "I" groups, which together constitute most of von Soden's textual data (the "H" group comprises about 4% of von Soden's manuscripts, although even some of these are Byzantine); as further discussed in the next section, "Determining the representative Byzantine Text," I note that in the manuscripts of von Soden's "I" group, c. 78% are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, i.e., c. 68% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine in the "I" parts, 10% are Byzantine only in specific parts, and c. 22% are non-Byzantine. And in von Soden's "K" group, c. 96.5% are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, i.e., c. 93% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine, c. 3.5% are Byzantine only in specific parts, and c. 3.5% are non-Byzantine. (This means his Kx group, *supra*, of which is 98% are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, i.e., c. 94% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine, c. 4% are Byzantine only in specific parts, and c. 2% are manuscripts that are outside the closed class of sources; is generally reflective of von Soden's wider "K" group.)

Though they do not give the detail, Hodges & Farstad themselves note the diversity within von Soden's "I" group, referring to it as "von Soden's highly amorphous I text" (Hodges & Farstad's "Introduction," p. xv)<sup>203</sup>. By contrast, the methodology used

---

<sup>203</sup> In the over 2/3rds Byzantine texts of this "I" group, it contains e.g., such Byzantine Texts as N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, 6th century; von Soden's ε 19 in his I π group); but then in the non-Byzantine texts of this "I" group it includes e.g., the Western Text, D 05 (*Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis*, 5th century; von Soden's δ5 which is his I α group in the Gospels, and his I α1 group in Acts). Who but von Soden (and perhaps Moffatt who thought highly of the critical text produced by von Soden, and sometimes followed the Western Text,) would put Byzantine and Western Texts in the same "group"?

by Robinson & Pierpont focuses on von Soden's K group which has a higher Byzantine manuscript count (even though in practice Hodges & Farstad's text will generally be the same as Robinson & Pierpont's in Matthew to Jude, and where it differs, at least to date, i.e., in Matt. 1-20, I have found this to simply be due to differing interpretations of the same basic conclusion on the manuscript data). Von Soden's "K" group contains c. 980 manuscripts, of which c. 950 are Byzantine and c. 915 are exclusively Byzantine. As further discussed in the next section, I consider this to be a more than adequate sample upon which to base a representative Byzantine Text. Hence (in Matthew to Jude) I consider Robinson and Pierpont may fairly entitle their work, *The New Testament in the ... the Byzantine Textform* (2005). That is because the "K" group that Robinson & Pierpont's Byzantine Text (2005) is based on, is more solidly Byzantine (c. 96.5 % are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, i.e., c. 93% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine), than is e.g., the "I" group that Hodges & Farstad also focus on (c. 78% are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, i.e., c. 68% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine).

And for this reason too, I am happy to use Green's Textual Apparatus, because being prepared by Pierpont, it would on his methodological principles contain this same K group base. I say in Volume 1, "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 *The New Testament ... According to the Byzantine / Majority Textform* (1991); although I may also consult one or more textual apparatuses<sup>204</sup>." These comments remain true of Robinson and Pierpont's *The New Testament in the ... the Byzantine Textform* (2005), since their Majority Text based on von Soden's "K" group, is more than 95% Byzantine (c. 96.5 % are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts,) and so in practice 'Majority Text' and 'Byzantine Text' remain basically as synonyms when using their text (even if, as seems improbable, on a given reading it was as low as the c. 93% completely Byzantine, this would still as a rounded number be c. 95%). I.e., in determining the majority Byzantine text I do so with reference to Robinson & Pierpont, Hodges & Farstad, and Green's Textual apparatus, and only rarely look beyond these three von Soden based works to the source book of von Soden's work.

In his "Introduction" to the religiously liberal Moffatt Bible (1926 & 1935), J. Moffatt of Scotland says, "The text from which the present translation has been made approximates to that of H. von Soden of Berlin, whose critical edition of the Greek New Testament ... made a fuller survey of the extant material than had as yet been attempted, and, ... his edition represents an advance in the right direction<sup>205</sup>". Though I would not

---

<sup>204</sup> "Introduction," to the "Appendices to St. Matthew's Gospel Matt 1-14."

<sup>205</sup> "Introduction," Moffatt Bible (1935), p. xliii.

agree with Moffatt that von Soden's "critical edition" of the text is "an advance in the right direction;" I note that more than 70 years after Moffatt said this, I would have to agree that Hermann von Soden of Berlin still has "made a fuller survey of the extant material than had as yet been attempted" by anyone else, and on this level of textual information, von Soden's "edition" still "represents an advance in the right direction."

I have twice visited the German capital of Berlin (March 2002 & April 2004). Among other sites of interest to me in that city, in 2002 I inspected the 1870-1 German-French War Monument, which would have been known to Hermann von Soden of Berlin (d. 1914). Another place I visited, in 2004 was Berlin's *Pergamon Museum* which inside a large sandstone building with a river canal running in front of it, houses such exhibits as the Ishtar Gate of ancient Babylon; together with buildings and statues from ancient Pergamos, including the Pergamos City Hall (built 175-164 B.C.), reliefs of some weaponry from Pergamos (2nd century B.C.), and the heathen Pergamon Temple itself, reconstructed inside the museum. This pagan temple gives one a vivid idea of the "Pergamos" "idols" (Rev. 2:12,14) used in the Book of Revelation to prophetically type the then future idols of Roman Catholicism (Rev. 13:6; 17:5). When addressing "the church in Pergamos" (Rev. 2:12-17), among other things our Lord says, "Repent, or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will fight against them with *the sword of my mouth*" (Rev. 2:16).

This passage in Rev. 2:16 thus teaches us that *the Word of God is the sword of the Lord* (II Cor. 3:17; Philp. 6:17). Unlike the exhibits in this Berlin museum, *the sword of the Lord* is no museum piece, but "is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing" as it goes (Heb. 4:12). If we, by the grace of God, know how to wield this sword, then we must use it among other things, to defend the doctrine of the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture, "the Word of the Lord endureth for ever" (I Peter 1:25). In this task, the textual apparatus of von Soden of Berlin still stands without peer or equal for the purposes of counting large numbers of NT Texts, a matter of particular interest to those who wish to compose a representative Byzantine Text on the available data. Therefore let us be grateful to God for this important Biblical aid, and let us use it properly and well, in conjunction with e.g., the von Soden based majority texts of Robinson & Pierpont and Hodges & Farstad, to first determine the majority Byzantine Text.

***\*Determining the representative Byzantine Text.***

None of us fallen, frail, human beings are perfect. "For in many things we offend all. If any man offend not in word, the same is a perfect man, and able also to bridle the whole body" (James 3:2). "Who can understand his errors?" (Ps. 19:12). All we Christians must be prepared to humbly say to our God, "O Lord, correct me, but with judgment: not in thine anger, lest thou bring me to nothing" (Jer. 10:24).

It is with some reserve and reluctance that I undertake a critique of writers such as Moorman, Waite, Hembd, Khoo, and Watts, *infra*. That is because all five writers (and any others like them,) are to be commended for seeking to uphold the AV and TR.

In the case of Jack Moorman, I have personally met him on several occasions, and on a personal level found him to be a friendly and personable individual, who sincerely and rightly believes in the Divine Inspiration of Scripture, its providential preservation, and the abiding value of the AV as the best English translation available. I first spoke to him at his Baptist Church in London (Wimbledon) about 5 years ago. At the time, the conversation was mainly on predestination which I said I supported (per Article 17 of the Anglican 39 Articles), and he said he did not support. I thus knew him to be Arminian.

When in London on my fifth trip there (Sept. 08-March 09), I usually attended Church on Sundays at St. John's *Church of England (Continuing)* at South Wimbledon. After getting the train from St. Helier to Wimbledon, I usually either walked past or rode in a bus past, Jack Moorman's (Baptist) Wimbledon Church *en route* to St. John's (Anglican) Church. Having already considered some of his works and those of the Burgon Society, I again spoke to Jack Moorman a few times at his church when I visited it in London. Though in discussions with him I made a clear distinction between Burgon's Majority Text (or what Burgonites sometimes call "the Traditional Text") and the Received Text of the AV, he was never able to accept such a distinction, and always maintained that on a proper count Burgon's majority text would yield the Received Text.

On the first occasion I spoke to him, he said to me that I should come again before I left London and he would give me some material that I might find useful. In between this and my next visit to him, I had spoke in London to Paul Rowland, the *General Secretary of the Trinitarian Bible Society*, mentioning to him both my disagreement with what Hembd had written, *infra*, and also my inability to convey to Jack Moorman of the Dean Burgon Society in London, the fact that Burgon's Majority Text, which he called "the Traditional Text," is not the same thing as the Received Text. Paul Rowland, (a Free Presbyterian<sup>206</sup>), said to me that he had encountered exactly the same difficulty when in the USA he had spoken to the founder and President of the Dean Burgon Society, Donald Waite.

When I again visited Jack Moorman, I once again strongly stressed the difference between Burgon's Majority Text and the Received Text. But Moorman insisted that any differences Burgon's Majority Text methodology had with 16th and 17th century Greek NT Texts, were within a permissible range of "under 400." I.e., as per an article by David Cloud's *Way of Life Literature, USA, supra*, "According to Scrivener . . . , there are . . . 252 places in which Erasmus, Stephanus, Elzevir, Beza, and [the] Complutensian Polyglot disagree sufficiently to affect the English translation<sup>207</sup>." In recognition of this

---

<sup>206</sup> He is a church member of the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland*.

<sup>207</sup> "Which Edition of the Received Text Should We Use?" *Way of Life Literature's Fundamental Baptist Information Service* (P.O. Box 610368, Port Huron, Michigan, 48061-0368, USA), 2001 (<http://www.wayoflife.org/fbns/whichtr.htm>). This article then refers to Luke 2:22; 17:36; John 1:28; 16:33; Rom. 8:11; 12:11; I Tim. 1:4; Heb. 9:1; Jas. 2:18.

type of thing, in which in a confined range of around a few hundred or so places, the NT texts of the 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantines differ, Moorman considers one can isolate any differences between a Burgonite Majority Text and the texts of the 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantines. To some extent the limited textual apparatus of the New King James Version helps to sustain this type of fiction, since it greatly understates the differences between a Majority Text and the Received Text. Of course, in Moorman's case, his belief in the accuracy of the Received Text of the King James Version additionally means that he further considers that the Majority Text of Burgon's principles will also yield the specific Received Text of the AV.

Jack Moorman then kindly gave me free copies of e.g., his works, "When the KJV Departs from the 'Majority' Text" (2<sup>nd</sup> edition, The Bible For Today, New Jersey, USA, 1988; though I already had a copy of this work,) and "Early Manuscripts, Church Fathers, and the Authorized Version" (Bible For Today Press, Collingswood, New Jersey, USA, 2005). But in the fly-cover of the latter, he wrote, "To Gavin McGrath 30 November 08. God bless you in your defence of the Traditional Text, and the preparations of your major work in this defence. Jack Moorman." *This meant that after two lengthy conversations, he could still not cognitively accept the differences between Burgon's "Traditional Text" or Majority Text which I had consistently said I did not support, and the Received Text of the AV which I had consistently said I supported and was working on in a textual commentary.*

While I do not dislike Jack Moorman at a personal level, I have found his inability to cognitively recognize the difference between Burgon's Majority / "Traditional" Text and the Received Text to be somewhat disappointing. E.g., as further discussed, *infra*, his answer, and the answer more generally of the Burgon Society to Hodges & Farstad's Majority Text (1982 & 1985), which except where the readings are fairly evenly divided is in the main text generally the same as the majority Byzantine Text of Robinson & Pierpont (1991 & 2005), is to pour unwarranted scorn on von Soden's textual apparatus. Like others of the Dean Burgon Society, the claim is made that on a fair count of the Byzantine Texts, the result will be the Received Text of the AV. For this, they can offer no positive proof i.e., by listing all the Byzantine manuscripts that they claim support the Received Text in those areas where von Soden's "K" group shows them to be in a clear minority and so not supportive of the Received Text e.g., where are the "majority" of texts supporting the TR (Textus Receptus) on I John 5:7,8? Instead, they make unwarranted and inaccurate claims about von Soden's work, which underpins both the Majority Text of Hodges & Farstad (von Soden's K & I groups) and the Byzantine Majority Text of Robinson & Pierpont (von Soden's K group).

On the one hand, as further discussed below (with reference to Matt. 19:19,) I do not in general directly consult von Soden's textual apparatus on a first-hand basis. But on the other hand, I am constantly consulting von Soden's textual apparatuses *for every reading* on a second-hand basis, and so *von Soden's work is integral to this textual commentary and my textual work*, because his classification of manuscripts in Matthew to

Jude underpins both Hodges & Farstad's and Robinson & Pierpont's Majority Text's<sup>208</sup>; as well as Green's Textual Apparatus; and my starting point for the representative Byzantine text is Robinson & Pierpont's Byzantine Text; although I also look at both Hodges & Farstad's and Green's Textual Apparatus. Since Robinson & Pierpont's Byzantine Text is based on von Soden's "K" (Koine) group of manuscripts, if this is wrong, then my starting point in determining the representative Byzantine Text (in Matthew to Jude) is wrong. If von Soden's "K" group which contains c. 980 manuscripts, of which c. 950 are Byzantine and c. 915 are exclusively Byzantine, are not an adequate base for Robinson & Pierpont to determine their representative or majority Byzantine Text from (in Matt. to Jude), or for Pierpont to compose Green's Textual Apparatus from<sup>209</sup>, (albeit taking into account a critical usage of this apparatus which recognizes that Pierpont here uses upper figures which may be up to 10% lower, since Pierpont failed to recognize the associated generalist nature of von Soden's group symbols), then my commentary is fatally flawed. *Clearly this is a foundational issue to my work as a neo-Byzantine textual analyst, and so one that must be addressed given the claims of the Dean Burgon Society.*

With one limited exception, *infra*, I shall leave discussion on Herman Hoskier (1864-1938) and the text for the Book of Revelation to a future volume (probably the first volume I do on the Book of Revelation); and so the following discussion on Hermann von Soden should be understood to be focused on usage of his New Testament textual apparatus for St. Matthew to Jude. We should give credit where credit is due; and the reality is that von Soden's textual apparatus is an extremely important and useful tool for we neo-Byzantines in Matthew to Jude. While we survived without Hermann von Soden's work before 1913, since its appearance we would be foolish to ignore it both for the initial purposes of determining the representative Byzantine text i.e., generally using Robinson & Pierpont's work based on von Soden's K group (which will usually equate the majority text i.e., using Hodges & Farstad's work based on von Soden's K & I groups); or for extra textual information when it is important to know it, and such manuscript information is present in von Soden's selections but lacking in more easily deciphered textual apparatuses (e.g., see my comments on Matt.19:19, *infra*).

It seems to me that men like Moorman and Waite, are so *subconsciously* immersed and brainwashed by "American democratic values," that they simply cannot

---

<sup>208</sup> Hodges & Farstad's and Robinson & Pierpont's majority texts were constructed primarily from Hermann Freiherr von Soden's *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt*, Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, Germany, 1913; and for the Book of Revelation, Herman Hoskier's (1864-1938), *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*, Bernard Quaritch, London, UK, 1929.

<sup>209</sup> Green's Textual Apparatus (1986) is found in an Appendix of Jay Green Sr.'s, *The Interlinear Bible* (Hendrickson, Massachusetts, USA, 2nd edition 1986, pp. 967-974), and was composed by William G. Pierpont (*Ibid.*, Preface), i.e., the Pierpont of Robinson & Pierpont's Majority Text (1991 & 2005).

conceive of, or allow for the idea, that something they so strongly believe to be correct, would not or could not be supported *by a majority* of texts. This sort of thinking is inculcated into Americans from an early age, where to “resolve a dispute” they “take a vote,” and “majority rules” means “the majority is right.” It is also reflected in the name of the organizations founded by Jerry Falwell (1933-2007), as “the Moral Majority” (1979-89) and “Moral Majority Coalition” (founded 2004). While I agree with some elements of his programme e.g., anti-pornography, anti-homosexual, anti-abortion, and while he had some electoral successes, the broad electoral results have not supported the proposition that he represented a “moral majority.” Though he was often in conflict with Bob Jones University which opposed him<sup>210</sup>, he would no doubt agree with one of the “Chapel sayings” of the Bob Jones University founder, Bob Jones, Sr. (1883-1968), “You and God make a majority in your community<sup>211</sup>” i.e., as here used by Bob Jones Sr., “make a majority” is a synonym for “are correct.”

When flying back to Australia from my fifth trip to London (Sept. 08 – March 09), in March 2009 I stopped off at several cities in North America, including Boston in Massachusetts, USA. I walked along their so called, “Freedom Trail,” which is a long red line on “the side-walk” (pavement), usually of red bricks although sometimes of red paint, which starts at the Massachusetts State Legislature, ends around the American Revolution’s Bunker Hill Monument to the American War of Independence (1775), and in between goes through a number of sites of historical interest in Boston. Among other places on this “Trail,” I visited Old South Meeting House. This was built in 1729 as a Puritan Meeting House, and is the place where the talented inventor, Benjamin Franklin, was baptized. The sign on it read, “NO TAX *on* TEA!!,” for it was here that “The Boston Tea Party” began, which helped lead to the tragic events of the American War of Independence or American Revolution, and associated Declaration of Independence (1776) of which Benjamin Franklin was one of the signatories. Artifacts I inspected there included a “musket, reportedly used at the Battle of Lexington, 1775.”

As I walked through this old American Puritan Church, which is now a museum, seated in the pews was a class of about 30 school students from a primary school, with their teacher out the front talking to them. They were being indoctrinated with American “democratic” values; and in this context were re-enacting some of the events of the Boston Tea Party. This involved the school students yelling and chanting out statements of sedition against the Crown, based on secular “democratic” republican values (deriving at least in part, their support in some North American Puritan quarters from the type of thinking one finds in Rutherford’s *Lex Rex* and associated republic under Cromwell’s

---

<sup>210</sup> “Moral Majority,” *Wikipedia* (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moral\_Majority), citing Allitt, P., *Religion in America Since 1945*, Columbia University Press, New York, USA, 2003, p. 153, & Vinson, C.D. & Guth, J.L., in Green, J.C. (Ed.), *The Christian Right in American Politics*, Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C., USA, 2003, p. 23.

<sup>211</sup> Wright, M., *Fortress of Faith*, The Story of Bob Jones University, Bob Jones University Press, Greenville, South Carolina, USA, 1960, revised edition 1984, pp. 279,283.

English Puritans more than a hundred years earlier). E.g., they were screaming out approval for burning down the Governor's House, i.e., the representative of the Crown (King George III, Regnal Years: 1760-1820). Certainly I was alarmed and horrified. As a New South Wales school teacher (who has also taught in England), and more fundamentally as a Christian, I would have to say that teaching school children to yell and scream in favour of "seditions" and "murders" (Gal. 5:20,21), rings no sympathetic cord in me. Teaching children to e.g., scream out in favour of burning down the Governor's House is a clear violation of the Biblical teaching, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God" (Rom. 13:1).

Nevertheless, with this type of thing so ingrained in the secular culture of the USA, people can subconsciously get affected and infected by it; and in my opinion, the inculcation of these type of "democratic" values helps to explain the bizarre claims of the American based Dean Burgon Society, i.e., that Burgon's Majority Text principles will yield the Received Text. Of course, this is a claim that true Burgonites like Hodges & Farstad, and indeed Burgon himself, would strongly reject, e.g., Burgon said, "I am not defending the '*Textus Receptus*' ..., it is without authority to bind, ... [and] it calls for ... revision," "upon the" basis of the "majority of authorities" (*Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, pp. 13 & 15). Thus Burgon's proud boast was this, "Again and again we shall have occasion to point out ... that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction" (*Revision Revised*, p. 21).

On the one hand, those of the American based Dean Burgon Society are correct to believe that God has preserved the Received Text (a religious belief); but on the other hand, when they come to articulate this belief, then at a subconscious level they necessarily conclude that "the Received Text is the Majority text" (an American political belief on a "majority count" resolving disputes cross-applied to their religious belief on the Received Text). To a proposition such as, "I John 5:7,8 is correct, but more than 99% of manuscripts lack it," they would think in their heads, *with an American accent*, something like, "Hey, ... that sounds un-American, ... that just can't be right." Since the Received Text is "right," and "majority" is "a synonym" for what is "right," the "Received Text *just must* be the Majority Text." I.e., there is a sub-conscious "intuitive" sense in which they "*just know*" that "the majority of manuscripts have gotta' support the Received Text!" I do not suggest that all Americans in the USA think this way, but some do, and it seems that those of the "home-spun" American based *Dean Burgon Society* certainly do. (So too, the success of Burgon's "Majority Text" idea among those who, unlike the Dean Burgon Society, are actually prepared to accept the count of Burgon's majority, appears to have found fertile ground in the USA for similar reasons. I.e., to a proposition such as, "I John 5:7,8 is correct, but more than 90% of manuscripts lack it," they would think in their heads, *with an American accent*, something like, "Hey, ... that sounds un-American, ... that just can't be right." Hence they support the Majority Text's omission of this passage, and thus deny the truth of Holy Writ.)

Jack Moorman clearly stands in the Wesleyan Arminian Baptist wing of Puritanism (as opposed to the Reformed: Baptist, Congregationalist, or Presbyterian wing

of Puritanism). He is an independent (Arminian) Baptist American “missionary” to England, connected with Waite’s organizations, *infra*. Moorman’s *When the KJV Departs from the Majority Text* (1988), *Early Manuscripts, Church Fathers, & the Authorized Version* (2005), and *8,000 Differences between the N.T. Greek Words of the King James Bible and the Modern Versions* (2006), are all interesting works containing some useful information. However, they also sadly reflect the inaccurate views of the Received Text promulgated by the Dean Burgon Society. E.g., Moorman’s *Early Manuscripts, Church Fathers, & the Authorized Version* (2005), contains a Foreword by Waite, who says of the American, “Dr. Jack Moorman,” that he “is one of the missionaries supported by our Bible For Today Baptist Church. He has been laboring ... for many years in the United Kingdom ... as a Baptist Pastor ... . In my opinion, Dr. Moorman is the world’s greatest living scholar who is defending the King James Bible and its underlying Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek words. He has the evidence to back up that defense, and knows how to put it in writing ... .” In this work, Moorman equates “the Received Text” with Burgon’s “Traditional Text.” For instance, he says of “*The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels* by Burgon and Miller (available from the Dean Burgon Society),” that it supports “Scrivener’s *Cambridge Greek Testament* (1887). This is an edition of the Received Text, where readings disputed by Westcott and Hort are printed in darker type. The results clearly favored the Traditional Text<sup>212</sup>.”

On one level I do not much like so strongly seeking to demolish the claims of those who profess to uphold the Received Text and Authorized Version. But on the other hand, it is my duty to God and godly brethren, to expose misconceptions and errors where I find them. It is my hope and prayer that in doing so, my godly brethren in Christ may come to a better understanding and appreciation of both the Received Text and Authorized Version. Thus while I do not wish to cause unnecessary divisions on these matters among those who stand for the Received Text and Authorized Version, nevertheless, out of respect for the truth, I undertake the following critique (which is as limited as I dare make it).

Donald Waite is an American (Arminian) Baptist Minister of *Bible for Today* which is a Baptist church / organization in Collingswood, New Jersey, USA, connected with the Dean Burgon Society (DBS)<sup>213</sup>. He was the inaugural President of DBS in 1978, and continues to hold that position. Waite is the Editor of *The Dean Burgon Society News* which describes him as “defender of ... Traditional Text underlying the KJB” (King James Bible).” In an Editorial, Waite says, “The motto of our DBS is ‘IN

---

<sup>212</sup> Moorman, J.A., *Early Manuscripts, Church Fathers, & the Authorized Version*, With a Foreword by Pastor D.A. Waite, Director of Bible for Today, Bible for Today Press, Collingswood, New Jersey, USA, 2005, pp. ii, 106 (ISBN #1-56848-048-2).

<sup>213</sup> An article in the *Wikipedia Encyclopaedia* (2008) describes him as the “successor of David Otis Fuller’s teachings ... . Fuller draws heavily on the teachings of Benjamin G. Wilkinson as well as Dean Burgon” ([en.wikipedia.org/wik/D.A\\_Waite](http://en.wikipedia.org/wik/D.A_Waite)).

DEFENSE OF TRADITIONAL BIBLE TEXTS'<sup>214</sup>.” In another edition, the Editor says, the “words underlying the King James Bible, ... are the words of the traditional Hebrew Masoretic Text by Abraham Jacob ben Chayyim, second edition, printed by Daniel Bomberg and the Traditional Greek Received Text underlying the King James Bible, which is printed by the Dean Burgon Society<sup>215</sup>.” This society greatly promotes and sells a number of Dean Burgon’s works, including e.g., *The Revision Revised*, *The Traditional Text*, *The Causes of Corruption*. It also sells copies of Scrivener’s Text, which it regards as the NT Received Text<sup>216</sup>.

On the one hand, Waite is to be commended for upholding the King James Bible and the Received Text which underpins it. (Which though not identical with Scrivener’s NT Text, is very close to it. See the first Appendices in Commentary Volumes 1 & 2.) But on the other hand, the fundamental claim of the Dean Burgon Society, namely, that the Bomberg Hebrew OT Text is the OT Received Text of the AV; and the NT Majority Text of Burgon, (which in practice is generally the same as the majority Byzantine Text, and reflects the same type of split that one finds in the Byzantine Text,) is the NT Received Text of the AV, is quite wrong. The representative Hebrew Masoretic Text, such as produced by Bomberg, is the starting point for the OT Received Text, so one only moves away from this Masoretic Text if there is a clear and obvious textual reason for doing so; and likewise the representative Byzantine text, which in practice will generally equate the Majority Text or its major divisions, is the starting point for the NT Received Text, so one only moves away from the majority Byzantine Text if there is a clear and obvious textual reason for doing so. It is notable that the Dean Burgon Society does not publish Burgon’s *Textual Commentary* (1899) which, as has already been observed, *supra*, makes 53 changes to the what it regards (in most instances correctly) as the Received Text in Matt. 1-14, of which *c.* 94% are followed by e.g., Hodges and Farstad in their Majority Text (1982 & 1985)<sup>217</sup>. If they did publish this important work by Burgon & Miller (1899), it would quickly show that Burgon was no supporter of the Received Text.

Let us consider two publications of Waite’s organization, with respect to some verses covered in Volume 1 of this commentary (Matt. 1-14), namely, the TR’s usage of “Jesus (Greek, *o Iesous*)” at Matt. 4:18, and the inclusion of “openly (Greek, *en to phanerō*)” at Matt. 6:18. As discussed in Volume 1 of this commentary, both of these

---

<sup>214</sup> Waite, D.A. (Editor), *The Dean Burgon Society News*, The Official Organ of the Dean Burgon Society, Number 82, Sept. 2008, Part 1, pp. 2,3.

<sup>215</sup> Waite, D.A. (Editor), *The Dean Burgon Society News*, Published by the Dean Burgon Society, Number 82, Sept. 2008, Part 2, p. 2.

<sup>216</sup> Waite, D.A. (Editor), *The Dean Burgon Society News*, Number 82, Sept. 2008, Part 1, pp. 5,7,8.

<sup>217</sup> Burgon, J.W. & Miller, E., *A Textual Commentary Upon the Holy Gospels*, *op. cit.* .

are minority Byzantine readings correctly included in the *Textus Receptus* and Authorized Version. When we read Moorman's *8,000 Differences between the N.T. Greek Words of the King James Bible and Modern Versions*, published jointly by *The Bible for Today* and *Dean Burgon Society* (2006), we find that in both instances, Scrivener's Text is said to be the Received Text, and (with no textual commentary, but simply showing these as differences,) correct to include these at both Matt. 4:18 and Matt. 6:18. By contrast, Nestle-Aland's 26th and 27th editions are said to be wrong for excluding them; although no reference is made to the fact that these would also have to be excluded on Burgon's Majority Text principles<sup>218</sup>.

But when we open up Burgon's *Causes of Corruption of the Traditional Text*, Volume II (1896), republished by the *Dean Burgon Society* (1998), a very different picture emerges on these two verses. Burgon says on page one of this work that "the Traditional Text" i.e., his Majority Text, "must be found ... in a laborious revision of the Received Text"<sup>219</sup>. He is thus clearly no supporter of the *Textus Receptus* (TR). Throughout this work, Burgon uses as his guide, "the great bulk of the mss [manuscripts]," or "the copies largely preponderate in favour of so" reading<sup>220</sup>, i.e., the Majority Text. *Of course, Burgon wrote before von Soden's landmark work of 1913 on virtually every Greek codex and minuscule, and so he determined his "majority text" from a much smaller sample than is now available.* Flowing from this Burgonite paradigm, Burgon gives a number of examples where he disagrees with the Received Text. "Thus *o Iesous* [Jesus] has often been inserted, and in some places remains wrongly (in the opinion of Dean Burgon) in the pages of the Received Text. ... [And] additions to the Received Text occur, as Dean Burgon thought, in St. Matt. 6:18, where *en to phanero* [openly] has crept in ... against the testimony of a large majority both of unical and cursive mss [manuscripts] ..."<sup>221</sup>.

A similar contradiction occurs between these two *Dean Burgon Society* works elsewhere<sup>222</sup>. The reality is, that Waite's *Dean Burgon Society*, while claiming to uphold the Received Text through Burgon's Majority Text School, is in fact undermining it.

---

<sup>218</sup> Moorman, J.A., *8,000 Differences between the N.T. Greek Words of the King James Bible and Modern Versions*, published jointly by *The Bible for Today* and *Dean Burgon Society*, New Jersey, USA, 2006 (ISBN 1-56848-054-7), pp. xviii, 5 & 8.

<sup>219</sup> Burgon, J.W., *The Causes of Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, arranged, completed, and edited by Edward Miller, George Bell & Sons, Cambridge, 1896, reprint Dean Burgon Society Press, New Jersey, USA, 1998 (ISBN 1-888328-03-7), p. 1.

<sup>220</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 107 & 125.

<sup>221</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 171.

<sup>222</sup> E.g., at this same p. 171, *Ibid.*, Matt. 25:13; 27:35; and Moorman's *8,000 Differences*, *op. cit.*, pp. 49 (Matt. 25:13), 56 (Matt. 27:35).

Yet they do not appear to understand the serious internal contradiction in their mutually exclusive claims and publications. Of course, Burgon was a wily and deceitful man. He generally isolated areas where his Majority Text principles agreed with the Received Text against the neo-Alexandrian Westcott-Hort text, *precisely to try and get those like Waite on side*. I.e., he created a majority text *sentiment* in favour of the TR, and so the simple-minded who embrace this sentiment then think the Majority Text supports the TR. (This is a well known technique e.g., Babelists and feminists use the racial and sexual universality of the gospel in Gal. 3:28, to create an anti-racist and anti-sexist *sentiment* which they develop into Babelism and sex role perversion.) The Lord calls us to *intellectual consciousness* as a fruit of his grace (e.g., Job 12:7-9; Ps. 191-6; I Cor. 11:14). Alas, few there are who by the grace of God ever so become *intellectually conscious*. Most, including a large number of Christians, just drift along in sentiment directed thinking, wherein they are all too easily carried away by this or that lust, or this and that programmer, who plays with and misuses their faith in Cromwellian fashion. (This is why the neo-Alexandrians and others think it so important to keep control of the universities, television, etc., i.e., so people play up to their silly stereotypes of what is “intelligent.”)

These are certainly simple-minded men in the *Dean Burgon Society*. I do not say that all they do is bad. E.g., their publication of the above referred to works has some value in it. Nevertheless, it is also clear that they are operating well beyond their intellectual and spiritual competencies, and need to humbly defer to those who are gifted by God to uphold the Received Text. While there are a variety of different “teachers” in the body of Christ, If all be “teachers” of the Received Text, then where is “the body”? (I Cor. 12:27,29).

What if they will not so defer to their intellectual superiors amongst those whose spiritual eyes are opened to the truth of the Received Text? The inescapable reality is that this type of thing found in the *Dean Burgon Society* acts to promote a great falsehood, namely, that the Received Text of the OT is simply the Hebrew Masoretic Text of Bomberg, and that the Received Text of the NT is simply Burgon’s Majority Text. I am left to conclude that those promoting these type of ideas are either incompetent or willful liars. With all due respect to them, if the former, then they would do well to consider the words of Ps. 131:1, “Lord, my heart is not haughty, nor mine eyes lofty: neither do I exercise myself in great matters, or in things too high for me.” If the latter, then they would do well to consider the words of Rev. 21:8, “But ... all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone” (Rev. 21:8).

On the one hand, any Christian may accept the veracity of the Received Text on the basis of faith, namely, “the Word of the Lord endureth forever” (I Peter 1:25), and indeed, he should do so. But on the other hand, if he wishes to defend or explain the greater detail of the Received Text, he must have suitable God given gifts, and submission to the directive will of God. God has given different gifts to different people. A Christian may have the gift of being a “teacher” (Rom. 12:6,7; I Cor. 12:28; Eph. 4:11), but if he is not called and gifted by God for teaching about the *Textus Receptus*, then he should not seek to make up for his deficit by manufacturing evidence. He should

do what he can to promote truth, and if he has publishing skills or capacity, he should use them in support of neo-Byzantine textual analysts such as e.g., Stephanus, Beza, Elzevir, or myself, *not Burgon*.

Malcolm Watts is the *Chairman of the Trinitarian Bible Society* (TBS) General Committee<sup>223</sup>. He is a Reformed Baptist Minister in Salisbury, England<sup>224</sup>, UK, and has written, *The New King James Version: A Critique* (2008). Albert Hemb, a Free Presbyterian from Houston, Texas, USA, is a *Consultant to the Trinitarian Bible Society*<sup>225</sup>. Hembd's article, "An Examination of the New King James Version" appears in the *Quarterly Review* of the Trinitarian Bible Society (Part 1, Oct-Dec. 2007; Part 2, Jan.-March 2008). Both Watts and Hembd are to be commended for seeking to uphold the AV and TR. On the upside, both articles contain much that is interesting, useful, and good. E.g., Watts is rightly concerned that the Alexandrian's "Codex Vaticanus ... and Codex Sinaiticus ... differ *radically* from the ... Received Text." He is also right to generally criticize the NKJV, which in general is very much the inferior of the KJV<sup>226</sup>. But on the downside, e.g., Hembd's article is to be criticized for containing more errors than I am here prepared to itemize.

The back-cover jacket of the *TBS Quarterly Record*, April-June, 2008, says "The aims of the Society" include, "To promote Bible translations which are accurate and trustworthy, conforming to the Hebrew Masoretic Text of the Old Testament, and the Greek Textus Receptus of the New Testament, upon which texts the English Authorised Version is based." And in *The New King James Version: A Critique*, Watts refers to the usage by the NKJV OT of e.g., the Greek Septuagint and Latin Vulgate (both inside the closed class of OT sources) and Syriac (outside the closed class of OT sources), and criticizes it for not following the "Masoretic reading or ... deviating from it, following some non-Masoretic variant."

---

<sup>223</sup> *TBS Quarterly Record*, The Magazine of the Trinitarian Bible Society, April-June 2008, "Officer of the Society," opposite p. 1.

<sup>224</sup> The Minister of Emmanuel Church, Salisbury, England, since 1971, whose website says "The teaching of the church reflects the theology of the 1689 Baptist Confession of Faith, to which the Minister and other Church Officers are required to give assent." It says that Watts (b. 1946) studied at London Bible College (1967-70) ("Emmanuel Church," [www.salisburyemmanuel.org.uk](http://www.salisburyemmanuel.org.uk)).

<sup>225</sup> Hembd is a member of the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland*, whose doctrinal standard is the Westminster Confession of 1647. He has a Master's degree in Special Education (1984) from Butler University, Indianapolis, Indiana, USA; and a Masters of Christian Studies Degree (2009) from Reformation International Theological Seminary, Fellsmere, Florida, USA ("Albert Hembd's Public Profile," [www.palxo.com/directory/profile/64426892832/d6dela07/Albert/Hembd](http://www.palxo.com/directory/profile/64426892832/d6dela07/Albert/Hembd)).

<sup>226</sup> Watts, M.H., *The New King James Version: A Critique*, Trinitarian Bible Society, London, 2008 (ISBN 978-1-86228-357-2), pp. 7, *et al.*

So too, we find Hembd makes such bizarre claims as, e.g., “the NKJV translates the Old Testament from the Hebrew Masoretic Text, as did the Authorized Version” (*TBS Quarterly Record*, Oct-Dec 2007, Part 1, p. 9). Certainly the OT Received Text is much closer to the representative Hebrew Masoretic Text than the NT Received Text is to the representative Greek Byzantine Text. But contrary to the claim of TBS, Watts, and Hembd, the OT Received Text is no more the representative Hebrew Masoretic Text, than the NT Received Text is the representative Byzantine Greek Text. Rather, one starts with the representative Hebrew Masoretic Text, and only moves away from it where there is a clear and obvious textual problem, resolved inside the closed class of OT sources e.g., the Septuagint, Vulgate, or Talmud.

This is what the King James Version translators did, but it must be said that the number of times they found it necessary to depart from the Hebrew Masoretic Text in composing the OT Received Text, was substantially far less than the number of times they departed from the representative Byzantine text in the NT. Thus while I expect the NT Received Text to take quite a number of volumes, even though the OT is about three times longer than the NT, I do not expect my OT TR commentary to take 3 times this number, rather, I expect to cover the entire OT Received Text in *just one* final volume; for while the OT TR is not the same as the Hebrew Masoretic Text, it is exceedingly close. It should also be said that many of the modern Versions have without warrant deviated from the OT TR.

Hembd then makes reference to the “Greek Orthodox Church.” Let us therefore first consider some relevant facts about this church. Article 19 of the Anglican *39 Articles*, refers to the Eastern Orthodox Churches in general, through specific reference to the Greek Orthodox Church in particular, as “the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch.” I.e., the Greek Orthodox Patriarchates of these three cities are the oldest Patriarchates with antecedent bishops in them. The Greek Orthodox Church (and by derivation the other later Eastern Orthodox Churches such as e.g., the Russian Orthodox Church,) left the Roman Catholic Church in what is known as *The Great Schism* of 1054. The two key issues of the Great Schism were Papal authority and the double procession of the Holy Ghost; although other issues later evolved, so that Eastern Orthodox theology is now more diverse from Romanism on a number of matters<sup>227</sup>. With respect to the first

---

<sup>227</sup> E.g., Eastern Orthodox notions of “the deification of man” and associated notions of sinless perfection allegedly having been attained by their Eastern Orthodox “Saints” (Gen. 3:5; I Kgs 8:46; I John 1:8). (Daniel Clendenin’s *Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, Baker Books, Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA, 1994, 2003, pp. 117-137.) Among other things, this constitutes a gross misuse of Ps. 82:6 and II Peter 1:4. (An associated misuse may also occur in claims that a church writer who simply quotes e.g., II Peter 1:4, is thereby supporting this Eastern Orthodox interpretation.) I find the Eastern Orthodox usage of Ps. 82:6, “I have said, Ye are gods,” reminiscent of Mormon misuse of this verse (Joseph Smith’s *Doctrines & Covenants* 76:50,56-58; 132:18-20,37; Hoekema, A.A., *The Four Major Cults*, Eerdmans, Michigan, 1963, pp. 39-40). Concerning the men called “gods” in Ps. 82:6; of “judges” (Exod. 20:8,9, Hebrew

issue, Papal authority, the Anglican *39 Articles* upholds the Greek Orthodox Church as having taken the right stand; but with respect to the second issue, their denial of the *Filioque*<sup>228</sup>, i.e., the double procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father *and the Son*, the Anglican *39 Articles* maintains that the Greek Orthodox Church “erred.”

On the one hand, concerning the first issue of the Great Schism (1054), Papal authority, Article 35, Book 2, Homily 21, “Against Rebellion,” Part 5, of the Anglican 39 Articles, says, “the Bishop of Rome, ... did by intolerable ambition challenge ... to be the head of all the Church dispersed throughout the world, ... most contrary to the doctrine ... of ... Christ, whose vicar, and of ... Peter, he pretendeth to be.” Thus “by this challenge once made by the Bishop of Rome, he became at once the spoiler and destroyer ... of the Church ... as an universal tyrant over all. And ... hereupon began ... much hatred between the Bishop of Rome and his clergy and friends on the one part, and the Grecian clergy and Christians of the East on the other part, for that they refused to acknowledge any such supreme authority of the Bishop of Rome over them.” Hence “the Bishop of Rome, for this cause amongst others, not only naming them and taking them for schismatics, but also never ceasing to persecute them and the Emperors who had their See and continuance in Greece ...” caused much trouble. E.g., reference is made to how “the Bishop of Rome” by encouraging “rebellion against their princes” for having

---

*elohim*) we read, “Thou shalt not revile the gods (Exod. 22:28, Hebrew *elohim*), and “gods” here is in Hebrew poetical parallelism with a “ruler of thy people” (Exod. 22:28). I.e., “the powers that be are ordained of God” (Rom. 13:1), and the judge or ruler is meant to enact God’s laws (Ps. 2:10-12), and in this sense he is God’s representative. Of course, it is also clear that a judge may abuse his powers by not enacting God’s law (Hab. 1:4), and so the judges or “gods” of Ps. 82 are reminded “ye shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes” (Ps. 82:6) i.e., “the spirit shall return unto God who gave it,” and “God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil” (Eccl. 12:7,14), a fact the judges both then and now would do well to remember. Concerning II Peter 1:4, to “be partakers of the Divine nature” is to receive a higher spiritual nature from God i.e., being “born again” (I Peter 1:23) or regenerated (John 3:3; Rom. 7:22; Eph. 4:24). Far from this leading us to think we are some kind of “god,” it reminds us of just how frail, fallen, and sinful we really are (Rom. 7:17-25).

<sup>228</sup> The name derives from the Western Church’s addition to the *Nicene Creed* of the Latin word, “*Filioque* (and of the Son).” This section of the *Nicene Creed* continues the earlier usage of the first word of the Latin *Nicene Creed*, “*Credo* (I believe),” by virtue of the “*in* (in),” and reads, at the relevant section, “*Et* (And) *in* (in) *Spiritum* (the Ghost) *Sanctum* (Holy), *Dominum* (the Lord) *et* (and) *vivificantem* (giver of life), *quo* (who) *ex* (from) *Patre* (the Father), *Filioque* (*Filio* = ‘the Son’ + *que* = ‘and’) *procedit* (proceedeth),” i.e., “And I believe in the Holy Ghost, The Lord and giver of life, Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son” (*Nicene Creed*, The Communion Service, Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662). The addition of the “*Filioque* (and of the Son),” found before that time in the *Athanasian Creed*, was a decision first taken by the Church of Rome, and then some 500 years later endorsed by the Protestant Reformers.

broken with Rome in 1054, helped in “the pitiful losses of so many goodly cities, countries, dominions, and kingdoms,” in the East, culminating in “the miserable fall of the [Byzantine] Empire and Church of Greece ... .” Indeed, since the Bishop of Rome had refused to assist in the defence of e.g., Constantinople in 1453, this then saw “the dreadful increase of the power of the [Mohammedan] infidels and miscreants; and all by the practice and procurement of the Bishop of Rome chiefly,” a fact known through greater reference to “the histories and chronicles written” even “by the Bishop of Rome’s own favourers and friends,” being “well known unto all such as are acquainted with the sad histories.” The Roman Catholic position (Matt. 16:18) is clearly unBiblical (Pss. 18:2; 62:1,2; Matt. 16:18; I Cor. 3:11; Col. 1:18; 2:19; I Peter 2:25). Of course, theological orthodoxy is not a pre-requisite for Gentile Latins preserving NT documents in the Latin textual tradition inside the closed class of sources, for if it was, the apostate Jews could never have preserved the Hebrew OT (Rom. 3:1-3; 11:29).

But in the one hand, concerning the second issue of the Great Schism (1054), the Articles uphold the double procession of the Holy Ghost against Greek Orthodox claims to the contrary. Article 19 of the Anglican 39 Articles says those in this Greek Orthodox “Church” “have erred.” Composed in 1562 and 1570, i.e., more than 100 years before the Eastern Orthodox *Synod of Jerusalem* (1672) formally denied and condemned Protestantism; Article 8 of the Anglican *39 Articles* nevertheless itemizes a heresy of note that was well known to be associated with the Eastern Church. Article 8 says, “The Three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius’s Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles’ Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture.” The Athanasian Creed upholds the double procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father *and the Son*, saying, “The Holy Ghost is of *the Father and of the Son*: neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but *proceeding*” (emphasis mine). This Trinitarian teaching was denied at the time of the *Great Schism* in 1054, when the Greek Orthodox claimed there was a single procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father *alone*. The Greek Orthodox position (John 14:26) is clearly unBiblical (John 14:26; 15:26; 16:7; Acts 2:17,32,33). Of course, theological orthodoxy is not a pre-requisite for Gentile Greeks preserving NT documents in the Greek textual tradition inside the closed class of sources, for if it was, the apostate Jews could never have preserved the Hebrew OT (Rom. 3:1-3; 11:29).

We thus find that with respect to the two major issues of *The Great Schism* of 1054 which formed the Greek Orthodox Church, and thereafter in derivation the other Eastern Orthodox Churches (not to be confused with the Oriental Orthodox Churches which are monophysitist), the Protestant Anglican *39 Articles* review the matter through the light of Biblical authority. In doing so, the Articles conclude that on the one hand, the Greek Orthodox were quite right to reject the claims of Papal authority, and that the conduct of the Bishops of Rome in claiming to be “Vicar of Christ” and “the head of all the Church,” did in fact make them a “spoiler and destroyer ... of the Church ... as an universal tyrant over all.” But on the other hand, the Articles conclude that the Greek Orthodox were wrong to deny the double procession of the Holy Ghost, an error which then put them into Trinitarian heresy.

The antecedent matter of icons is also addressed in the Thirty-Nine Articles. Iconolatriy (icon idolatry) is a well known defining quality of Eastern Orthodoxy, and predates the *Great Schism* of 1054, since this form of idolatry existed in the Eastern Church when most of Eastern Christendom was a part of the Roman Church under the Pope between 607 and 1054. Under *The First Iconoclasm* (730-787) (reversed by the idolatrous *Nicea II Council*, 787), this was condemned by the *Council of Hieria* (754). The anti-iconolater (anti-icon idolater) stance of the Byzantine Emperors of *The First Iconoclasm* (730-787), Leo III (Regnal Years: 717-741), Constantine V (Regnal Years: 741-775), and Leo IV (Regnal Years: 775-780), is rightly praised in Article 35 of the 39 Articles, Book 2, Homily 2 (Part 2), “Against peril of idolatry.” Thus e.g., we here read, “Leo, the Third ... was ... a very wise, godly, merciful, and valiant prince. This Leo by proclamation commanded, that all images set up in churches to be worshipped should be plucked down and defaced, and required specially the Bishop of Rome that he should do the same ... . When Gregorius, the Third of that name Bishop of Rome [Pope: 731-741], heard of the Emperor’s doings in Greece concerning images, he assembled a Council of Italian bishops against him; and ... stirred up ... against the Emperor ... rebellion ... .”

“After this Leo [the Fourth] reigned ..., succeeded [by] his son Constantine the Fifth; who after his father’s example, kept images out of the temples. And ... he also assembled a Council of all the learned men and bishops of Asia and Greece” i.e., the *Council of Hieria* (also known as the *Council of Constantintople*) (754). “In this great assembly they sat in Council ..., and made concerning the use of images this decree: ‘It is not lawful for them that believe in God through Jesus Christ to have any images, neither of the Creator nor of any creatures, set up in temples to be worshipped; but rather that all images, by the law of God and for the avoiding of offence, ought to be taken out of churches.’ And this decree was executed in all places where any images were found in Asia or Greece. ... And ... Paul then Bishop of Rome [Pope: 757-767], ... assembled another Council in Italy for images, [and] condemned the Emperor and the Council of Constantintople [also known as the *Council of Hieria*] of heresy; and made a decree, that ‘holy images’ (for so they called them) of Christ, the blessed Virgin, and other Saints were indeed worthy [of] honour and worshipping. ... Note here, I pray you ..., that in the churches of Asia and Greece ... the ... Emperors, and all the learned men and bishops of the east[ern] Church, condemned ... images ... . Now on the contrary part note ye, that the Bishops of Rome, being ... usurpers of princes’ authority contrary to God’s Word, were the maintainers of images against God’s Word ... .”

The fact that Article 35 of the Anglican 39 Articles here very specifically equates icon idolatry with “the Bishops of Rome” because during the time the Eastern Church was part of the Roman Catholic Church between 607 and 1054, “the Bishops of Rome” defended iconolatriy against the anti-icon idolatry Byzantine Emperors of *The First Iconoclasm* (730-787), is also significant for the purposes of Article 22 of the 39 Articles. It means that iconolatriy or icon idolatry is specifically included in the meaning of the words, “The Romish doctrine concerning ... worshipping and adoration, as well of images ..., and also invocation of Saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded

upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God<sup>229</sup>.” This thus also forms a part of the teaching of Article 19 of the 39 Articles that those in “the” Greek Orthodox “Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred.”

With this background to the Greek Orthodox Church, formed in 1054, let us now further consider Hembd’s references to it. Hembd makes usage of a historically modern “Greek Orthodox Church” “official lectionary” which rightly includes I John 5:7 (*TBS Quarterly Record*, Jan.-March 2008, Part 2, p. 23). He also refers to this as “the Greek Patriarchal Text,” evidentially regarding it as authoritative not only at I John 5:7, but also Rev. 6:11 (Part 2, p. 39), and elsewhere (Part 2, p. 41), on the basis that, “we contend that the Greeks themselves, particularly their monks, are peerless in the knowledge of their own text” (Part 2, p. 42). Though I have great sympathy for this last statement, it requires a number of qualifications that Hembd does not make.

In the first place, the Byzantine text manuscripts we consult as authoritative should not be later than the 16th century. They are mainly, though not exclusively, from the Byzantine Greek East, for instance, the purple parchment, *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century), featured in these commentaries in St. Matthew’s and St. Mark’s Gospels, comes from Western Europe, specifically, from Rossano Cathedral in Italy. But most of the Byzantine texts are from the Eastern Greek Church, which was under the independent Patriarchate of Constantinople from the time of Constantine the Great in the 4th century till the Decree of Phocas in 607 A.D. establishing the Bishop of Rome as Pope and “universal bishop” over the Patriarchate of Constantinople; then under the Roman Catholic Pope from 607 A.D. to 1054 A.D.; and then from the time of the Great Schism in 1054, under the Greek Orthodox Church which was then formed under the Patriarch of Constantinople.

But the work of Divine preservation undertaken in the handwritten Greek text which is so important for establishing the representative Byzantine text, comes to an end over a period of about 150 years with events such as e.g., the fall of Constantinople in 1453, the invention of the printing press, and the publication of printed Greek New Testament texts from the 16th century on. There is clearly a transition period in and during the 16th century. From the 17th century on our reliance on handwritten texts is no longer applicable as an ongoing process. Thus the established Received Text being formally compiled in the 16th and 17th centuries, is discovered through earlier written Greek (or Latin) texts i.e., Byzantine Greek texts from the 16th century are at the tail end

---

<sup>229</sup> Also reflecting this nexus to Romanism, a chief proponent of icon idolatry and a chief opponent of *The First Iconoclasm* (730-787) was John of Damascus (d. before 754), also known as John Damascene or John Damascus. Significantly he is regarded as a “Saint” not only by the Eastern Orthodox Churches, but also by the Roman Catholic Church. The Papists sometimes call him, “The last of the Church Fathers,” (thus assigning a much later date to the Church Fathers Era than Protestant Anglicans would,) and in 1883, Pope Leo XIII (Pope 1878-1903), made him “a doctor” of the Roman Church (thereafter he was remembered on the Roman Calendar from 1890 to 1969 on 27 March; and since 1969 on 4 Dec.).

of the closed class of sources. Thus the 16th century being a transition period is an era of both the printed texts of Erasmus, Beza, *et al*, and handwritten Greek texts; so that from this time on we generally look to see the TR's compilation in printed texts, as in conjunction with the Protestant Reformation, from the 16th century on the NT Text came to be more formally compiled in toto and printed (rather than composed verse by verse on a less comprehensive local needs basis).

While there were bad monks, in both east and west there were also better monks. These better monks who worked on Greek (or in the West usually Latin) manuscripts, were deeply religious, single celibate men, with an interest in saints days of a liturgical year, and some of whom were also school teachers; so that in these respects, notwithstanding our differences, they bear a close resemblance and affinity with myself. (The fact that, like myself, they also enjoyed drinking wine, is another point of our commonality!) The monks performed an important work as copyists, but for we neo-Byzantines, that work came to a close in the 16th century; although some Greek Orthodox libraries, quite possibly in monasteries, like some Greek Orthodox Churches keeping older manuscripts, continued to serve an important function of preserving many of these older Greek documents (even as in the west Roman Catholic monasteries and libraries preserved important Latin documents). Indeed, to this day e.g., the greater number of Lectionaries dating from the 16th century or earlier are in the East, in e.g., Greek Orthodox Libraries in places such as Athens, Athos, Alexandria, and Mt. Sinai, or other Eastern Orthodox locations e.g., Russia.

In the second place, while we can still sight later Greek manuscripts, including the 1904 "the Greek Patriarchal Text" and Lectionary referred to by Hembd, it is only in the same way that we can sight the Latin Clementine Vulgate. (To cover this important second point will take me about the next 20 pages<sup>230</sup>.) Thus providing we can show from the earlier Latin textual tradition that a reading is found inside the closed class of sources, we can sight its manifestation in the Clementine. So likewise, providing we can show from the earlier Greek or Latin textual tradition that a reading is found inside the closed class of sources, then we can sight its manifestation in "the Greek Patriarchal Text." Thus e.g., we can certainly say that I John 5:7,8 is found in the modern Greek Orthodox *Apostolos* (Acts-Jude) *Lectionary* (Athens, 1st edition, Constantinople, 1901, or the later 1904 Athens edition, and subsequent editions, *infra*). I.e., we can say that this or that reading is *manifested in the later Clementine Vulgate*, or *manifested in this or that later Greek lectionary or Greek Orthodox text*. But that is not what Hembd is doing. He is treating Greek Orthodox texts from after the 15th and 16th centuries, indeed historically modern early 20th century Greek Orthodox texts, as though they were inside the closed class of sources.

The King James Version translators mainly used Stephanus's editions of 1550 and 1551 and Beza's edition of 1598. They thus produced their own Greek New Testament Text, which is the text I refer to as the Received Text. It would certainly be within the bounds of reasonable speculation, to conjecture that Stephanus, Beza, and some of the

---

<sup>230</sup> I.e., up till, "In the third place, Hembd's," *infra*.

KJV's NT translators owned in their private libraries some Greek Orthodox Lectionaries which they consulted in the process of composing the NT Text; although I know of no definitive proof for this speculation.

So when *exactly* does the transition period occur from Greek Orthodox written texts to the printed text? Is it with the Complutensian NT of 1514? Or Erasmus's five editions of 1516 to 1535 (if so, which one)? Or Aldus in 1518? Or Colinaeus in 1534? Or Stephanus's four editions of 1546 to 1551 (if so, which one)? Or Plantin in 1572? Or Beza's five editions of 1560 to 1598 (if so, which one)? At one end of the 16th century, it is clear that we should include e.g., Lectionary 994 from 1502 A.D. . But at the other end of the 16th century, should we include e.g., Lectionaries 1150 and 1447 from 1597 A.D., or Lectionary 1787 from 1599 A.D.?

Clearly there was a transition to the printed text which in broad terms we use as the Received Text at some point in the 16th century, though exactly when that transition was completed may be the subject of some disagreement. The *prima facie* possible range from 1514 to 1598/9 is thus in the order of *c.* 1556 A.D. (the year of Byzantine Lectionaries 607 & 1296) +/- 42 years. But we neo-Byzantines can live with such difficulties and possible diversity of viewpoint. Importantly, *however we resolve it with a date inside the 16th century will in no way affect what constitutes our starting point of the representative Byzantine Text, or what constitutes our finishing point of the NT Received Text.*

Certainly I admit that there is an area of some vagueness and possible disagreement as to exactly when in the 16th century one would make the cut off point for a Greek Orthodox text. E.g., should we include the Gospels and Acts of Minuscule 61 (16th century, Dublin, Byzantine in Matthew to Acts)? What about other 16th century Byzantine Minuscules, namely, 335, 445, 724, 755, 867, 957, 1019, 1030, 1065, 1068, 1088, 1239, 1362, 1370, 1374, 1618, 1749, 1768, 1861, 1883, 1911, 1930, 1931, 1936, 1937, 1979, 2009, 2218, 2378, 2422, 2496, 2501, 2532, 2572, 2573, 2579, 2635, 2636, 2690, 2711, 2721, 2779?

What of about two hundred 16th century Lectionaries? I.e., 14, 58, 90 (1533 A.D.), 93, 96, 99, 158, 161, 272, 315, 391, 419, 436 (1545 A.D.), 492, 500, 502, 505, 561, 569, 581, 607 (1556 A.D.), 619, 620 (1542 A.D.), 622, 642, 644 (1559 A.D.), 684, 685, 686, 687, 706, 707, 708, 711, 712, 717 (1559 A.D.), 719 (1586 A.D.), 736, 737, 738 (1524 A.D.), 739, 754 (1583 A.D.), 759 (1521 A.D.), 783 (1542 A.D.), 873 (1554 A.D.), 874, 886, 897 (1522 A.D.), 945 (15th / 16th century), 957, 990 (1565 A.D.), 994 (1502 A.D.), 1022 (1535 A.D.), 1034, 1036 (1596 A.D.), 1046 (1542 A.D.), 1051, 1052, 1054 (1595 A.D.), 1072, 1088, 1090 (1505 A.D.), 1144 (1503 A.D.), 1145, 1147 (1583 A.D.), 1148 (1562 A.D.), 1149 (1576 A.D.), 1150 (1597 A.D.), 1164 (1564 A.D.), 1165, 1171, 1174, 1175, 1195, 1196, 1199 (1547 A.D.), 1202 (1577 A.D.), 1203, 1210 (1588 A.D.), 1212 (1562 A.D.), 1253, 1254, 1255, 1278, 1282 (1510 A.D.), 1283 (1551), 1284, 1289 (1544), 1296 (1556 A.D.), 1305, 1331, 1338, 1363, 1387, 1445, 1459, 1473, 1477 (1597 A.D.), 1503, 1512, 1513, 1515 (1588 A.D.), 1517 (1572 A.D.), 1519, 1524 (1522 A.D.), 1558, 1559, 1580, 1595 (1563 A.D.), 1638, 1640, 1641 (1548 A.D.), 1676, 1682, 1689

(1529 A.D.), 1704 (1549 A.D.), 1707 (1511 A.D.), 1709, 1710, 1712 (1558 A.D.), 1713, 1725, 1728, 1740, 1760, 1766, 1767 (1545 A.D.), 1769 (1545 A.D.), 1786 (1551 A.D.), 1787 (1599 A.D.), 1791, 1795, 1797, 1799, 1810 (1543 A.D.), 1814 (1538 A.D.), 1818, 1823 (1563 A.D.), 1909, 1915, 1925, 1931 (1519 A.D.), 1933 (1552 A.D.), 1937, 1968 (1544 A.D.), 2003, 2015 (1583 A.D.), 2027 (1542 A.D.), 2032 (1543 A.D.), 2039, 2042, 2043, 2057 (1537 A.D.), 2059, 2062, 2063 (1588 A.D.), 2066, 2067, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2087, 2152, 2154 (15th / 16th century), 2155 (15th / 16th century), 2162 (1511 A.D.), 2166, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172 (1531 A.D.), 2177 (1567 A.D.), 2188 (1531 A.D.), 2192, 2197 (1515), 2273, 2282, 2298, 2299, 2301, 2396 (13th & 16th centuries), 2399, and 2403.

The matter is admittedly one of fine tuning in line-drawing. Having now given the matter matured consideration, I consider they should be included on the basis that the 16th century was still part of a transition period between the hand-written and printed text. But after allowing just over a year's grace for Beza's final edition of 1598 to start circulating i.e., to 1599, the period should then firmly end at this point. Any cut-off point will unavoidably have some "close shaves" and "near misses," so that here Lectionary 1787 of 1599 A.D. is included, whereas Lectionary 1325 of 1600 A.D. is excluded. *C'est la vie!*<sup>231</sup>

Thus e.g., I would not use as inside the closed class of sources, 17th and later century Byzantine text type Minuscules, namely, 289, 868, 956, 963, 988, 1044, 1063, 1101, 1104, 1301, 1748, 1869, 2267, 2450, 2597, 2581, 2619, or 2656. Nor likewise about seventy-five Byzantine text type lectionaries from the 17th or later centuries, such as the 17th century Lectionaries 55 (1602 A.D.), 271, 462, 487, 501 (1641 A.D.), 504, 571, 577, 621, 626, 643 (1655 A.D.), 645, 646, 647, 648, 681 (1642 A.D.), 718 (1654 A.D.), 721, 742, 843, 898, 908 (1697 A.D.), 925, 993, 1008 (1628 A.D.), 1011 (1634 A.D.), 1026 (1647 A.D.), 1027 (1610 A.D.), 1028 (1633 A.D.), 1037 (1642 A.D.), 1047 (1620 A.D.), 1061, 1166 (1620 A.D.), 1167 (1653 A.D.), 1168 (1624 A.D.), 1169 (1654 A.D.), 1170, 1181 (1654 A.D.), 1213, 1263, 1325 (1600 A.D.), 1330 (1601 A.D.), 1362, 1464, 1465, 1480, 1486, 1507, 1509, 1511, 1514, 1518, 1542, 1550 (1618 A.D.), 1619, 1620, 1691, 1720 (1699 A.D.), 1721 (1688 A.D.), 1768, 1775 (1616 A.D.), 1789 (1690 A.D.), 1793, 1802 (1602 A.D.), 1819, 1921, 2004 (1644 A.D.), 2058 (1619 A.D.), 2134, 2138 (1627 A.D.), 2146, 2180, 2272 (1672 A.D.), and 2274. Nor about a dozen 18th century Lectionaries such as 423 (1732 A.D.), 506, 508, 713, 733, 992 (1762 A.D.), 1361, 1463 (1706 A.D.), 1466, 1796 (1743 A.D.), 2381 (18th century?)<sup>232</sup>.

---

<sup>231</sup> French, "That's life."

<sup>232</sup> The broad dates of a small number of manuscripts are disputed. E.g., is Lectionary 2382 16th century? Moreover, some may be composite from different times e.g., Lectionary 1475 is dated at 1548 and 1612. (Aland, K., *et unum, The Text of the NT*, translated by E.F. Rhodes, 2nd ed., Eerdmans, Michigan, USA, 1989, pp. 129-142; Aland's *Kurzgefasste, op. cit.*, pp. 219-370.)

Does this mean that such 17th and 18th century Greek Orthodox Lectionaries are valueless? Absolutely not! Providing that their reading can be shown to exist in the Greek or Latin textual traditions in manuscripts from or before the 16th century, then like other later Greek Orthodox lectionaries from even later centuries, indeed, up to our own day, they may still be looked at and cited as *manifesting* this or that reading. Nevertheless, they are outside the closed class of sources used for determining the NT Greek text. Thus e.g., the Lectionary count of Aland (d. 1994) has about 2,400 Lectionaries (2,403), but whereas I would include about 200 Lectionaries of the 16th century, and exclude about 100 Lectionaries from later centuries; it follows that of the 2,403 numbered lectionaries I would accept that about 2,300 of them are inside the closed class of sources.

It should be remembered that before the sword of Islam encroached with the advance of Mohammedanism into Asia Minor, culminating in the tragic Fall of Constantinople and end of the Greek speaking Byzantine Empire in 1453, Asia Minor (modern Turkey) and Constantinople (Istanbul) were, like modern day Greece, part of the Greek speaking and culturally Greek, Byzantine Empire. Thus from the time of the Great Schism in 1054, they were specifically Greek Orthodox, as opposed to some other Eastern Orthodox Church e.g., Serbian Orthodox or Russian Orthodox. Hence the Byzantine Text is the Greek text.

There was never an “Asia Minor Orthodox Church.” It was the Greek Orthodox Church in Asia Minor and modern day Greece from 1054; before that the Greek speaking Roman Catholic Church in Greece and Asia Minor from 607 to 1054; before that the Greek speaking independent Patriarchate of Constantinople from the time of Constantine the Great to 607; and before that, a group of independent Greek speaking and culturally Greek churches under bishops or oversees whose jurisdiction would be just their local area. Thus the Greek Orthodox Church in modern day Greece does not have a Patriarch in Greece, (their highest church official in Greece is the Archbishop of Athens,) rather their Patriarch is the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople (Istanbul). By contrast, in e.g., the Russian Orthodox Church their Patriarch is the Patriarch of Moscow. Thus the fall of Constantinople in 1453 constituted the fall of the Byzantine Empire, after whom the Byzantine Text is named.

Hence I would see a transition period from handwritten Greek Orthodox texts to printed texts lasting about 150 years. It starts around the time of the fall of the capital of the Byzantine Empire, Constantinople, to Mohammedan Turks in 1453, and the great disruption that brought to both Eastern and Western Christendom in general, and Eastern Christendom in particular. In approximate terms, this sad event in the East correlated with a glad event in the West, namely, the invention of the printing press in the mid 15th century. John Gutenberg (d. 1468) from Strassburg (German form, now Strasbourg, France), refined his invention of the 1430s in subsequent decades, improving it. In time, its value was appreciated and by the grace of God a great advance for mankind was thus made.

Thus this transition from Byzantine handwritten texts to neo-Byzantine printed texts, occurred slowly and steadily over a period of about 150 years. It largely culminated with the neo-Byzantine Beza's final edition in 1598, and allowing about a year's grace for it to circulate, by 1599 the process was complete. Hence the closed class of sources ends with 16th century Greek Orthodox texts. Those from the 17th century on may be consulted, and if they follow earlier readings, they may be said to *manifest* the Byzantine majority Text or *manifest* a minority Byzantine reading. But they are outside the closed class of sources and may not be used to discover and determine the NT text of Scripture.

Now if, as I suggest, we accept all 16th century Greek Orthodox texts, closing the class in 1599 with just over one year of grace following Beza's final edition in 1598, the reality is that Hembd's Greek Orthodox texts which he treats as usable for determining the Received Text are clearly well after the 16th century. *They are well and truly too late in time for such usage!* If on the one hand, Hembd or anyone else wants to cite modern Greek Orthodox texts such as the 20th century Greek Orthodox Lectionary which includes I John 5:7,8, *supra*, as *manifesting* the correct reading, then I have no quarrel with them. Indeed, I think that suchlike is quite valid. But if on the other hand, Hembd or anyone else wants to start citing such a Greek Orthodox lectionary as authoritative for determining the New Testament Greek text, then we neo-Byzantines of the Received Text must part company with them on this issue. The Received Text essentially reached its final form with Beza's edition of 1598, and while some fine-tuning of it then occurred in the 17th century, such work is traceable to readings in texts found in the 16th century and earlier. The matter of formally composing the Received Text is a *fait accompli*<sup>233</sup>. The texts used for discovering or defending the Received Text are in a closed class of sources which date from before that time. We neo-Byzantines cannot, and do not accept, the claims of Hembd to the contrary.

Thus with respect to Hembd's usage of a historically modern "Greek Orthodox Church" "official lectionary" which rightly includes I John 5:7, *supra*, I would say that most of e.g., the 1904 lectionary is usable as *manifesting* earlier Byzantine readings, but one must still isolate those readings rather than this early 20th century lectionary. Thus far from agreeing with Hembd that a 1904 Greek Orthodox Lectionary can be used for the Received Text reading of I John 5:7,8, or any other reading, on the basis that, "the Greeks ... , particularly their monks, are peerless in the knowledge of their own text" (*TBS Quarterly Record*, Jan.-March 2008, Part 2, p. 42, *supra*); I would say the matter is now *entirely out of the hands of Greek Orthodox scribes, and has been for over 400 years i.e., since 1600 A.D.* .

The 1904 Lectionary was compiled by Professor Antoniadis (Antoniadis) and published with the approval of the Greek Orthodox Church (Apostoliki Diakonia, Athens, Greece, 1904). It was generally based on *c.* 60 lectionaries from the 9th to 16th centuries *i.e.*, lectionaries inside the closed class of sources, although Metzger notes that sometimes

---

<sup>233</sup> French, meaning "an accomplished fact."

Antoniades preferred a non-Byzantine Text reading (e.g., Matt. 12:25-27,40; 13:13,36, 17:22, 21:38). Moreover, Antoniades says that he included I John 5:7,8 *not* on the basis of the manuscript support, but because he was so directed to do so by his Eastern Orthodox Synod<sup>234</sup>. Hence while in the Greek Orthodox Lectionary these words appear in the same normal print as the rest of the passage they quote (I John 4:20-5:21)<sup>235</sup>; by contrast, in the Patriarchal Text of 1904 printed as a New Testament Greek text, these key words of I John 5:7,8 are placed in italics, indicating some *unwarranted* doubt as to their authenticity<sup>236</sup>. Thus Hembd *et al* have no basis for claiming that the inclusion of I John 5:7 in e.g., the 1904 Greek Orthodox Lectionary was the result of otherwise uncounted readings in lectionaries used by Antoniadis. Nor in other Lectionaries that have been looked at (see UBS Lectionaries on I John 5:7,8, *infra*). In saying this, I remain open to the possibility that a careful scrutiny of Greek Lectionaries at some point in the future *might* produce some relatively small number that do contain I John 5:7,8; although I am also open to the possibility that they may not. *This is presently an open question.*

---

<sup>234</sup> Metzger, B.M., “Greek Lectionaries and a Critical Edition of the Greek New Testament,” in Aland, K., *Die Alten Uebersetzungen Des Neuen Testament, Die Kirchenvaterzitate und Lektionare*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, Germany, & New York, USA, 1972, at p. 486.

<sup>235</sup> *Apostolos*, Oikos mix. Sagiberoy A.E., Etadioy 14 Athenai [undated, c. 1962] (Copy held at St. Andrew’s Greek Orthodox Theological Library, Sydney. Handwriting on p. 349 shows it was originally a gift given in January 1963, hence the approximate date of this publication from Athens in Greece, is c. 1962). The reading appears at pp. 228-9, “*THi* (For the) *TRITHi* (Thursday) *THΣ* ([in] the) *AE*’. (35<sup>th</sup>) ΕΒΔΟΜΑΔΟΣ (week).” Also in a current print *Apostolos*, Published by Apostoliki Diakonia, 1st ed. 1979, 5th ed. 2007, Athens, Greece, pp. 275-277 (Email: apostoliki-diakonia@ath.forthnet.gr or website: <http://www.apostoliki-diakonia.gr> ISBN 978-960-315-294-1).

<sup>236</sup> *H* (The) *KAINH* (New) *DIAΘHKH* (Testament) ... *anatuposis* (reprint) *tes* (-) *ekdoseos* (edition) *tou* (of) 1904,” Published by A.E. Stamoulis (Greek “*Stamoule*”), Athens, Greece, 2004 (Email: [info@stamoulis.gr](mailto:info@stamoulis.gr) or website: <http://www.stamoulis.gr>), p. 567. More commonly known in English as “The Patriarchal Text,” or “Antoniades’ *Greek Patriarchal Text*,” this is a centenary edition (1904-2004) “*egkrisei* (endorsed by) *tes* (the) *Megales* (Great) *tou* (of) *Xristou* (Christ) *Ekklesias* (Church)” i.e., “The Great Church of Christ,” a name used historically in the Greek Orthodox Church *only* for the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Constantinople. It also bears the insignia of office or official stamp, of the “*Oikoumenikon* (Ecumenical) *Patriarcheion* (Patriarchate),” containing the title of “*PTRX KPC* (in overlapping letter symbols = *Patriarches Konstaninoupoleos* = the Patriarchate of Constantinople),” and bearing the name of “*BARTHLMC* (in overlapping letter symbols = Bartholomaios = Bartholomew),” the Patriarch of Constantinople since 1991.

Indeed, this leads me to make *one important qualification to the fact that a count of the Greek Lectionaries would not fundamentally change the representative Byzantine text*. Specifically, I am open to the possibility that if a careful study of the Lectionaries was undertaken, then some readings may be increased in number as minority Byzantine readings, or come into existence as minority variants not previously documented in the Byzantine textual tradition. To some extent, I can already demonstrate this through reference to Metzger's Lectionary work on Luke 6:1-10; 8:41-56, *infra*. Here I note that of 15 main Lectionary readings itemized by Metzger, 5 of them or 1/3rd of readings (readings 2,5,9,12,15, *infra*), are known minority Byzantine text readings. Or my original work on the two Sydney University Lectionaries also yields this result. E.g., at Matt. 18:11 Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D., Sydney University) follows a minority Byzantine reading (*Variant 1*), and at Matt. 18:15a Lectionary 2378 (11th century) likewise follows a minority Byzantine reading (*Variant 2*). Or at Matt. 18:15b, both follow the same otherwise poorly attested to minority Byzantine reading.

And as I will discuss in my revised Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) (scheduled for Dedication on 30 Jan. 2010), which is primarily being produced in order for me include reference to these two Greek Lectionaries and the Latin of St. Gregory, at Matt. 1:11 we find a new variant originating in the 11th century, which is really a copyist's error, i.e., an omission due to ellipsis in Lectionary 2378; or, in fairness to Moorman's claims, I note that e.g., at Matt. 4:18 the TR's reading, "Jesus," which is otherwise poorly attested to as a minority Byzantine reading, is found in both Sydney University Lectionaries. But in what might be deemed, "A horrifying development!," by Moorman and the USA based Dean Burgon Society, at Matt. 6:4a Lectionary 1968 provides us with our first known instance of a variant as a minority Byzantine reading, (omitting "*autos*" / "himself"), in what had been a previously a known variant in Latin manuscripts (and both Greek and Latin ancient writers). This data from Matt. 6:4a is thus going in the very opposite direction of e.g., Moorman's predictions i.e., Lectionary 1968 is here going against the Received Text in a new way that no other Byzantine Texts were known to do! So too at Matt. 10:19, we find that both Lectionaries 2378 and 1968 adopt a minority Byzantine reading, "*paradosousin* ('they shall deliver up,' future tense)," over the Received Text's and majority Byzantine text's reading, "*paradidosin* ('they deliver up,' present tense). Nevertheless, these types of things i.e., support for non-TR minority Byzantine readings; or a new minority Byzantine reading that is contrary to the TR e.g., Lectionary 767 (12th-14th century, Alexandria, Egypt) adds "*autou* (of him)" to "*doulos* (servant)" at Matt. 18:26 i.e., "His servant therefore fell down" etc.<sup>237</sup>; are still exceptions to the general rule that the Lectionaries follow the representative Byzantine text, but not the Received Text where the two differ.

---

<sup>237</sup> Geerlings, J., *Family E & its Allies in Mark*, Appendix A: Studies of Lectionary 767; & Appendix B: Codex 2633 (Spyridon Loverdou 4 Library, Kephissia, Athens, Greece), p. 77, in *Studies & Documents* (No. XXXI) edited by Jacob Geerlings, Utah University Press, Salt Lake City, Utah, USA, 1968. (A copy of Geerlings work is held at Newcastle University, New South Wales, Australia.)

Thus in fairness to e.g., Moorman, while he radically overstates the fairly limited increased support for the TR where it differs from the majority Byzantine text in these Lectionaries (an idea which he postulates for ideological “democratic” reasons as an unsubstantiated theory against the general evidence), there is nevertheless some *prima facie* evidence to indicate some truth in the idea that *some* such TR readings will benefit in manuscript strength, (e.g., Matt. 4:18, *supra*,) I DO NOT SAY THEY WILL BECOME MAJORITY BYZANTINE TEXT READINGS, if more work on the Lectionaries is done. Thus if 2300 Lectionaries were to be counted, and of course, a number of these would only have either the Evangelion (Gospels) or the Apostolos (Acts to Jude), or some selection thereof, *and this trend were to prove representative*, then the effect would be to substantially increase the numbers and strength of these minority Byzantine readings.

There is also some other *prima facie* evidence, which while not proving this to be the case, nevertheless is sufficient to at least raise it as a possibility worthy of further investigation. In this commentary at Matt. 20:21, I support the TR’s reading, “*eis* (the one) *ek* (on) *dexion* (the right hand) *sou* (of thee), *kai* (and) *eis* (one) *ex* (on) *euonumon* (the left),” i.e., “the one on thy right hand, and the other on the left” (TR & AV); and the TR’s reading at Matt. 20:22b the “*kai* (and),” i.e., “*and* to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?” Interestingly, these minority Byzantine readings, which do not, like the majority Byzantine readings, have “*sou* (of thee)” after “*euonumon* (the left)” at Matt. 20:21, or have “*e* (or)” rather than “*kai* (and)” at Matt. 20:22b, are both found in the current Greek Orthodox Gospel Lectionary (*Evangelion*) derived from Antoniades work, *supra*<sup>238</sup>.

Does this mean that these readings were found in a number of the *c.* 60 lectionaries used by Antoniades from the 9th to 16th centuries? The matter would need to be proven before one could be sure one way or the other. Importantly, there is “a fly in the ointment,” namely, that in his Patriarchal Text of the New Testament (1904), Antoniades follows the majority Byzantine text at Matt. 20:21 i.e., he adds *sou* (of thee)” after “*euonumon* (the left);” and he also reads “*e* (or)” at Matt. 20:22b. We know that Antoniades used some non-Lectionary sources, and so we cannot say for certain that a given reading in the contemporary Greek Lectionary coming from his work necessarily manifests a Lectionary reading inside the closed class of sources, although *generally* it will. Therefore, exactly what one is to make of this diversity of readings between Antoniades’ Greek Lectionary and Antoniades’ Patriarchal Text at Matt. 20:21 and Matt. 20:22b remains unclear, although both readings were clearly known to him, and both used in the Patriarchal Text New Testament (majority Byzantine readings of Matt. 20:21; 20:22b), and the the Gospel Lectionary (minority Byzantine readings and *Textus Receptus* readings of Matt. 20:21; 20:22b).

---

<sup>238</sup> *Evangelion*, Apostoliki Diakonia (commonly used name for official publisher of Greek Orthodox works, or “Apostolic Diaconate,” literally, “ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΙΚΗΣ ΔΙΑΚΟΝΙΑΣ”) Athens, Greece, 1st edition, 1973, 5th edition, 2005, pp. 143-4 (Matt. 20:17-28).

Of course, if further study on the Lectionaries should prove that the strength of the TR's reading as a minority Byzantine reading is improved substantially at Matt. 20:21 and Matt. 20:22b, and this should prove to be a trend with some other minority Byzantine TR readings, then this in turn would help to raise "a kite" I sometimes "fly"<sup>239</sup>." Specifically, the speculatively issue of to what extent, if any, the neo-Byzantines of the 16th and 17th centuries, may have used a *relatively small number* of Greek Lectionaries that they held in their private libraries? In this context, with respect to the two Sydney University Lectionaries being featured in these commentaries, let the reader consider e.g., the variants in Appendix 1 found in various neo-Byzantine texts followed by Scrivener at Matt. 17:14b (Lectionary 2378), Matt. 17:27b (Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), Matt. 20:5b (Lectionary 2378), and John 21:3 (Lectionary 1968). *Perhaps the only thing we can presently say for certain then, is that more research work needs to be done on the c. 2300 Lectionaries!*

In the March 2009 USA flight I took from New York to San Francisco, *supra*, the fifth state I flew over was Illinois, and the United Airlines flight map showed the plane route going over the Illinois capital of Chicago; and the ninth state I flew over was Utah. Notably, some important work on Lectionaries has been undertaken in the USA at both Chicago University in Illinois and Utah University<sup>240</sup>.

The Lectionaries<sup>241</sup> contain selected readings from the Gospels and Apostolos. The "Apostolos" (or "Apostoloi," or "Praxapostolos") refers to Acts to Jude i.e., readings from the Book of Revelation are excluded from the Lectionaries. (Unlike in the Western tradition where a Lectionary generally contains all readings; in the Eastern tradition, in the general tradition there are two Lectionaries, the *Evangelion / Gospels*<sup>242</sup> and the

---

<sup>239</sup> For the meaning of the terminology, "flying a kite," see Commentary at Matt. 11:8, "The Third Matter: Flying a Kite."

<sup>240</sup> The following useful works are available at Moore Theological College Library. From Chicago University: *Studies in the Lectionary Text of the Greek NT*, Chicago Univ. Press, Illinois, USA, Vol. 1 (Ernest Coleman & Donald Riddle's *Prolegomena to the Study of the Lectionary Text of the Gospels*, 1933), Vol. 2, No. 3 (Bruce Metzger's *The Saturday & Sunday Lessons from Luke in the Greek Gospel Lectionary*, 1944), Vol. 2, No. 4 (Harry Merwyn's *The Johannine Lessons in the Greek Gospel Lectionary*, 1958), Vol. 2, No. 5 (*The Weekday Lessons from Luke in the Greek Gospel Lectionary*, 1959); & From Utah University: Ronald Cocroft's *A Study of the Pauline Lessons in the Matthean Sections of the Greek Lectionary*, in: *Studies & Documents* edited by Jacob Geerlings, Utah University Press, Salt Lake City, Utah, USA, 1968 (see Geerlings other Utah University work, *infra*).

<sup>241</sup> See Aland, K., *et unum, The Text of the NT* (1989), *op. cit.*, pp. 163-170 and Metzger, B.M., "Greek Lectionaries and a Critical Edition of the Greek New Testament," *op. cit.*, at pp. 479-497.

<sup>242</sup> The modern *Evangelion* is usually very ornate, placed inside a Greek Orthodox Church, and connected with certain unBiblical Greek Orthodox practices. But

*Apostolos / Acts- Jude*, although in a smaller number of instances, there are Lectionaries that combine the *Evangelion* and *Apostolos*. Certainly this occurs in Saturday & Sunday Lectionaries such as Lectionary 1968.) Studies of the Greek Lectionaries by Ernest Colwell in 1932 found that, “Whether a small number of lectionaries are compared in a large number of lections or a large number of lectionaries are compared in a small number of lection[arie]s, the result is the same: they agree with one another . . . . Such agreement justifies speaking of the text of lectionaries as ‘the lectionary text’<sup>243</sup>.”

In James Branton’s study, *The Common Text of the Gospel Lectionary in the Lenton Lections* (1934), Branton found from 27 manuscripts, that “the manuscripts were in all but perfect agreement in reading 30 variants from Stephanus. More than 50% of the manuscripts were in agreement in four other readings.” When Branton analyzed the lectionary variants, he found that 25 of the 34 variants were in von Soden Kr subgroup<sup>244</sup>. (As discussed at Matt. 20:15c, von Soden’s Kr group contains 211 manuscripts, of which c. 209 or 99% are Byzantine, with c. 189 or c. 89.5% being completely Byzantine, c. 20 or c. 9.5% being Byzantine only in parts, and 2 or c. 1% being outside the closed class of sources.)

On the one hand, further analysis of variants from certain sections of the Lectionaries by Redus (1936) and Buck (1958), have found that while they generally conform to von Soden’s K (Koine) group (c. 93% of manuscripts in von Soden’s wider K group are completely Byzantine, and a further c. 3.5% are Byzantine only in specific parts, i.e., c. 96.5 % of von Soden’s wider K group are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, *infra*), the variants tend to be the same as those found in the “Caesarean” text type<sup>245</sup>. But on the other hand, Harms (1966) found that notwithstanding the fact

---

one can still procure a normal book bound copy e.g., *EYAITTEAION* (Evangelion), Published by Apostoliki Diakonia, 1st ed. 1973, 5th ed. 2005, Athens, Greece (Email: apostoliki-diakonia@ath.forthnet.gr or website: <http://www.apostoliki-diakonia.gr>), ISBN 960-315-204-8. (The *Evangelion / Gospel* is read by the Greek Orthodox priest; and *The Apostolos / Acts- Jude* is read by a lectionary reader.)

<sup>243</sup> Colwell, *H TH R 25* (1932), pp. 73-84, quoted in Metzger’s “Greek Lectionaries . . .,” *op. cit.*, p. 487.

<sup>244</sup> Branton’s monograph, Vol. 11, no. 1, of the Chicago series, pp. 2, 26; quoted and referred to in Metzger’s “Greek Lectionaries . . .,” *op. cit.*, pp. 487-8.

<sup>245</sup> Morgan W. Redus’ *The Text of the Major Festivals of the Menologian in the Greek Gospel Lectionary*, monograph vol 2, no. 2, Chicago series & Harry M. Buck’s *The Johannine Lessons in the Greek Gospel Lectionary*, vol. 2, no. 4 in the Chicago series, both quoted and referred to in Metzger’s “Greek Lectionaries . . .,” *op. cit.*, pp. 488-9. The issue of whether or not there is a “Caesarean” text type is disputed. Compare e.g., Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1971, pp. xxviii-xxxi (pro-Caesarean Text view); with Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 2nd ed., 1994, pp. 14\*-16\* (anti-Caesarean Text view).

that the text-type of the Matthean weekday readings “may be described” as Byzantine, “characterized by an increment of early” so called “Caesarean,” nevertheless, “the lectionary majority readings exhibit more homogeneity than those of the [four] text-types with which comparison was made. While minority readings are not so consistently attested, they also indicate a common textual pattern, i.e., basic agreement with the *Textus Receptus*<sup>246</sup>.”

Given that the Byzantine textual tradition includes, in addition to the representative Byzantine text, a series of minority Byzantine readings, means that the Lectionaries can be accepted as Byzantine Text, *per se*. Thus while Metzger claims, “the Greek lectionary text presents a Byzantine type of text, but there are also present noticeable traces of ... the Caesarean type of text, as well as certain Alexandrian and Western readings,” I would say rather, that as elsewhere, *some* minority Byzantine readings are also found in *some* manuscripts outside the closed class of sources i.e., this diversity in the Lectionaries is best described as that of minority Byzantine readings. It should also be remembered that what is here being called by Metzger “Caesarean<sup>247</sup>,” readings in the Lectionaries, may in fact be readings introduced directly from ancient church writers, especially Origen, Eusebius, and Cyril of Jerusalem, all three of whom are historically connected to the theory of a Caesarean text type, rather than from a specifically “Caesarean” text type, the very existence of which is itself a matter of dispute. Notably then, Metzger also says, “The evidence of Greek lectionaries may be presented most clearly in the apparatus of the Greek New Testament by representing the reading of the majority text,” although where relevant then separately citing any variant minority Byzantine “readings” they contain<sup>248</sup>.

Referring to Metzger’s work, Aland Says, “Metzger concedes that ‘basically, the Greek lectionary text presents a Byzantine type of text.’ Actually, the text we find in the Greek lectionaries is almost identical with the Byzantine Imperial text. The results of lectionary research in America ... were far less conclusive than was imagined because the collations were made against the *Textus Receptus* (Oxford 1873 edition). *When variants from this base were found in the lectionaries they were thought to be traces of an earlier text, whereas only too frequently they merely represented deviations of the printed Textus Receptus from the Byzantine Imperial Text.* Although the *Textus Receptus* shows a notable textual consistency, it does occasionally divide into two separate traditions ... with all the possibilities of variation this implies<sup>249</sup>.” *Though Aland’s terminology is*

---

<sup>246</sup> Harns. Vol. 2, no 6 of the Chicago series, p. 41, quoted and referred to in Metzger’s “Greek Lectionaries ...,” *op. cit.*, pp. 490.

<sup>247</sup> Metzger, B., *The Saturday & Sunday Lessons from Luke in the Greek Gospel Lectionary*, 1944, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

<sup>248</sup> Metzger’s “Greek Lectionaries ...,” *op. cit.*, pp. 495-6.

<sup>249</sup> Aland, K., *et unum, The Text of the NT* (1989), *op. cit.*, pp. 168-9 (emphasis mine), quoting Metzger’s “Greek Lectionaries ...,” *op. cit.*, p. 495.

*different to mine, there is a semantic difference rather than a difference of basic finding. Aland has thus reached the same basic conclusion as myself i.e., the Lectionaries follow the representative Byzantine text, and any variants they contain are found to be part of the wider set of variants inside the closed class of sources.*

Let us look at a specific example of what it meant on this issue of what Aland and Metzger call “Caesarean” readings and I would call “minority Byzantine readings,” through reference to Metzger’s work, *The Saturday & Sunday Lessons from Luke in the Greek Gospel Lectionary* (1944)<sup>250</sup>. Notwithstanding my associated criticisms of Metzger’s Lectionary work, *infra*, he is to be commended for seeking to raise some greater academic interest in the Greek Lectionaries. Metzger relates the origins of *The Saturday & Sunday Lectionary* tradition to an Eastern Church practice connected with public religious observances on both Saturday and Sunday<sup>251</sup>. In this context, I would note that even as the Jewish Sabbath (Saturday) had a preceding “Jew’s Preparation Day” (Friday, John 19:42; cf. Exod. 16:5,22-26; Matt. 27:62; Mark 15:42; Luke 23:54), so likewise the Christian Sabbath (Sunday) has a preceding Christian’s Preparation Day (Saturday); and this may be the best explanation for the later liturgical significance of Saturday in the East, reflected in the Eastern Church’s *Saturday & Sunday Lectionary* tradition.

In Tables 8 (Luke 6:1-10) & 9 (Luke 8:41-56) of Metzger’s work, he lists “Agreements between lectionaries and Caesarean witnesses when both differ from the Textus Receptus.” He lists 15 main Lectionary variants first in Luke 6:1-10; 8:41-56, i.e., supported by a larger number of Lectionaries, and then 14 minor Lectionary variants in Luke 6:1-10; 8:41-56, i.e., supported by a smaller number of Lectionaries. Let us first consider his 15 main Lectionary variants in greater detail, and then in much less detail consider his 14 minor Lectionary variants.

Metzger considers 9 main Lectionary readings from 13 Lectionaries for Luke 6:1-10 (Lecture for the Fourth Sunday)<sup>252</sup>; and 6 main Lectionary readings from 11

---

<sup>250</sup> Metzger, B., *The Saturday & Sunday Lessons from Luke in the Greek Gospel Lectionary* 1944, *op. cit.*, pp. 38,39.

<sup>251</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.

<sup>252</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7. Lectionaries 1231 (10th century, Princeton, New Jersey), 32 (11th century, Gotha Ducalis), 374 (1070 A.D., Paris Bibliothéque Nationale), 1627 (11th century, Maywood Theological Seminary), “C947” (11th / 12th century, not then assigned a Gregory number, manuscript 947 Chicago University Library), 80 (12th century, Paris Bibliothéque Nationale), 303 (12th century, Princeton, New Jersey), 1564 (12th century, Chicago Theological Seminary), 1634 (12th century, New York Pierpont Morgan Library), 12 (13th century, Paris Bibliothéque Nationale), 333 (13th century, London British Library), 1642 (13th century, Chicago University Library), & 1663 (14th century, Chicago University Library). Sometimes supplemented by one other varying Lectionary which I shall not refer to keep the count at 13 possible Lectionaries for them all.

Lectionaries Luke 8:41-56 (Lecture for the Seventh Sunday)<sup>253</sup> i.e., a total of 15 main Lectionary readings where he finds “Agreements between the lectionaries and Caesarean witnesses when both differ from the Textus Receptus.” For the main 15 readings I shall also include reference to Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, Sydney University) and 1968 (1544 A.D., Sydney University) when referring to the Byzantine Text, but not include them in the count so as to keep to the Lectionaries Metzger used<sup>254</sup>.

1) At Luke 6:1, all 13 (of the Luke 6:1-10) Lectionaries read, “*eporeueto* (from *poreuomai*, ‘he went’) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus) *tois* (on the) *sabbasin* (sabbath) *dia* (through).” It is also found (in both instances abbreviating “*Iesous*” / “*ἰησοῦς*” to “*ic*” with a bar on top) in Sydney University Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, variant spelling using “*o*” rather than “*o*” at end of “*eporeueto*”) and 1968 (1544 A.D.) By contrast, the TR & Majority Byzantine Text read, “*Egeneto de* (And it came to pass) *en* (on) *sabbato* (the sabbath) *deuteropoto* (‘second-first’ = ‘second after the first’), *diapereusesthai* (= *dia* + *poreuomai*, ‘to go through’ = ‘went through’) *auton* (he)” i.e., “And it came to pass on the second sabbath after the first, that he went through” (AV). This Lectionary reading is found in no non-Lectionary texts, and so while it is absent in other Byzantine texts, it is also absent in all “pre-Caesarean” texts and “Caesarean Proper” Texts as well i.e., it is exclusively a Lectionary reading.

That the Lectionary may slightly change a reading at the beginning is within normative parameters. E.g., Sydney University Lectionaries 2378 and 1968 will sometimes start a Gospel reading with, “*Eipen* (he said) *o* (the) *Kurios* (Lord)” i.e., “The Lord said,” etc., (John 5:24 & John 5:30)<sup>255</sup>, or “*Tō* (-) *kairō* (time) *ekeino* (that),” i.e., “At that time,” etc. (John 9:1 & John 11:47)<sup>256</sup>. Thus it is normative to allow some level of variation as introductory lectionary style, e.g., here “*o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)” and associated removal of “*auton* (he).” The removal of “*deuteropoto* (second after the first),” is a known variant inside the closed class of sources from the Latin (old Latin b, q, l, & c). But it must be said that the combination of these, with the splitting of *diapereusesthai* into its constituent parts, does in fact as a package deal create a variant.

---

<sup>253</sup> Lectionaries 1599 (10th / 11th century, Chicago University Library), 32, 374, 1627, “C947,” 303, 1634, 12, 333, 1642, & 1663. Sometimes supplemented by one other varying Lectionary which I shall not refer to keep the count at 11 possible Lectionaries for them all.

<sup>254</sup> Luke 6:1-10 is found in Lectionary 2378 at pp. 42b-43a, and in Lectionary 1968 at pp. 82a-82b. Luke 8:41-56 is found in Lectionary 2378 at pp. 46a-46b, and in Lectionary 1968 at pp. 91a-91b.

<sup>255</sup> Lectionary 2378, p. 7a (John 5:24-30), pp. 7a-8a (John 5:30-6:2); & Lectionary 1968, pp. 334a-334b (John 5:24-30).

<sup>256</sup> Lectionary 2378, pp. 17a-18a (John 9:1-38), pp. 18b-19a (John 11:47-54); & Lectionary 1968, pp. 23b-26a (John 9:1-38).

2) Luke 6:4, “*elabe* (‘he took,’ = ‘did take,’ AV) *kai* (and)” is both the Received Text & Majority Byzantine Text (e.g., Sydney University Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). It is omitted in Metzger’s 13 Lectionaries, but it is also omitted in Byzantine Codices K 017 (9th century), Pi 041 (9th century), and in Irenaeus (2nd century). Thus it is not a “Caesarean” text introduced reading, but a known minority Byzantine reading.

3) The introductory words of Luke 6:6, “*egeneto* (it came to pass) ... *didaskain* (‘to teach’ = ‘taught,’ AV)” are both the Received Text & Majority Byzantine Text (e.g., Sydney University Lectionary 1968). They are omitted in 11 of the 13 Lectionaries Metzger cites<sup>257</sup> (as well as Sydney University Lectionary 2378). But Lectionaries are selections of readings, and this Lectionary reading is found in no non-Lectionary texts. Thus while it is absent in other Byzantine texts, it is also absent in all “pre-Caesarean” texts and “Caesarean Proper” Texts as well i.e., it is exclusively a Lectionary reading.

4) Omission of “*auton* (him)” at Luke 6:7, accords with the Majority Byzantine Text (e.g., Sydney University Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) which also omits this word from the *Textus Receptus* (TR). Since this TR’s reading is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., Codex X 033, 10th century), it would surely be more natural and probable to say that at Luke 6:7 these 10 out of 13 Lectionaries<sup>258</sup> are here following the majority Byzantine Text rather than the “Caesarean” Text which also makes this omission.

5) At Luke 6:8 the TR’s reading of Scrivener’s Text “*egeirai* (‘Rise up,’ active aorist infinitive, from *egeiro*),” is Majority Byzantine Text (Robinson & Pierpont), e.g., Gamma 036 (10th century); and Sydney University Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). However the majority text has a notable division in it (Hodges & Farstad), with other manuscripts reading, “*egeire* (‘Arise thou’ = ‘Arise,’ imperative active present, 2nd person singular verb, from *egeiro*)” (cf. commentary at Matt. 9:5, Appendix on minor variants, Vol. 1, Matt. 1-14). While 6 of Metzger’s 13 Lectionaries have “*egeire*<sup>259</sup>,” so do a number of Byzantine manuscripts e.g., Codices E 07 (8th century), K 017 (9th century), and S 028 (10th century). Since this is clearly a well established minority Byzantine reading, this is not a “Caesarean” text introduced reading, but a known minority Byzantine reading. Moreover, while I am not at all familiar with these Lectionaries of Metzger, given the issue of revowelings with an interchange of “*e*” and “*ai*” evident in W 032 and found *inconsistently* in Lectionaries 2378 and 1968, must at least act to *raise the question* if this was the origin of this apparent “diversity”? If so, it is not actually a “diversity” of meaning.

6) At Luke 6:9, the TR’s “*apolesai* (‘to destroy,’ active aorist infinitive, from *apollumi*),” is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., X 033, 10th century); whereas the

---

<sup>257</sup> Lectionaries 1231, 374, “C947,” 80, 303, 1564, 1634, 12, 333, 1642, & 1663.

<sup>258</sup> Lectionaries 1231, 32, 374, 1627, 80, 303, 1634, 12, 333, & 1642.

<sup>259</sup> Lectionaries 1231, 32, “C947,” 80, 1642, & 1663.

variant found in 12 Lectionaries<sup>260</sup>, “*apokteinai* (‘to kill,’ active aorist infinitive, from *apokteino*),” is the majority Byzantine reading (e.g., Sydney University Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). It would surely be more natural and probable to say that these 12 out of 13 Lectionaries are here following the majority Byzantine Text rather than the “Caesarean” Text.

7) At Luke 6:10a, the TR’s “*to* (unto the) *anthropo* (man),” is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., X 033, 10th century); whereas the variant found in 12 Lectionaries<sup>261</sup>, “*auto* (unto him),” is the majority Byzantine reading (e.g., Sydney University Lectionary 2378). (The reading of Sydney University Lectionary 1968, “*auton*” / ‘of them,’ is evidently a copyist’s error). It would surely be more natural and probable to say that these 12 out of 13 Lectionaries are here following the majority Byzantine Text rather than the “Caesarean” Text.

8) At Luke 6:10b, the TR’s “*outo* (so),” is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., K 017, 9th century); whereas the variant found in 10 Lectionaries<sup>262</sup> which omits this word is the majority Byzantine reading (e.g., Sydney University Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). It would surely be more natural and probable to say that these 10 out of 13 Lectionaries are here following the majority Byzantine Text rather than the “Caesarean” Text.

9) At Luke 6:10c, the TR’s reading, “*apokatestathe* (‘it was restored,’ indicative passive aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *apokathistemi*),” is the majority Byzantine text reading (e.g., Sydney University Lectionary 2378); whereas the variant spelling, “*apekatestathe* (‘it was restored,’ indicative passive aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *apokathistemi*),” found in 7 of the 13 Lectionaries<sup>263</sup>, is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., E 07, 8th century; V 031, 9th century; & Gamma 036, 10th century). (Sydney University Lectionary 1968 contains another minority Byzantine spelling, *apokatastathe*.) Since this is clearly a well established minority Byzantine reading, this is not a “Caesarean” text introduced reading, but a known minority Byzantine reading.

10) At Luke 8:41, all 11 (of the Luke 8:41-56) Lectionaries read, “*anthropos* (man) *tis* (a certain) *proselthe* (‘approaching’ = ‘approached,’ active aorist, masculine singular nominative participle, from *proserchomai*) *to* (-) *Iesou* (Jesus) *o* (to whom) *onoma* (name),” i.e., “a certain man came to Jesus named<sup>264</sup>.” So too (in both instances

---

<sup>260</sup> Lectionaries 1231, 32, 374, “C947,” 80, 303, 1564, 1634, 12, 333, 1642, & 1663.

<sup>261</sup> Lectionaries 32, 374, 1627, “C947,” 80, 303, 1564, 1634, 12, 333, 1642, & 1663.

<sup>262</sup> Lectionaries 1231, 374, 1627, “C947,” 303, 1634, 12, 333, 1642, & 1663.

<sup>263</sup> Lectionaries 1231, 32, 1627, “C947,” 80, 1642, & 1663.

<sup>264</sup> Lectionaries 1599, 32, 374, 1627, “C947,” 303, 1634, 12, 333, 1642, & 1663.

abbreviating “*anthropos*” / “*ἄνθρωπος*” to “*anos*” / “*ἄνοϛ*” with a bar over the middle two letters, and abbreviating “*Iesous*” / “*Ἰηϛουϛ*” to “*ιϛ*” with a bar on top), this Lectionary reading is found in Sydney University Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.) By contrast, the TR & Majority Byzantine Text read, “*elthen* (‘[there] came,’ indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *erchomai*) *aner* (a man) *o* (to whom) *onoma* (name),” i.e., “there came a man named” (AV). This Lectionary reading is found in no non-Lectionary texts, and so while it is absent in other Byzantine texts, it is also absent in all “pre-Caesarean” texts and “Caesarean Proper” Texts as well i.e., it is exclusively a Lectionary reading with these introductory words designed for a Lectionary format.

Let us now consider the Luke 8:41-56 reading. As discussed at Luke 6:1, *supra*, that the Lectionary may slightly change a selected Scripture reading at the beginning of that reading is within normative Lectionary parameters. Thus it is normative to allow some level of variation as introductory lectionary style, e.g., here “*to* (-) *Iesou* (Jesus).” This occurs with other introductory words, also found in the beginning of the Luke 8:41-56 reading in Sydney University Lectionaries 2378 and 1968.

11) At Luke 8:43, the reading of e.g., Scrivener’s Text, “*eis* (preposition *eis* + accusative = ‘upon’ etc.) *iatrous* (‘physicians,’ masculine plural accusative noun, from *iatros*),” is found in e.g., Origen (with the definite article, “*tous*” / ‘the’ i.e., “*eis tous iatrous*”), and the accusative form is also found in the Latin Vulgate’s “*in* (preposition *in* + accusative = ‘towards’ etc.) *medicos* (‘physicians,’ masculine plural accusative noun, from *medicus*).” But the reading of 8 Lectionaries<sup>265</sup>, “*iatrois* (‘for physicians,’ masculine plural dative noun, from *iatros*),” is the majority Byzantine reading (e.g., Sydney University Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). It would surely be more natural and probable to say that these 8 out of 11 Lectionaries are here following the majority Byzantine Text rather than the “Caesarean” Text.

12) At Luke 8:45, the TR’s “*met*’ (with) *autou* (him),” is majority Byzantine Text (e.g., Sydney University Lectionaries 2378 & 1968); whereas the reading of 5 out of 11 Lectionaries<sup>266</sup>, “*sun* (with) *auto* (him),” is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., A 02, Byzantine Gospels, 5th century & P 024, 6th century). Since this is clearly a well established minority Byzantine reading, this is not a “Caesarean” text introduced reading, but a known minority Byzantine reading.

13) At Luke 8:51a, the reading of e.g., Scrivener’s Text, “*eiselthon* (coming in) ... *eis* (into),” i.e., “when he came into,” is a minority Byzantine reading (V 031, 9th century); whereas the reading of 9 out of 11 Lectionaries<sup>267</sup>, “*elthon* (coming)... *eis* (into),” i.e., “when he came into,” is the majority Byzantine text (e.g., Sydney University

---

<sup>265</sup> Lectionaries 32, 1627, “C947,” 303, 1634, 12, 1642, & 1663.

<sup>266</sup> Lectionaries 374, 303, 1634, 12, & 333.

<sup>267</sup> Lectionaries 374, 1627, “C947,” 303, 1634, 12, 333, 1642, & 1663.

Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). It would surely be more natural and probable to say that these 9 Lectionaries are here following the majority Byzantine Text rather than the “Caesarean” Text.

14) At Luke 8:51b, the reading of e.g., Scrivener’s Text, “*kai* (‘and,’ word 1) *Iakobon* (‘James,’ word 2) *kai* (‘and,’ word 3) *Ioannen* (‘John,’ word 4),” is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., A 02, Byzantine Gospels, 5th century; S 028, 10th century; & Sydney University Lectionary 1968); whereas the reading of 9 out of 11 Lectionaries<sup>268</sup>, which is word order, 1,4,3,2, is the majority Byzantine reading (e.g., Sydney University Lectionary 2378). It would surely be more natural and probable to say that these 9 out of 11 Lectionaries are here following the majority Byzantine Text rather than the “Caesarean” Text.

15) At Luke 8:52, the TR’s “*ouk* (not),” i.e., “she is *not* dead” (AV) is the majority Byzantine text reading (e.g., Sydney University Lectionary 1968); whereas the reading found in 5 out of 11 Lectionaries<sup>269</sup>, “*ou* (not) *gar* (for),” i.e., “*for* she is *not* dead,” is a minority Byzantine reading (F 09, 9th century; X 033, 10th century; & Sydney University Lectionary 2378). Since this is clearly a well established minority Byzantine reading, this is not a “Caesarean” text introduced reading, but a known minority Byzantine reading.

This means that in overview, if we consider the 15 main Lectionary readings that Metzger isolates to demonstrate “Agreements between lectionaries and Caesarean witnesses when both differ from the Textus Receptus,” the following facts emerge. 5 of the 15 readings, or 1/3rd of readings (readings 2,5,9,12,15, *supra*), are in fact minority Byzantine text readings, and so classification of them as “Caesarean” is at best needless and improbable. Thus they are better classified as simply conforming to established minority Byzantine readings. 7 of the 15 readings, or just under ½ of the readings (readings 4,6,7,8,11,13,14, *supra*), are in fact majority Byzantine text readings, and so classification of them as “Caesarean” is supercilious. Thus they are clearly Byzantine text readings. And 3 of the 15 readings, or 1/5 of readings (readings 1,3,10, *supra*), are in fact found in no Byzantine texts, no “Caesarean” texts, and no other texts, and so classification of them as “Caesarean” is ridiculous. Given the general text type of the Lectionaries as Byzantine, these uniquely Lectionary readings are thus best classified as minority Byzantine readings, found only in the Greek Lectionaries. *Clearly then, Metzger’s proposition that these 15 main Lectionary readings support the “Caesarean” Text is at best highly unlikely and unconvincing to all but those determined to find a “Caesarean” text in these 15 readings.*

Metzger then considers 7 minor Lectionary readings from his 13 Lectionaries for Luke 6:1-10 (Lecture for the Fourth Sunday); and 7 minor Lectionary readings from 11 main Lectionaries Luke 8:41-56 (Lecture for the Seventh Sunday) i.e., a total of 14 minor

<sup>268</sup> Lectionaries 32, 374, 1627, “C947,” 303, 1634, 12, 333, & 1642.

<sup>269</sup> Lectionaries 32, 1627, 303, 1634, & 1642.

supported readings where he finds “Agreements between the lectionaries and Caesarean witnesses when both differ from the Textus Receptus.” I shall not consider these in the same detail. Suffice to note, that these show 7 out of 14 or ½ of them are found in both Byzantine and “Caesarean” Texts, Minor Supported Readings 1<sup>270</sup>, 2<sup>271</sup>, 3<sup>272</sup>, 7<sup>273</sup>, 9<sup>274</sup>, 10<sup>275</sup>, and 13<sup>276</sup>; and 1 of the 14 readings, 8<sup>277</sup>, is found only in a Byzantine Text. Thus

<sup>270</sup> Luke 6:1 (Lectionary 1663), found in both the “pre-Caesarean” Text’s Minuscule 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), and the Byzantine Text’s 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark). Might the itemized “change” from *ψωχοντες* (*psochontes* = “rubbing,” AV) to “*ψωγοντες* (*psogontes*)” have originated due to a paper fade of one of the downward lines on the letter *χ* (chi) so as to look like a *γ* (gamma)? If so, why was it not then corrected in 1 & 28? (Greek *psogontes* is found in the Swanson Family 13 manuscripts: 1346, 10th / 11th century; 124, 11th century; 13, 13th century.) Therefore, is this more probably a localized spelling form of *ψωχοντες* (*psochontes*) from *ψωχω* (*psochō*)? If not, what is meant by “*ψωγοντες* (*psogontes*)” (from “*ψωγω*” / “*psogō*”?).

<sup>271</sup> Luke 6:3 (Lectionary 12), found e.g., in both the “pre-Caesarean” Text’s 13 (13th century, independent), and the Byzantine Text’s 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark). Lectionary omission of, “*pros* (to) *autos* (them) *eipen* (said) *o* ( ) *Iesus* (Jesus).”

<sup>272</sup> Luke 6:3 (Lectionary 12), found e.g., in both the “Caesarean Proper” Text’s 700 (11th century, independent), and the Byzantine Text’s X 033 (10th century). Lectionary omission of “*ontes* (being).”

<sup>273</sup> Luke 6:10 (Lectionary 1642), found in e.g., both the “pre-Caesarean” Text’s 13 (13th century, independent), and the Byzantine Text’s X 033 (10th century). Lectionary change of “*epoisen* (he did)” to “*exeteine* (stretch thou).”

<sup>274</sup> Luke 8:42 (Lectionaries 1663 & “C 947”), found in e.g., both the “pre-Caesarean” Text’s 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), and the Byzantine Text’s 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark). Lectionary change of “*sunepnigon* (pressed upon)” to “*sunethlibon* (‘thronged’ or ‘pressed upon’).”

<sup>275</sup> Luke 8:47 (Lectionary 1633), found e.g., in both the “Caesarean Proper” Text’s 700 (11th century, independent), and the Byzantine Text’s X 033 (10th century). Lectionary omission of “*autō* (him).”

<sup>276</sup> Luke 8:49a (Lectionary 32), found e.g., in both the “Caesarean Proper” Text’s 700 (11th century, independent), and the Byzantine Text’s X 033 (10th century). Lectionary spelling change of “*skulle* (trouble)” to “*skule*.”

<sup>277</sup> Luke 8:42 (Lectionary “C 947”), found in the Byzantine Text’s 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark). Lectionary change of “*tō* (‘the’ singular dative)” to “*to* (‘the’ singular nominative).”

we can immediately classify 8 of 14 as known Byzantine readings outside of the Lectionaries on Metzger's own data.

Of the remaining 6 of these 14 minor lectionary supported variants, another 3 are also known Byzantine readings. Minor Supported Readings 4<sup>278</sup>, 6<sup>279</sup>, 12<sup>280</sup>. Once again, it is therefore surely reasonable to conclude that these are simply reflecting known Byzantine readings. This means that we have now reduced Metzger's 15 main supported Lectionary variants and 14 minor supported Lectionary variants i.e., 29 variants from Luke 6:1-10; 8:41-56, on his Tables showing "Agreements between the lectionaries and Caesarean witnesses when both differ from the Textus Receptus," to just 3 remaining variants. I.e., c. 90% of the Lectionary variants Metzger uses as his starting point have been eliminated from the "Caesarean" list, and we are left with c. 10% of Metzger's original number. All 3 of these are classified by Metzger as having only minor Lectionary support.

Let us now consider these three remaining instances.

Minor Supported Reading 5, Luke 6:5, Lectionary 12 omits the TR's majority Byzantine reading, "*oti* (that);" as does the "pre-Caesarean" Text's Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere) and 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), and "Caesarean Proper" Text's 700 (11th century, independent). The omission is also found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century).

Was this *oti* (That)" at Luke 6:5 deliberately omitted as "redundant" on a number of separate occasions? Rather than arguing that these texts are all related to a common "Caesarean" origin, might not this be better classified as an independent omission? Was this an accidental omission due to a paper fade? The loss of such a small word is not uncommon, and may best explain the origins of its absence in the "pre-Caesarean" text

---

<sup>278</sup> Luke 6:4, Lectionary 1231 omits the TR's majority Byzantine reading, "*kai* (and) *edoke* (he gave) *kai* (also) *tois* (to [them]) *met* ([that were] with) *autou* (him);" as does the "Caesarean Proper" Text's 700 (11th century, independent). But this omission is also found in Byzantine Minuscule 1006 (11th century, Byzantine outside of Revelation); and has also been found in Lectionary 859 (11th century).

<sup>279</sup> Luke 6:7, Lectionary 12 adds before the TR's majority Byzantine reading, "*autou* (him)," the word, "*kata* (against);" as does no "Caesarean" texts, although it is found in 157 (independent, 12th century). But it is also a minority Byzantine reading (K 017, 9th century).

<sup>280</sup> Luke 8:49b, Lectionary 1627 changes the TR's majority Byzantine reading, "*para* (from)," to "*apo* (from);" as does "Caesarean Proper" Text's 700 (11th century, independent). But it is also a minority Byzantine reading (A 02, Byzantine Gospels, 5th century & P 024, 6th century).

types the *Family 1 Manuscripts* of 1 and 209, and “Caesarean Proper” Text’s 700; as well as in the Alexandrian text’s two main manuscripts, as well as in this Lectionary 12. Thus while “Caesarean” text influence is one possible explanation for the reading of Lectionary 12, it is certainly not the only possible explanation.

Minor Supported Reading 11, Luke 8:48, Lectionary 1627 omits the TR’s and majority Byzantine text’s reading, “*tharsei* (Be of good comfort),” as does the “pre-Caesarean” text types the *Family 1 Manuscripts* of 1 and 209 as well as *Family 13 Manuscript* of 346. Inside closed class of sources, this omission is also found in the Latin Vulgate. Minor Supported Reading 14, Luke 8:54, Lectionary 32 omits the TR’s majority Byzantine reading, “*exō* (out) *pantes* (all);” as does “Caesarean Proper” Text’s Theta 038 (mixed text type, 9th century). Inside closed class of sources, this omission is also found in the Latin Vulgate. Are these readings in Lectionaries 1627 (Luke 8:48) and 32 (Luke 8:54) the result of some kind of Latin influence producing a “Graeco-Latin” reading rather than “Caesarean” influenced reading? Thus once again, other explanations besides a “Caesarean” text influence are possible.

We thus find that the whole case for Metzger’s 29 Lectionary readings showing a “Caesarean” influence, can in fact be reduced to 3 cases. On Metzger’s own admission, these are minor cases where the variants are not read by many of his sample lectionaries. In the first instance (Luke 6:5), a common omission, also reflected in the Alexandrian Text is possibly the explanation; and in the second (Luke 8:48) and third (Luke 8:54) instance, a Latin influence rather than a “Caesarean” influence is possibly the explanation. *Thus the whole case of any “Caesarean” influence is at best, unclear and uncertain; and due to the presence of reasonable alternative explanations, fairly unlikely, although not absolutely impossible.*

Nevertheless, let us for the sake of argument assume that in fact Luke 6:5; 8:48,54, do represent Metzger’s “Caesarean” influence. *In fairness to Metzger, it is one possible explanation, even though we cannot with his dogmatism claim that it is definitely the source of the textual corruption.* But I maintain that even if it is “Caesarean” text corruption of the Byzantine Text, its preservation in what in broad terms are clearly Byzantine text type Lectionaries, means that these reading may still be simultaneously classified as a minority Byzantine variants. After all, more generally there are other corruptions in the Byzantine Text, and if we can with some likelihood locate the originating source of the corruption, we do not then reclassify them as non-Byzantine variants.

That the Byzantine text has to some extent been corrupted, is evident both in the large number of minority Byzantine readings rejected by the TR, and also the relatively small number of minority Byzantine readings or other readings inside the closed class of sources sometimes used in preference to the majority Byzantine reading. The issue of when such variation produces a different text type is subjective and may in some instances be controversial e.g., I consider von Soden’s “I” type text type is quite properly rejected in general. All agree that the Western Text has been corrupted, and is now a separate text type. All agree that the “Caesarean” Text type has been corrupted (a

largely Alexandrian and Byzantine mixture), but there is dispute as to whether or not it can be fairly called a separate text type. Formerly the trend was towards such a classification, but the present trend is against such a designation. Will the trend change in the future or stay the same? (Who really cares what “the trend” is anyway? Most of these guys do not really know what they are doing beyond “living up to the academic stereotype” and “going with the flow” of whoever controls the academic colleges, journals, publishing houses, etc. .)

Even if we allow that the Lectionaries have at times been corrupted by some “Caesarean” readings, whether in the cases of Luke 6:5; 8:48,54, or elsewhere, that is therefore not a mutually exclusive fact to the proposition that these same readings may also be classified as minority Byzantine variants if the overall text type of the manuscript is clearly Byzantine. This is certainly the case with the Lectionaries, and so while it is a matter of interest to know where some corrupting minority Byzantine variants might be coming from, i.e., the “Caesarean” text type *might* be the explanation for Luke 6:5; 8:48,54 in the 3 Lectionaries, *supra*; this does not alter the fact that the Lectionaries can still be classified as Byzantine Text on the basis of their overall textual structure.

I hope this analysis of Metzger’s Tables showing 29 “Agreements between the lectionaries and Caesarean witnesses when both differ from the *Textus Receptus*,” in these Lectionaries thus better helps the reader understand why I regard the Lectionaries as Byzantine Text. *On the one hand, I think Metzger’s basic claim that these 29 selected lectionary readings show a “Caesarean” influence is at best very questionable, and something that looks suspiciously like, “a wild-goose chase.”* And to the extent that this type of work helped to establish Metzger’s “credentials” as a textual analyst in the Neo-Alexandrian School, correspondingly reminds us that their abilities in this area of textual analysis are *something less than adequate*.

But on the other hand, for my purposes of a Byzantine Text classification of the Lectionaries (I do not say for every matter dealing with a Lectionary reading), in the final analysis, I really “don’t give a brass farthing” if one can track down the probable origins of this or that corrupt Byzantine variant in the Lectionaries (or Codices and Minuscules) to this or that writer, or “Caesarean” Text influence, or an individual scribe, for there are “many which corrupt the Word of God” (II Cor. 2:17). Any such “probable origins” are always speculative anyway, and may be wrong. *In the final analysis, I stick to what we clearly know. As a package deal the general text of these Lectionaries is clearly Byzantine, and so I accept any variants as minority Byzantine readings i.e., inside the closed class of sources.*

It should also be said, that if enough study is done on the Lectionaries, it may be that some further Byzantine variants may turn up in one or more Lectionaries that are Received Text minority Greek readings, either little known in the Byzantine Greek, or perhaps unknown outside the Lectionaries in the Byzantine Greek, possibly having been formerly reconstructed in the *Textus Receptus* from the Latin textual tradition and / or some church writer(s). Certainly on the limited evidence we have above, we can say with confidence that we have already shown that the numbers of some minority

Byzantine readings will increase their strength if more comprehensive work is done on the Greek Lectionaries, and in my opinion such further work would be a desirable thing. Thus this limited finding acts as an important qualification to my basic point, that the evidence indicates that a count of the Greek Lectionaries would not fundamentally change the representative Byzantine text.

It should also be noted that my own view of the Lectionaries being properly classified as Byzantine Text rather Byzantine with “Caesarean” Text elements, has a more general precedent. Formerly, Minuscule 28 was generally regarded as “Pre-Caesarean” Text, as was Minuscule 69 since it is part of the *Family 13 Manuscripts* (and both the *Family 1 & 13 Manuscripts* were regarded as “Pre-Caesarean” Text. I.e., as opposed to the “Caesarean Proper” Text of Theta 038, 565, 700, and the Armenian and Georgian Versions, with special reference to Origen, Eusebius, and Cyril of Jerusalem<sup>281</sup>.) But further more careful study on Minuscule 28 yielded the result that 28 is of independent text in Mark but Byzantine Text elsewhere; and [update 2015,] Aland also claims that Minuscule 69 is “an independent text” “in Paul, but” “purely or predominantly Byzantine” “elsewhere<sup>282</sup>.” However, upon reviewing this issue in 2015 (see Corrigenda for Textual Commentaries Vol. 5 of 2015 in Appendix 6), I came to disagree with this assessment for the sections I had examined in the first two gospels which are mixed text type, and since due to time constraints I am unable to more comprehensively examine Minuscule 69, (other than saying it is clearly a corrupt manuscript in many areas,) I am discontinuing general references to it. However, the recognition that Minuscule 28 is Byzantine Text type in these sections of St. Luke’s Gospel; is additionally significant because Metzger therefore wrongly cited Minuscule 28 as supporting a “Caesarean” text type, when in fact it is now regarded as a Byzantine text type.

The work of Jacob Geerlings should also be mentioned. Geerlings analyzed Lectionary 767 (12th / 13th / 14th century, Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria Library, Egypt, North Africa). This is a Gospel (*Evangelion*) Lectionary for the Saturdays and Sundays of the year, with weekly readings and annual festival days, in a cursive Greek script. Lectionary 767 was microfilmed by Geerlings at Alexandria in 1964, and his work published four years later. While noting that Caspar Gregory dates it as 12th century and Aland as 14th century, Geerlings thinks it is either 12th or 13th century<sup>283</sup>. After collating variants, Geerlings considered, “the text of 767 differs only in minor details from the Textus Receptus.” He refers to the work on “the Lectionary text at the University of Chicago,” *supra*, and by Buck, *supra*. But he concludes “that the

---

<sup>281</sup> Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1971, pp. xxix-xx.

<sup>282</sup> Aland, K., *et unum, The Text of the NT* (1989), *op. cit.*, p. 129.

<sup>283</sup> Jacob Geerlings’ *Family E & its Allies in Mark*, *op. cit.*, p. 71, (see Geerlings other edited work, *supra*). This Lectionary was kept at the Greek Orthodox Patriarchal Library at Cairo before 1928, and before it was renumbered by Gregory as 767, it was known as 950 (*Ibid.*, p. 71).

readings of the Caesarean text-type do not appear as often in [Lectionary] 767 as in the 25 [Lectionaries] studied by Buck.” He further says, “A collation of selected Matthean Saturday and Sunday lections in 767 with” various manuscripts cited in the critical apparatus of “S.C.E. Legg’s *Novum Testamentum Graece*,” on St. Matthew’s Gospel, led him to this conclusion “of 767. No influence of the Caesarean text is discernable<sup>284</sup>.”

While my work on the two Sydney University Greek Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.), is still at an early stage, being to date primarily focused on the readings covered in Volumes 1 & 2 of St. Matthew’s Gospel (a revised Volume 1 is to be produced and is scheduled for Dedication on 30 Jan. 2010), to date I have found that while they sometimes contain minority Byzantine readings, they more generally follow the representative Byzantine text. Importantly with respect to the claims of Moorman and the Dean Burgon Society, they thus generally follow the majority Byzantine text against the Received Text. E.g., as discussed in this commentary at Matt. 19:19, the TR’s Greek, “*ton* (the) *patera* (father) *sou* (of thee),” i.e., “thy father,” in the words, “Honour thy father” (AV), is a minority Byzantine reading, and correct. But the “*sou* (thy)” is omitted in the majority Byzantine Text, as reflected in e.g., both Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). An exception to this is Matt. 17:27b, where both Lectionaries 2378 and 1968 follow the minority reading of Scrivener, although as discussed in Appendix 1, this makes no difference to English translation.

As a consequence of the now generally recognized finding that the Lectionaries generally follow the Majority Byzantine Text reading, and where they occasionally do not, either they simply represent otherwise known minority Byzantine readings, or are simply the source of yet more minority Byzantine readings, the neo-Alexandrians have not had much interest in them, although some have had more interest than others. E.g., Metzger notes that “von Soden ... deliberately excluded lectionaries from his otherwise comprehensive survey<sup>285</sup>,” so that von Soden’s textual apparatus only makes reference to 8 of the *c.* 2300 lectionaries. Or Aland considers, “nearly all the approximately 2,300 lectionary manuscripts can be of significance only in exceptional instances ... . For this reason only five lectionary manuscripts are ... listed in Appendix I of Nestle-Aland<sup>286</sup>.”

---

<sup>284</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 84-5.

<sup>285</sup> Metzger’s “Greek Lectionaries ...,” *op. cit.*, p. 479; citing von Soden’s *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, I, I, Leipzig, 1902, pp. 19f. . Typical of von Soden’s meandering classification style, he did not divide his four volume work, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* of 1911 to 1913, into a simple Volume 1, 2, 3, & 4; but rather, made a division of “2” volumes in which his “1st” volume has 3 parts. Thus his four volumes divide into Vol. I, I [= Vol. 1]; Vol. I, II [= Vol. 2]; Vol. I, III [= Vol. 3]; & Vol. II [= Vol. 4]. The reader should also be warned that his Vol. I, II [= Vol. 2] is subtitled, “A,” and then his Vol. I, III [= Vol. 3] is subtitled, “B,” so that there is not a Vol. I, II, B following a Vol. I, II, A; but rather, a Vol. I, III, B, following a Vol. I, II, A. The reader should be further warned that these are the twists and folds of *mild circumvolution* when compared with some of his groupings and sub-groupings of Greek manuscripts.

<sup>286</sup> Aland, K., *et unum*, *The Text of the NT* (1989), *op. cit.*, p. 169.

This deplorable neo-Alexandrian attitude to the *c.* 2,300 Greek Lectionaries, manifested in Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993), is somewhat improved upon in the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions which list *c.* 50 previously unutilized Greek Lectionaries, coupled with a sporadic usage of *c.* 100 further Greek Lectionaries cited in previous editions of the Greek NT, and not generally rechecked for their accuracy<sup>287</sup>. The UBS 4th revised edition (1993) uses *c.* 70 Lectionaries, of which *c.* 40 were not used in the earlier UBS 3rd & 3rd corrected editions<sup>288</sup>. The usage of lectionary detail citations in the apparatus is generally better in the UBS 3rd (1975) & 3rd corrected (1983) editions than it is in UBS 4th revised edition (1993). However, the very limited nature of the UBS textual apparatuses which only consider a very small number of variants, means that this valuable data has only a very limited scope. Nevertheless, I am grateful for the lectionary data I can sometimes get from UBS or another textual apparatus (e.g., Tischendorf's *y-scr* = Lectionary 184 of 1319 A.D.).

As a special bonus to these commentaries, starting from Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20) I will be showing the readings in Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, Sydney University) and 1968 (1544 A.D., Sydney University), as well as the Latin readings of St. Gregory. A revised Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) will also be made, primarily so as to include these Greek readings from these two Lectionaries as well as the Latin readings from Bishop Gregory the Great's writings. In doing so, I am thus making my own small contribution to the much larger task of helping to counter-balance this deplorable lack of interest in the Greek Lectionaries; and likewise addressing the deplorable failure to cite the Latin writings of one of the four great ancient and early mediaeval doctors of the Western Church.

On the one hand, none of my commentary volumes make very much usage of the Lectionaries, other than the two Sydney University Lectionaries, except in considering that the other Lectionaries' readings are generally represented by the Majority Byzantine Text, even though this is composed from von Soden's K group Codices and Minuscules, without specific reference to about 2,300 Lectionaries. Of course, there are exceptions in the Lectionaries to the majority Byzantine text e.g., at both Matt. 19:3a and Matt. 19:3b, I refer to "minority Byzantine" readings followed by Sydney University Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). However for the Lectionaries, of the apparatuses I have been using, UBS is the best on Lectionaries, e.g., they use "Lect" for a majority Lectionary reading from their limited selection, and "Lect pt" (Lectionary part) if at least 10 lectionaries differ. But on the other hand, the Lectionary information is sometimes of greater value when they cover a verse of particular interest. Such an example is clearly relevant to the claims of Hembd, Moorman, *et al*, is their treatment of I John 5:7,8. While UBS 4th revised edition (1994) shows the reading followed in Antoniades (Antoniadis) Greek Orthodox Lectionary of 1904, it shows it in no other Lectionaries, and nor does the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions. I.e., none of the *c.* 200 lectionaries these

---

<sup>287</sup> UBS 3rd (1975) & 3rd corrected (1983) editions, pp. xxviii-xxxi.

<sup>288</sup> UBS 4th revised edition (1993), pp. 21\*-23\*.

two UBS editions cover have the I John 5:7,8 reading in them, although to this must be made some further qualifications that reduce this number of *c.* 200 lectionaries down to *c.* 40 relevant lectionaries.

Of the 190 Lectionaries used in the UBS 3rd (1975), 3rd corrected (1983), and 4th revised editions, 130 are *Evangelion* (Gospel) Lectionaries, 44 are *Apostolos* (Acts to Jude) Lectionaries, and 16 are combined *Evangelion-Apostolos* Lectionaries. Of course, not all Lectionaries include weekday readings, i.e., some give only Saturday and Sunday readings, and some are incomplete or fragmentary. This is relevant as the I John 5:7,8 reading found in the 1904 Greek Orthodox Lectionary, is a reading *For the Thursday in the 35th week*, and so possibly not in all the UBS *Apostolos* Lectionaries. In the case of the UBS 4th revised edition we are told that there are 26 of their 40 *Apostolos* Lectionaries (whether a separate *Apostolos* or combined *Evangelion-Apostolos* Lectionary) that have daily lessons<sup>289</sup> i.e., 65% or *c.* 2/3rds of them. Such data detail is lacking in the UBS 3rd and 3rd corrected editions on their additional 20 *Apostolos* Lectionaries (whether a separate *Apostolos* or combined *Evangelion-Apostolos* Lectionary); but if the same percentages held up, and possibly they do not, of these extra 20, *c.* 13 would have daily lessons. This means that on the available data, it would seem that *c.* 40 relevant Lectionaries (the 26 UBS 4th revised edition and *c.* extra 13 from UBS 3rd editions), have been looked at, and none contain the I John 5:7,8 reading.

Given there are about 2,300 Lectionaries, and about 180 have been looked at in such detail by UBS i.e., about 8% of Lectionaries, we clearly have a reasonable representative size of lectionaries, none of which contain the I John 5:7,8 reading. On the basis of this research I think it fair to conclude that a good 95% of the Lectionaries lack the TR's reading, and possibly 100% lack it. On this particular reading we know from other sources that the Greek manuscript support in the codices and minuscules for I John 5:7,8 is in fact less than 1%. Therefore we can in broad terms project this to say that the Lectionary support for this reading would be in the approximate range of 0%-1%. Of course, when dealing with very small numbers these figures are more "rubbery" than usual, and so to be safe, perhaps one should allow a possible range of about 0-2%. Thus to be confident of the exact figure between about 98% and 100% would require actually going through and looking at every relevant Lectionary. Of course, the number of lectionaries considered is actually slightly higher than these *c.* 40 relevant Lectionaries, since it must also be remembered that *c.* 60 lectionaries were used by Antoniades (Antoniadis), *supra*, although once again, not all of these 60 would have had the relevant *Apostolos* reading from I John 5 in them. Therefore the presently available, though admittedly incomplete data, that we have in the form of evidence from a representative group of Greek Lectionaries, clearly shows that this reading will at best be a slim minority reading found in no more than about 2% of the Lectionaries, *and quite possibly not found at all in any of the Lectionaries* up to the 16th century. Thus as seen by reference to this example, this specific Lectionary evidence with regard to I John 5:7,8 simply does not support the sort of claims being made by Hembd and Moorman *et al*, i.e., that "a true majority count" of these Lectionaries will yield the Received Text. Indeed,

---

<sup>289</sup> UBS 4th revised edition (1993), p. 20\*.

the evidence clearly indicates quite the opposite i.e., the Lectionaries generally follow the representative Byzantine text, not the Received Text, where the two disagree.

The failure of Hembd to recognize that we can only site Antoniadēs' *Greek Patriarchal Text* the same way that we can sight the Latin Clementine Vulgate i.e., if and where it is a manifestation of readings inside the closed class of sources, is thus fatal to his argument. Its reading of I John 5:7,8 is not based on a majority count of earlier Lectionary evidence from that smaller number of lectionaries which contain the Apostolos reading from I John 5 out of the larger number of c. 60 lectionaries that were used by Antoniadēs; let alone, as Hembd *et al* would have us believe, an even larger number again; and the Lectionary evidence we have from the UBS 3rd, 3rd corrected, and 4th revised editions, acts to confirm the type of conclusion that Antoniadēs made on the absence of this Received Text reading in the Lectionaries (although whether that be from all, or simply from most of them, is still unknown). The inclusion of I John 5:7,8 was the result of a direction to Antoniadēs to do so by a Greek Orthodox Synod. While I would agree with Hembd *et al* that this reading is genuine, and so the Synod was right to make this direction, that is another issue.

In the third place (my response to Hembd, "In the second place," starts about 20 pages back), Hembd's unqualified methodology which rests on the view that "the Greek ... are peerless in the knowledge of their own text" (*TBS Quarterly Record*, Jan.-March 2008, Part 2, p. 42), is defective in a number of particulars. What does Hembd do when this Greek Orthodox text disagrees with the Received Text? He simply ignores it! Moreover, who made the true Greek text "their... text" i.e., the Greek Orthodox Church's text? The true Greek text certainly does not belong to the Greek Orthodox Church. Furthermore, for those of us who support the neo-Byzantine *Textus Receptus*, it would be more accurate to say, *the neo-Byzantine textual analysts of the 16th and 17th centuries, such as e.g., Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzevirs were peerless in the knowledge of the Received Text.* However even that should be qualified i.e., it was not because God did not give textual analysts before or after that time, but because these luminaries from the 16th and 17th centuries more formally composed the entire NT Text, and that had not been previously done, nor needs to be subsequently done.

Certainly we neo-Byzantines would recognize that up till the 15th and 16th centuries, the Byzantine School "Greeks, ... particularly their monks," were in a higher class of their own when compared to the relatively poor scribal standards found among Alexandrian School scribes, Western Greek School scribes (as opposed to the generally high quality Western Latin scribes), and various mixed text type scribes. But we neo-Byzantines also recognize that the Byzantine School scribes made some copyists' errors. Hence the Greek *Textus Receptus* sometimes finds it necessary to correct the representative Byzantine Greek text where there are good textual grounds for doing so. Hembd's understanding of the Received Text is thus defective.

Hembd further says, "the Reformed forefathers were right in following Greek minority readings in eight places" (*TBS Quarterly Record*, Jan.-March 2008, Part 2, p. 39). Well they were, but *there are far more than "eight places"* where the NT Received Text does not follow the representative Byzantine text. Alas, as evident from these

references, Hembd from the USA State of Texas, has been strongly influenced by Majority Text ideas similar to those of the USA based Dean Burgon Society, although with his “eight places,” Hembd would still find some area to disagree with the Dean Burgon Society over. Hembd does not himself realize the extent to which he has been so influenced by Majority Text ideas. Thus e.g., he likes to claim contrary to the evidence, that far more TR readings are simultaneously majority Byzantine readings, than the data will actually warrant (cf. Part 2, pp. 42-3).

In short, though he does not say so in these precise words, Hembd, like Khoo and Watts, *infra*, helps to create *the fiction* of some “Alice in Wonderland” type Majority Text, *out there somewhere, hidden in all these Byzantine Text Greek Lectionaries and other manuscripts that Pierpont in Green’s Textual Apparatus (1986), Hodges & Farstad (1982 & 1985), or Robinson & Pierpont (1991 & 2005), just do not consider.* The implication is that “if only someone would get out there and count them properly,” then “they would find that the Received Text is really the Majority Text” in many, if not all cases, where e.g., the present Byzantine Text of Robinson & Pierpont (2005) disagrees with the TR. Hembd is by no means the only person who in the alleged name of upholding the Received Text, makes these kind of absurd claims. In essence, such persons claim on the one hand to believe in the Received Text of the Authorized Version; but claim on the other hand to believe in Burgon’s Majority Text principles, or in Hembd’s case, something far too close to them. Thus when the two do not correlate, the Majority Text composer such as e.g., Zane Hodges, or William Pierpont, then becomes some kind of *dark-cloaked fiendish figure lurking in a dark-corner*, deviously “concealing the true numbers count” so as “to conceal the fact” that the Majority Text “really supports the Received Text.” Hence the associated basic criticism made of Hodges & Farstad’s majority text, Pierpont & Robinson’s majority text, or Pierpont’s work in Green’s majority text Textual Apparatus, is fundamentally misplaced.

In this context, we find that on the one hand, Watts strongly criticizes “the so-called Majority Text, edited by Zane Hodges and ... Arthur Farstad of Dallas Theological Seminary.” He says “this Majority Text contains nearly 1,900 changes to the Received Text, including the omission of such Scriptures as Matthew 27:35; Acts 8:37; 9:5,6; 10:6b; and I John 5:7<sup>290</sup>.” While I prefer the Byzantine manuscript ideological focus of Pierpont & Robinson’s methodology as opposed to the parity placed between Byzantine and non-Byzantine texts on the methodology of Hodges & Farstad (though the two texts are generally the same in Matt. to Jude<sup>291</sup>), Watts basic criticism would also be the same

---

<sup>290</sup> Watts’ *The New King James Version: A Critique*, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

<sup>291</sup> An example of where the two texts differ is found at Matt. 21:30. Here Pierpont & Robinson (2005) (based on von Soden’s K group) show their majority text split fairly evenly between “*t̄o* (the) *deutero* (second)” which they put in their main text, and “*t̄o* (the) *etero* (other)” which they show as a side-note alternative, thus indicating “the Byzantine Textform” is “significantly divided,” but they consider their main text reading is the “superior” one. Hodges & Farstad (1985) (based on von Soden’s K & I groups) also consider there is a substantial division between these two readings, but they have the opposite order putting “the (*t̄o*) other (*etero*)” in their main text. But for my

for Pierpont & Robinson's majority text, or Green's Textual Apparatus, and is fundamentally incorrect.

But on the other hand, two pages later, Watts says, "The major text-types are: the Traditional (Byzantine) text-type ... called Byzantine because it was the recognized Greek text throughout the Byzantine period" (post Constantine 4th century division of eastern and western Roman Empire, to the fall of Eastern Roman Empire or Byzantine Empire in 1453), "and the Alexandrian text-type ... . The Byzantine text-type has the overwhelming support of the Greek manuscripts (over 95% of the more than five thousand Greek manuscripts in existence<sup>292</sup>) ... . It is in this text-type that the Traditional Text has survived, which was published in the 16th and 17th centuries by Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza and the Elzevirs. In the 'Preface' to the Elzevirs' second edition (1633) reference is made to the 'text now received by all' (*textum ... nunc ab omnibus receptum*), from whence arose the designation 'Textus Receptus' or Received Text.' It is a text of this type which underlies the Authorised Version." Watts thus makes an equation between what he calls "the Traditional or Received Text," and the "Byzantine text-type."

The "Traditional Text" is Burgon's term for his Majority Text, best manifested in Hodges & Farstad's text; and fundamentally different to the "Received Text." The two are certainly not, as Watts thinks, synonyms. E.g., Watts says, the Alexandrian "Codex Vaticanus ... and Codex Sinaiticus ... differ *radically* from the Traditional or Received Text. It is estimated that there are about six thousand differences." Thus, he says, "Westcott and Hort ... dismiss the Traditional or Received Text, supported by 90% [of] the Greek manuscripts ...<sup>293</sup>." So too, the "Byzantine text-type" (Watts) is best found in Robinson & Pierpont's text, and once again is fundamentally different to what Watts calls the "Received Text."

In fact, what Watts criticizes as Zane and Hodges Majority Text containing about 1,900 differences with the Received Text, is identical with the so called "Traditional

---

neo-Byzantine purposes of first determining the representative Byzantine text, or applying textual analysis if the text is fairly evenly divided, both majority texts here yield the same basic result.

<sup>292</sup> On one level Hembd's figures of "over 95% of the more than five thousand Greek manuscripts" have some clear similarity with my own figures, *infra*, of c. 89.1% (or 4,224 i.e., 4,335 – 111 = 4,224) of the c. 4,740 manuscripts being completely Byzantine, with c. 2.4% (or 111) of them being Byzantine in part i.e., a total of c. 91.5% (or 4,335) of the c. 4,740 manuscripts being Byzantine, and 8.5% being non-Byzantine. However, these Byzantine manuscripts include within them a number of minority Byzantine readings on this or that text, and sometimes are fairly evenly divided on a given reading, so that one could not, like Hembd, say that they always monolithically support a representative Byzantine text.

<sup>293</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

Text,” that he so vigorously defends, wrongly thinking the “Traditional Text” is the Received Text. The Majority Text and the Traditional Text are just two different names that Burgonites use for the same thing. Burgon himself preferred the term, “Traditional Text,” whereas his later Burgonite minions have tended to prefer the term, “Majority Text,” but the two are the same thing. This text is, in practice, a Byzantine Text since the vast majority of manuscripts used in the Majority Text are Byzantine (Farstad & Hodges focusing on von Soden’s “K” and “I” groups for Matthew to Jude, though including some reference to his “H” group with Codex Sinaiticus or ⳨, Codex Vaticanus or B, Codex Ephraemis Rescriptus or C, and in Acts to Revelation Codex Alexandrinus or A). Nevertheless, it is not the same as the Received Text. Watts thus defends the Burgonites Majority Text under the name of “Traditional Text,” and wrongly thinks that this equates the Received Text of the neo-Byzantines Stephanus, Beza, the King James Translators, *et al.* Watts is sadly mistaken. As one who supports the TR and AV, I say in Christian love, *Watts has bitten off more than he can chew.*

Similarly ridiculous claims are e.g., made by Jeffrey Khoo, former Academic Dean, now Principal, of the (Presbyterian) *Far Eastern Bible College* in Singapore. Like Watts, Khoo goes *even further than Hembd* in this direction. Khoo, who thinks highly of “the writings of ... Waite,” the “President of the Dean Burgon Society” who “visited Singapore in 1992,” thinks that “the writings of J.W. Burgon,” and “the Dean Burgon Society” actually support “the Greek Textus Receptus published by the Trinitarian Bible Society.” Though Khoo is well intentioned, this has the effect that he lambastes all and any “textual criticism which,” with a touch of Puritan rhetoric looking for that old civil war-time enemy, the Anglicans, he says, “favoured the critical theories of Anglican liberals.” What about Puritan liberals like Moffatt?<sup>294</sup> Is he aware that his great darling, Burgon, was a Puseyite Anglican? In following this methodology, Khoo’s intent is to fairly attack “the modernistic United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament edited by

---

<sup>294</sup> As a Mongoloid (*Head Hair*: black & straight; *Prognathism*: medium; *Eyes*: brown; *Skin*: brown), Khoo is a Gentile son of Shem, the Great Patriarch of Asia; rather than, like the Caucasian Caucasoid (*Head Hair*: wavy and of various colours; *Facial & body hair*: abundant in males; *Nose*: narrow; *Prognathism*: slight; *Eyes*: variable, usually blue, green, or brown; *Skin*: white,) British, a son of Japheth, the Great Patriarch of Europe and “the Isles of the Gentiles” (Gen. 10:5), although Japheth’s holdings included some small parts of Western Asia with e.g., the “Madai” (Medes) (Gen. 10:2), long before God did “enlarge Japheth” (Gen. 9:27) with the expansion of the white man to North America, Australia, and New Zealand. Thus by this comment, I do not mean that Khoo’s ancestors were in the British Isles during the English civil war, but merely, that as a Puritan, he seems to have picked up some of their rhetoric. Of course, the Scottish Puritans, in the main, supported the monarchy (with qualification), and certainly did not support Cromwell’s republic, whose power base lay with English Puritans, and only the odd Scottish Puritan e.g., Rutherford. But since the 19th century a group of Presbyterians, of which MacKenzie, (see next footnote), who published Khoo’s article is one derivative, started to promote the English Puritan view with special reference to Rutherford, as a view that the thought should be followed by Scottish derived Presbyterians, something that historically, it generally *was not*.

Metzger *et al.*” But the consequential effect of his flawed methodology, is to undermine all forms of textual analysis. He thus attacks the methodological principles of the Received Text, though like “the king with no clothes,” Khoo is evidently unaware of his own nakedness.

On one level, those who think they can get far more Received Text readings from *a better numbers* of the majority text (Hembd), or indeed the entire Received Text from the Majority Text (Khoo, Waite, & Moorman) and / or Byzantine Text (Watts), are living in a fool’s paradise and doing damage to the cause of the Received Text and King James Version that they so passionately believe in. None of us are perfect, and we all make mistakes. Indeed, I say of myself that which is true for all of us poor, frail, fallen, human creatures, “Who can understand his errors?” (Ps. 19:12, AV), or “Who can tell how oft he offendeth?” (Ps. 19:12, Psalter, Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662). It is to be hoped that those who presently embrace these types of errors will come to embrace the proper principles of the Received Text.

Certainly on another level, there is much that is good in all of their articles. E.g., Watts is clearly anti neo-Alexandrian, and upholds such TR passages as e.g., John 7:53-8:11; I John 5:7,8. Khoo fairly asks, “Why are fundamentalist pastors and scholars from Bob Jones University, Central, Detroit, Temple, and other fundamentalist Baptist Seminaries ... commending and recommending Metzger ... and many modern versions that stem from his corrupt Greek text? Is this apostasy, hypocrisy, compromise, or what?” But for all that, e.g., Khoo’s *simple solution* belief that Burgon’s Majority Text equates the Received Text, is just not correct<sup>295</sup>.

---

<sup>295</sup> Khoo, J., “Bruce Metzger [d. Feb. 2007, aged 93] & the Curse of Textual Criticism,” *Faith & Freedom*, April 2007, pp. 1,4. *Faith & Freedom* (largely, although not entirely, a cut’n’paste work of various newspaper and other articles), was produced by John MacKenzie (P.O. Box 88, Para Hills, S.A. 5096, Australia). But due to illness and old age, his last edition was produced in 2008, and the publication ceased (see next footnote). MacKenzie is a Puritan of Presbyterian allegiance, and his articles sometimes included the glorification of “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:20,21) in connection with his support for Oliver Cromwell and the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60. In fairness to him, he reprinted a *Protestant Truth Society* article (“Tolerance, Freedom, and Law,” *Protestant Truth*, May-June 2006), which said, “Oliver Cromwell is not everyone’s hero. The mere mention of his name can rouse some people to anger even three and a half centuries after his death.” But the article fails to state why such righteous anger is aroused; and it then goes on to try and put Cromwell in what it regards as a favourable light (*Faith & Freedom*, May 2006, pp. 5,12). Though MacKenzie’s monthly magazine contained much that was useful and good, the good Christian reader looking over old editions up till 2008, should exercise some caution with it, especially, although not exclusively, if he is a Reformed (Evangelical) Anglican such as myself; or a more traditional type of Presbyterian derived from the Established *Church of Scotland*, which was historically also anti-Cromwell. Khoo is an Elder of the True Life Bible-Presbyterian Church in Singapore, and some two years after it appeared in *Faith & Freedom* (2007), his article was later republished in the *Far Eastern Bible College’s*

E.g., in August 2009, as the Principal of the Far Eastern Bible College, Singapore, Khoo again wrote an article in *Faith & Freedom*. Here Khoo says he upholds, “The ‘Providential’ preservation of Scriptures.” But in this context he says, “The infallible and inerrant words of Scripture are found in the faithfully preserved Traditional / Byzantine / Majority manuscripts, and fully represented in the ... Received Text (or Textus Receptus) that underlie[s] ... the KJV ..., and not in the corrupt ... texts of Westcott and Hort that underlie the many modern version of the English Bible like the NIV, NASV, ESV, RSV, TEV, CEV, TLB etc. ... . In the field of textual recognition, Burgon is good, Hills is better, Waite is best. See John William Burgon, *The Revision Revised: A Refutation of Westcott and Hort’s False Greek Text and Theory* (Collingswood: Dean Burgon Society Press, 2<sup>nd</sup> printing, 2000); Edward F. Hills, *The King James Version Defended* (Des Moines: Christian Research Press, 1984); D.A. Waite, *Defending the King James Bible*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Collingswood: Bible For Today Press, 1996)<sup>296</sup>.” Thus once again we see that Khoo, who promotes the USA based Dean Burgon Society, wrongly equates the “Byzantine / Majority manuscripts” with the “Received Text (or Textus Receptus) that underlie[s] ... the KJV.”

Against this backdrop, I am particularly concerned with one of Hembd’s inaccurate claims. He says, he “shall show that the so-called Byzantine majority texts of both Hodges and Farstad, and Pierpont and Robinson, are fatally flawed, in that, ... their editors relied primarily on the work of ... von Soden” (*TBS Quarterly Record*, Oct-Dec 2007, Part 1, p. 13). Hembd’s concern is that, “von Soden, had either failed to collate completely the Byzantine evidence extant, or ... failed to note the lectionary evidence, or

---

publication, *The Burning Bush*, Vol. 15, No. 1, 2009, and is presently available at the *Far Eastern Bible College* website ([www.febc.edu.sg/BBVol15\\_1b.htm](http://www.febc.edu.sg/BBVol15_1b.htm)), where he attended College (1985-9), and in 2007 was the Academic Dean, though he has since become its Principal.

<sup>296</sup> Khoo’s Article, “The Verbal Plenary Preservation of the Sacred Scriptures,” is in *Faith & Freedom*, Aug. 2009, pp. 9-10, and includes a photo of Khoo with John Mackenzie and his wife taken in Indonesia in July 2008. In August 09, *Faith & Freedom* started again under Errol Stone as Editor (P.O. Box 1117, Innaloo City, W.A., 6918), though the exact form of its continuing format is not yet clear. The August 09 edition advertized for sale at its bookshop works by such an offensive writer as Samuel Rutherford (advertized as, “Letters of Samuel Rutherford – A Puritan Paperback by Samuel Rutherford”), who claimed that so called natural law could be used to override God’s law and allow sedition against the Crown and murder of the King. See McGrath, G.B (myself), “Freedom of Speech or Lies?” *English Churchman* 31 July & 7 Aug. 2009, p. 2, where I refer to “the teachings in the 1662-1859 Office for ‘King Charles the Martyr,’ that Cromwell and his cohorts were ‘cruel men, sons of Belial’ (I Sam. 2:12; II Cor. 6:15),” and note that “on the authority of God’s Word, ... both ... Cromwell and Rutherford [are] in the burning flames of hell (Gal. 5:20,21; Rev. 21:8; cf. II John 9-11; Matt. 7:21-23; 19:18; 22:21).” See also McGrath, G.B (myself), “Cromwell,” *English Churchman*, 28 Aug. & 4 Sept. 2009, pp. 2-3.

both” (*TBS Quarterly Record*, Jan.-March 2008, Part 2, p. 41). This mirrors the sort of statements we find in Moorman’s Dean Burgon Society work, where he stresses that on this type of basis “von Soden’s Apparatus is ‘honeycombed with error’<sup>297</sup>.”

On one level I have some sympathy for the concerns of Hembd from the Trinitarian Bible Society and Moorman from the Dean Burgon Society, about both von Soden and Hodges & Farstad. Certainly I consider the Byzantine manuscript priority principle of Robinson & Pierpont to be better than the Byzantine and non-Byzantine manuscript parity principle of Hodges & Farstad. With respect to von Soden, I too have some concerns. In the first place, we cannot doubt that von Soden produced a very bad Greek text. It was much liked and used by James Moffatt in the religiously liberal and unreliable, Moffatt Bible<sup>298</sup>. In the second place, we do not have a comprehensively constructed representative Byzantine text, with apparatus showing all variants, based on *all* manuscripts up to the 16th century. Whether or not we shall ever be privileged to have such a mammoth work available to us is presently uncertain and unknown. Thirdly, at the micro-level of von Soden’s textual apparatus, Moorman’s criticisms have some validity. I.e., as one who has sometimes looked in vain for some detail on a reading in von Soden’s textual apparatus and been disappointed with it; it must be frankly admitted that like any textual apparatus, von Soden’s is selective in its details<sup>299</sup>. Nevertheless, it is another thing to say that at the macro-level, von Soden’s textual apparatus cannot be used by Hodges & Farstad (1982 & 1985) to construct a viable Majority Text or Robinson & Pierpont (1991 & 2005) to construct a viable Majority Byzantine Text, which in practice will generally be the same; and in both instances, generally deviate from the Received Text in the same places in Matthew to Jude.

Like Hembd, Moorman is critical of von Soden for similar reasons of a limited manuscript count. Moorman has clearly gone into further study of the matter than Hembd, although with all due respect to him, *not enough study*. Moorman considers “the hard core of von Soden’s work is in ... 414 ... MSS [manuscripts],” focusing on “his I category, which is basically the Byzantine Text with varying amounts of corruption. A far smaller number are of the Alexandrian (H) Text. And he ... cites ... about 55 K [Koine] or Byzantine MSS [manuscripts].” In “the Gospels, he cites” “8” + “4” + “300” (e.g., the “300” are from, “Kx” group) “Byzantine (K) MSS” (manuscripts), plus “Kr”

---

<sup>297</sup> Moorman’s *When the KJV Departs from the ‘Majority’ Text*, *op. cit.*, p. 9; quoting Hoskier (JTS, 15-1914, p. 307), though applying Hoskier’s words as a general comment on the integrity of von Soden’s work in favour of his own views that the true “Majority Text” or “traditional Text” is the Received Text of the AV.

<sup>298</sup> Moffatt says, “The text from which the present translation has been made approximates to that of H. von Soden of Berlin, whose critical edition of the Greek New Testament ... appeared during the first decade of this [20th] century. ... I have added a few notes, principally in order to explain my departures from it. But they are deliberately few” (“Introduction,” to the Moffatt Bible, 1935 p. xliii).

<sup>299</sup> E.g., see von Soden on I John 5:7,8, *infra*.

and “Kc” which Moorman says has “? MSS” i.e., he does not know how many manuscripts. This is a rather curious admission given the importance of these figures as to how large the wider K group is! Moorman considers that “in Acts to Jude” (the Apostolos), von Soden cites in the K group only 25 manuscripts (“9” from “K”+ “4” from “Kc” + “4” from “Kr”). “Remember also,” continues Moorman, “the Majority Text Edition does not take into consideration the 2,143 lectionary MSS [manuscripts] (40% of total Greek MSS), nor the vast field of Patristic and Versional evidence. Thus it is only with the greatest exaggeration that Hodges and Farstad can claim to revise the Received Text on the basis of a *majority* of MSS!<sup>300</sup>.”

Of course, as one who considers that it is possible to reconstruct the representative Byzantine text from a reasonable sample of Byzantine manuscripts, and use it as one’s starting point, even if the representative Byzantine Text of Acts to Jude was so constructed on about two dozen Byzantine manuscripts, then I would regard that as perfectly valid. This is an ample number of good Byzantine manuscripts for a requisitely gifted and talented person to construct a representative Byzantine text from that has fundamental integrity. Thereafter, issues of textual analysis by a requisitely gifted and talented neo-Byzantine textual analyst would be relevant as to the composition of the *Textus Receptus* (TR), although in the vast majority of instances there is no clear and obvious textual problem with the representative Byzantine text which then, as a general though not absolute rule, becomes the TR.

But are Moorman’s figures correct? E.g., von Soden’s ε (“evangelien” = gospels) manuscripts i.e., just the Gospels, alone has over 1400 manuscripts in it, most of which are Byzantine. Admittedly von Soden’s “Kc” group is quite small, consisting of two Byzantine manuscripts<sup>301</sup>, and three otherwise unclassified manuscripts outside of von Soden’s system<sup>302</sup>. But his “Kr” group is much larger. (There is some doubt as to what grouping a small number of von Soden’s manuscripts are meant by him to belong to with regard to the Kr group<sup>303</sup>.) In the Gospels (a small number are different outside of the Gospels e.g., 1637 is Kr group in the Gospels & I b group in Acts), it consists of 98

---

<sup>300</sup> Moorman, J.A., *When the KJV Departs from the “Majority” Text*, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-15. On my figures, *infra*, von Soden’s “H” group contains *c.* 85 manuscripts, and of these, *c.* 5 % are completely Byzantine, *c.* 1% is Byzantine only in specific parts, and *c.* 94% are non-Byzantine.

<sup>301</sup> Minuscules 223 & 1859.

<sup>302</sup> Minuscules 1405, 1753, & 2115.

<sup>303</sup> Aland (*Kurzgefasste*, *op. cit.*) asks if von Soden includes 1323 (von Soden’s ε 1268) (Byzantine), 1658 (von Soden’s ε 1509) (otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden’s system), or 1990 (von Soden’s ε 1171) (otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden’s system), in his Kr group?

Byzantine manuscripts<sup>304</sup>, of which one is Byzantine only in specific parts, and 73 manuscripts otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden's system<sup>305</sup>. More widely i.e., Gospels & Epistles, von Soden's Kr group contains 211 manuscripts, of which c. 209 or 99% are Byzantine, with c. 189 or c. 89.5% being completely Byzantine, c. 20 or c. 9.5% being Byzantine only in parts, and 2 or c. 1% being outside the closed class of sources<sup>306</sup>. Applying these wider Kr subgroup figures as projections to the 73 otherwise unclassified gospel manuscripts, means that 89.5% or 65 of these gospel manuscripts are completely Byzantine. Thus the total number of completely Byzantine text Gospel manuscripts in Kr is c. 171 (98 + 73 = 171). *Even if von Soden used ONLY this Kr group in the Gospels of c. 171 manuscripts, this would still dwarf the number of Gospel manuscripts the 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantines used!*

Yet at an even more fundamental level, Moorman has gotten it wrong. Von Soden's textual apparatus has a residual feature. Where von Soden makes no reference to a reading in his Apparatus, this means it has the residual support of the manuscripts in his "K," "I," and "H" groups (if they cover this passage), or 90% + (ninety per cent plus i.e., 90% or more) of those manuscripts in that group that cover that particular reading<sup>307</sup>. Thus much of the text can be seen to be followed by all three of von Soden's groups i.e., by 90% + of the manuscripts in them that cover that reading. Moreover, if his apparatus says "add" for a reading, and von Soden then cites certain manuscripts, it means 90% + of the other manuscripts *not listed do not* have what he calls "add." Or if he says, "om (omit)," and then cites certain manuscripts, it means 90% + of the other manuscripts *not listed do have* this reading. This residual quality is one of the features that helps allow him to refer to so many manuscripts.

---

<sup>304</sup> Minuscules: 66, 83, 141, 147, 155, 167, 179, 189, 201, 246, 285, 290, 328, 361, 386, 387, 394, 479, 480, 510, 511, 520, 521, 547, 553, 586, 588, 634, 673, 685, 691, 696, 757, 758, 763, 769, 802, 806, 824, 845, 867, 897, 928, 936, 938, 953, 955, 958, 959, 960, 962, 1003, 1017, 1020, 1023, 1030, 1046, 1059, 1072, 1075, 1088, 1100, 1119, 1176, 1189, 1224, 1234, 1249, 1250, 1251 (Byzantine outside General Epistles), 1330, 1334, 1339, 1362, 1400, 1445, 1492, 1503, 1508, 1543, 1548, 1572, 1614, 1617, 1619, 1622, 1628, 1636, 1637, 1649, 1656, 1725, 1732, 1749, 1752, 1855, 1856, & 2175.

<sup>305</sup> Minuscules: 56, 252, 363, 444, 486, 676, 940, 986, 1040, 1092, 1095, 1111, 1117, 1131, 1132, 1133, 1140, 1145, 1158, 1165, 1180, 1329, 1348, 1401, 1427, 1461, 1462, 1465, 1480, 1487, 1488, 1489, 1491, 1493, 1496, 1501, 1550, 1551, 1552, 1559, 1560, 1576, 1584, 1591, 1596, 1600, 1601, 1609, 1620, 1621, 1624, 1625, 1630, 1633, 1634, 1638, 1650, 1653, 1659, 1667, 1680, 1698, 1700, 1705, 1713, 1779, 1785, 1865, 2124, 2235, 2253, 2255, & 2296.

<sup>306</sup> See commentary at Matt. 20:15c, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," "The First Matter."

<sup>307</sup> See Von Soden's Vol. I, I [= Vol. 1 of his 4 volumes], pp. 102-289 (section 18).

This residual quality is nevertheless subject to *an important qualification*, already referred to. *Where the support for a different reading is quite small, i.e., c. 10% or less of his manuscripts, von Soden may not refer to it.* E.g., at Matt. 14:3 “*Philippou* (Phillip)” is omitted in the leading Western Text, D 05, found in von Soden’s Ia in the Gospels (as δ5). Yet his apparatus makes no reference to this omission.

Or at Matt. 14:23, von Soden’s main text reads “*kat’ idian* (‘with himself,’ preposition *kata* + accusative<sup>308</sup> = ‘with’ + ‘himself’ i.e., ‘apart,’ AV),” and von Soden’s textual apparatus makes no reference to the minor variant of D 05 (von Soden’s δ5) which has “*kath*” rather than “*kat*.” In Greek, before a vowel, the “*t*” (tau) of *kat*’ may become a “*th*” (theta), e.g., in Acts 9:31 we read of “the churches” “throughout (*kath*’) all (*oles*) Judea and Galilee and Samaria,” this being the *kath* (kata)-*ol* (olos)-ic (English suffix derived from the French) / *catholic* churches created from the command of Acts 1:8, to be “witnesses” “in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria” i.e., the “catholic (Greek *katholikos* from *katholou*; from *kata* / *kat*’ / *kath* + *olos* / *holos*)” or “universal” church of the *Apostles’ & Nicene Creeds*. Importantly, von Soden’s textual apparatus makes no reference to this minor variant found in D 05 (not affecting English translation) here at Matt. 14:23. *Therefore, on the one hand, one can confidently use von Soden’s textual apparatus to say that 90% plus of the manuscripts in his groups read “kat” at Matt. 14:23 i.e., the way Pierpont & Robinson use von Soden’s textual apparatus for his “K” group; but on the other hand, one could not with confidence use von Soden’s textual apparatus to construct the detail of e.g., D 05, the leading Western Text.*

*Thus the residual element of von Soden’s textual apparatus is subject to the important qualification that it may omit reference to a variant not well attested to.* This same qualification may also apply to the selection of readings he shows for a variant i.e., there might be a relatively small number of additional manuscripts i.e., less than 10%, supporting this variant that he does not refer to. E.g., at I John 5:7,8, von Soden gives only two Greek manuscripts with the TR’s correct reading (if I omit reference to minor differences), and both are in his K (Koine) group. Given that c. 96.5 % of von Soden’s “K” group is either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, i.e., c. 93% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine, c. 3.5% are Byzantine only in specific parts, and c. 3.5% are non-Byzantine, *infra*, one might *prima facie* think there is a good chance that both of von Soden’s selections are Byzantine. But upon closer inspection, one finds that of this limited selection he makes, both are non-Byzantine, i.e., Minuscules 629 (von Soden’s α 460 in his K group, 14th century, independent text type) and 61 (von Soden’s δ 603 in his K x group, 16th century, Byzantine in Gospels & Acts, independent elsewhere). (Furthermore both go on to omit other words from the TR immediately after these words.) Even putting aside the issue of the Latin support for this reading, none of which von Soden refers to; what of e.g., the support for the TR’s text in the marginal reading of Byzantine Minuscule 221 (von Soden’s α 69 in his I c2 group)? Why does he not also

---

<sup>308</sup> Greek, “*idian* (himself),” is a feminine singular accusative adjective, from *idios* (one’s own); although the combined terminology = “apart” (AV).

mention its presence in Minuscules 88 (von Soden's  $\alpha$  200 in his I a1 group), 429 (von Soden's  $\alpha$  398 in his I b1 group &  $\alpha$  1471 in his K group), or 918 (von Soden's O66)?

The point that emerges from I John 5:7,8 is thus clear. On the one hand, one can confidently use von Soden's textual apparatus to say that 90% + of the manuscripts in his three groups do not have the I John 5:7,8 reading; and that at least two of them do. But one cannot confidently say that there are not a relatively small number of other manuscripts in his system that support the reading and which he has not referred to. *Therefore, on the one hand, one can confidently use von Soden's textual apparatus to say that 90% plus (i.e., 90% or more) of the manuscripts in his groups omit these key words at I John 5:7,8 i.e., the way Pierpont & Robinson (von Soden's K group) or Hodges & Farstad (von Soden's K & I groups) use von Soden's textual apparatus to construct their text; but on the other hand, one could not with confidence use von Soden's textual apparatus to construct the manuscript detail of minority readings of e.g., I John 5:7,8. (On this particular reading we know from other sources that the Greek manuscript support in the codices and minuscules for I John 5:7,8 is in fact less than 1%. But if we only had von Soden's apparatus, it would be unwise to go beyond saying "about 10% or less" have it.)*

This general residual feature of von Soden's textual apparatus for his "K," "I," and "H," groups, which allows one to know what 90% + of the manuscripts in his system say, even though it does not allow one to know all minor variants in his manuscripts, is thus an important feature that Moorman has failed to recognize in his "critique" of von Soden. Thus because Robinson & Pierpont are only interested in one of these three groups, the "K" group, they note in their "Introduction" (2005), "Where von Soden makes no statement regarding" his "K" (Koine) group, "his main text represents the Byzantine reading." I.e., (if they all cover that passage,) it has the support of *c.* 885 or more (i.e., 90% +) K group Byzantine manuscripts! (And though Robinson & Pierpont do not consider von Soden's "I" group, if no reference was made to the "I" group, it would also have the support of the more than 2/3rds Byzantine manuscripts in the "I" group i.e., if they all cover that passage about a further *c.* 330-370 + Byzantine manuscripts<sup>309</sup>; or residually parts thereof not referred to in the "I" group manuscripts cited in his apparatus.)

Due to the fragmentary nature of so many manuscripts, probably the count would rarely, if ever, be this high for a given reading. Nevertheless, the salient point remains that where Moorman thinks von Soden has only consulted a small number of manuscripts itemized in his textual apparatus, and the others were not considered "individually," so that von Soden made only "a cursory sampling"<sup>310</sup>, Moorman is wrong. In fact, there

---

<sup>309</sup> There are *c.* 530 manuscripts in the "I" group, of which *c.* 410 are Byzantine (including those Byzantine only in parts,) and *c.* 370 completely Byzantine. 90% + of this *c.* 370-410 range is thus *c.* 330-370 + Byzantine manuscripts.

<sup>310</sup> Moorman, J.A., *When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text*, *op. cit.*, pp. 14,15.

would be some hundreds of Byzantine manuscripts in support of the reading from the “K” group isolated by Robinson & Pierpont (and also in the “I” group not consulted by Robinson & Pierpont), and von Soden is saying in his apparatus that 90% + of them read *the same thing*, so he does not itemize them. I.e., when von Soden shows some split in the “K” group which Moorman recognizes to be small, e.g., the Kr or Kc subgroup, the other K groups not specifically itemized residually go with the alternative reading (as do the other Byzantine manuscripts in the “I” group not itemized).

Moorman refers in support for his claims to Hodges & Farstad’s reference to Luke 22:30 in von Soden<sup>311</sup>. With regard to the reading, “*en* (in) *te* (the) *basileia* (kingdom) *mou* (of me),” i.e., “in my kingdom” (AV). Hodges & Farstad here say this terminology “was omitted in 10 of the 13 manuscripts from Kx which von Soden examined,” and “this” “sample” “is” “much too small.” From this, Moorman draws a more general conclusion about what he calls “von Soden’s fractional use of the materials,” and says, “In the light of this admission, we wonder why the project was undertaken at all!”<sup>312</sup>,

But if we look at von Soden’s textual apparatus for “*en te bas. mou*” here at Luke 22:30, it reads, “*om*[it] *εν τη βασι. μου*” in “K” group, contrary to “Kx 3:10.” I.e., “3:10” here means “3” manuscripts in Kx have this reading, whereas “10” manuscripts in Kx do not. Thus Hodges & Farstad say that 10 of the 13 manuscripts von Soden examined in his Kx group omit it. *But one cannot, like Moorman, draw a general conclusion about the number of manuscripts von Soden uses for his reading, when he here, very specifically says “3:10.” I.e., Hodges & Farstad only know that von Soden here consulted just 13 of the Kx manuscripts because he specifically says so. But if such symbols have any meaning, it follows that when von Soden does not usually say so, then this is not the case. Moorman misses this vital point, and tries to extrapolate the “3:10” statement here at Luke 22:30 more generally, i.e., when von Soden does not make such a qualification in his textual apparatus (which is more commonly the case).*

Moorman quotes approvingly of Wisse who says, “Once the extent of error is seen, the word ‘inaccuracy’ becomes a euphemism. Of the 99 checked MSS [manuscripts], 76 [von Soden references] were missing one or more times when they should have been cited<sup>313</sup>.” Even if, we *prima facie* accept that this was a valid check by Wisse (a matter which is itself *in dubio, infra*), Wisse and Moorman are wrong to thereby conclude these were “errors” in von Soden. I.e., like Pierpont in Green’s textual Apparatus, they in fact simply failed to recognize the generalist nature of von Soden’s group symbols. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that von Soden may give *some* examples of a variant, but not *all* examples; or he may give no example of a variant, that may have up to *c.* 10% support. Though a more detailed study of Wisse is beyond the

<sup>311</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13, referring to Hodges & Farstad (1985), Introduction, p. xii.

<sup>312</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13.

<sup>313</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11; quoting Frederick Wisse’s *Profile Method*, pp. 16,17.

scope of this work, I note that Moorman also says Wisse “profiled upwards of 1385” manuscripts in his critique of von Soden<sup>314</sup>. This immediately strikes me as incredulous, since to locate this number of manuscripts has only ever been done directly by von Soden’s team of about 40 research assistants. The effect of this claim is thus to cast doubt upon the more general credulity of Wisse’s research claims.

Furthermore, where a much smaller number of comparisons than this alleged “1385” manuscripts check are done, e.g., Wisse’s “99 checked” figure, this may prove to be a case of comparing another textual apparatuses with von Soden’s. This presumably was Wisse’s methodology for most, if not all, of “the 99” he “checked.” Given the lack of credibility in the “1385” manuscripts figure, we must question the veracity of the “99 checked” figure also. Nevertheless, I would accept this number would otherwise be inside the limits of possibility, particularly if Wisse used a combination of textual apparatuses coupled with some direct checking of a more limited number of manuscripts. But if one is comparing von Soden’s textual apparatus with others, one cannot assume that it is von Soden’s textual apparatus that has the error, since it may be the non-von Soden apparatus that is in error i.e., in every such instance, one would have to consult the underpinning manuscript itself to know.

Let us consider a very limited number of examples just to make this basic point about the residual feature, and some other features, in von Soden’s textual apparatus. (The interested reader may find many more such examples himself.)

Part of the difficulty in working through von Soden’s textual apparatus is understanding his symbols. E.g., the symbol, “]” means “at” in the sense of, “instead of;” and as in other apparatuses “c” is used for a manuscript “corrector.” E.g., at Matt. 20:26, “εστω ] εσται2 ... Ηδ2c” means, reading “εστω” (*estō* = ‘let him be,’ present tense) instead of the 2nd “εσται” (*estai* = ‘he shall be,’ future tense) in von Soden’s main text at that verse (his textual apparatus is unintelligible without his associated bad main text), in the “H” group, manuscript “δ2” (which in von Soden’s symbols = Gregory number κ 01 = the Alexandrian’s Codex Sinaiticus) by the hand of a “corrector” (“c”).

I have sought to include enough information in these Preface sections for the interested and careful reader, to get a general understanding of von Soden’s textual apparatus if that is what he wishes to do. (By which I also mean looking up relevant references I make to various works in the footnotes e.g., Aland’s *Kurzgefasste*.)

At Matt. 1:6, the second occurrence of the TR’s Greek words, “o (the) *basileus* (king),” in the words, “David the king begat Solomon,” is omitted in von Soden’s main text. The footnote says, “I add ο βασιλευς p δε2 (6a) **K** gg **H** δ1-2 01 bo **I** a 133 η l exc b1211 c226 φb1413\* r253 κ c329 r77f ’70 pa sy af g (1013) l”.

Let us consider this in further detail. “l” at the beginning and end is a “paragraph” type marker dividing one reading from another. “add *o basileus* p [Latin

---

<sup>314</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13.

‘post’ = after] *de* 2 [the second ‘*de*’ / ‘and’ in this verse] 6a [i.e., Matt. 1:6a] **K**” i.e., this has the support of at least 90% of the “K” group manuscripts i.e., c. 885 manuscripts plus, and thus the representative Byzantine text.

Next we read, “gg [German ‘*gegen*’ = ‘contrary to’] those manuscripts not containing these words. These so omitting “*o* (the) *basileus* (king),” are then itemized in the “H” group as: “δ1-2” i.e., B 03 (Rome Vaticanus, 4th century; major Alexandrian text; von Soden’s δ1 in his H group), Aleph 01 (London Sinaiticus, 4th century; major Alexandrian text; von Soden’s δ2 in his H group), “01” i.e., Papyri 1 (von Soden’s ε 01 in his H group), “bo” i.e., the Coptic Bohairic Version; and in the “I” group: “Iα133” i.e., 700 (11th century, independent text; von Soden’s ε 133 in his Iα group); “η” i.e., in his Iη group, Minuscules eap1 (12th century, independent text in Gospels, von Soden’s δ254, his Iηa group in the Gospels), 22 (12th century, otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden’s system, von Soden’s ε 288 in his Iηb group), 118 (13th century, otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden’s system, von Soden’s ε 346 in his Iηb group), 131 (14th century, otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden’s system, von Soden’s ε 467 in his Iη group), 205 (15th century, independent in Gospels, von Soden’s δ500, his Iη group in the Gospels), 209 (14th century in independent Gospels, von Soden’s δ457, his Iηb group in the Gospels), 697 (13th century, otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden’s system, von Soden’s ε 1389 in his Iη group), 872 (12th century, otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden’s system, von Soden’s ε 203 in his Iηb group), 924 (13th century, Byzantine text, von Soden’s ε 1355 in his Iη group), 1005 (12th century, otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden’s system, von Soden’s ε 1263 in his Iη group), 1192 (11th century, otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden’s system, von Soden’s ε 1115 in his Iηb group), 1210 (11th century, otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden’s system, von Soden’s ε 1198 in his Iηb group), 1278 (12th century, otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden’s system, von Soden’s ε 277 in his Iη group), 1582 (11th century, independent in Gospels, von Soden’s ε 183 in his Iηa group), & 2193 (10th / 11th century, independent, von Soden’s ε 1131 in his Iηa group).

Next after “η” at Matt. 1:6, von Soden’s apparatus reads, “l exc [Latin ‘*exceptus*’ = ‘except’] b1211 c226” i.e., von Soden’s Il group except for 124 (12th century, otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden’s system, von Soden’s ε 1211 in his I lb group) and 346 (12th century, independent text, von Soden’s ε 226 in his I lc group). These are Minuscules: 13 (13th century, independent text, von Soden’s ε 368 in his I lc group), 69 (15th century, von Soden’s δ505, his I lb group in the Gospels), 174 (11th century, otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden’s system, von Soden’s ε 109 in his I lb group), 230 (11th century, otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden’s system, von Soden’s ε 173 in his I lc group), 543 (12th century, independent text, von Soden’s ε 257 in his I lc group), 826 (12th century, independent text, von Soden’s ε 218 in his I lc group), 828 (12th century, independent text, von Soden’s ε 219 in his I lc group), 983 (12th / 13th century, independent text, von Soden’s ε 3017 in his I la group), & 1689 (10th century, otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden’s system, von Soden’s ε 1054 in his I la group).

Next after “l exc b1211 c226” at Matt. 1:6, von Soden’s apparatus reads, “ϕb1413\*.” An asterisk, “\*,” denotes the original reading in a manuscript that has since been changed by one or more “correctors<sup>315</sup>.” This is 1391 (14th century, otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden’s system, von Soden’s ε 1413 in his I ϕb group). Next the apparatus reads, “r253” i.e., 71 (12th century, otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden’s system, von Soden’s ε 253 in his I ϕr group). Next the apparatus reads, “κ c329” i.e., 482 (13th century, Byzantine Text, von Soden’s ε 329 in his I κc group).

Next the apparatus reads, “r77f” i.e., von Soden’s ε 77 = Lambda 039 (9th century, Byzantine Text, von Soden’s ε 77 in his I r group). However, in von Soden’s Vol. I. I, p. 129, he says of ε 77 that it is “vac[Latin “vacant”] Mt. Mk” i.e., this Gospel manuscript only contains Luke & John. So if it cannot possibly contain anything on Matt. 1:6, why does he mention it here? The answer lies in the following “f” after “r77.” Latin “folio” means “leaf,” and can carry the connotation of paging consecutively etc., i.e., the next after ε 77. Why then write it this way? This relates to a feature of some of von Soden’s groupings.

I.e., Von Soden wants to make the point that this manuscript is part of the ε 77 grouping, but the reader must check with his manuscript listings in order to realize that *on this particular occasion* ε 77 itself is not included because it only contains Luke & John. (This issue of fragmentary manuscripts is much wider in scope than just here e.g., he says ε 26 is “only” in St. Matthew’s Gospel<sup>316</sup>.) For certain groups, von Soden uses a system in which a series of f’s are used to denote a group e.g., Hδ48f means Hδ48 and 56, Hδ48ff means Hδ48 + 56 + 76, Hδ48ffff means Hδ48 + 56 + 76 + 1016 + 376. This is subject to the qualification already made with respect to one not being applicable if the manuscript does not cover the verse in question. In the Gospels, for von Soden’s Ir group, the manuscript after ε 77 is ε 1083<sup>317</sup>. This is Minuscule 1187 (11th century, Byzantine Text).

Next in the apparatus we read, “70”. This is Codex Gamma 036 (10th century, Byzantine text, von Soden’s ε 77 in his I’ group). Next we read “pa”. This is the Palestinian Lectionary. Next, “sy” is the Syriac. Then “af” is the African Latin Text<sup>318</sup>. Then “g” is old Latin gl.

Finally (before the paragraph bar “|” ending this section,) we read, “(1013).” The brackets denote a similar reading with minor differences. Thus Minuscule 411 (10th century, Byzantine Text, von Soden’s ε 1013 in his Kx group) agrees, with minor

---

<sup>315</sup> Von Soden’s Vol. I. III. B, p. 2179 (See \* & “c” for corrector).

<sup>316</sup> Von Soden’s Vol. I. II. p. 957 (German, “*nur*” in “nur Mt” = only, i.e., “only Matthew”).

<sup>317</sup> Von Soden’s Vol. II, p. xv.

<sup>318</sup> Von Soden’s Vol. I. III. B, p. 2179 (last three symbols).

differences, in omitting, “the king.” To the question, “What are the minor differences?” the answer is, “We do not know.” Sometimes von Soden gives the detail for his classification of a minor difference (e.g., Matt. 2:6; Mark 3:12; 11:13), or part detail (e.g., Mark 4:11), and sometimes no specific detail (e.g., Mark 8:32; 9:36). To give the reader an idea of the type of thing meant by “minor differences,” I refer to the relevant sections of Mark 8:32; 9:36; where von Soden likewise gives no detail, but I am able to consult the Latin to determine what that difference actually is. At Mark 8:32 von Soden says, “... *auto* ... (lat) ...”. Greek “*auto* (him),” in, “Peter took him” (AV), is a masculine singular dative pronoun from *autos*; whereas in the Latin this reads, “*eum* (him),” which is a masculine singular accusative pronoun, from *is* (masculine form in masculine-feminine-neuter forms of *is-ea-id*). Or at Mark 9:36, at the reading for the first “*auto* (‘him,’ a neuter singular accusative pronoun, from *autos*),” in “and set him in the midst” (AV), von Soden reads for a variant, “*auton* ... (lat).” Greek “*auton* (him),” is a masculine singular accusative pronoun, from *autos*; and in the Vulgate and old Latin ff2, f, q, l, & c (manifested in the Clementine) this is Latin “*eum* (him),” *supra*; but in old Latin a, b, d, i, f, aur, this is Latin, “*illum* (‘that [one]’),” a masculine singular accusative pronoun, from *ille*. Thus in the case of Mark 9:36, von Soden means the Latin is the same as the Greek in that it is masculine rather than neuter gender, and by *minor differences* von Soden means the Latin is, “that one (*illum*),” rather than “him (Greek, *auton*; Latin *eum*).” But without consulting the Greek and Latin texts at Mark 9:36, one would only know that there were Latin manuscripts agreeing with the Greek reading *auton*, but with minor differences. However, since I do not have direct access to copies of most of the Greek manuscripts von Soden used, precisely what he means at e.g., Matt. 1:6b by a *minor difference* in his ε 1013 following the reading that omits “the king,” is not something I am able to determine.

We have taken multiple pages to “unpack” what in von Soden’s textual apparatus is c. 1½ lines at Matt. 1:6. *And we have not unpacked it fully*, since I have, for the sake of brevity, omitted reference to von Soden’s generalist information on the manuscripts e.g., their locations *et al*<sup>319</sup>. It is thus clear from this reading at Matt. 1:6, in Von Soden’s Vol. II, that von Soden’s textual apparatus requires a lot of “unpacking” from its short statement, “I add ο βασιλευς ρ δε2 (6a) **K** gg **H** δ1-2 01 bo **I** a 133 η l exc b1211 c226 φb1413\* r253 κ c329 r77f ’70 pa sy af g (1013) l”. The unwary reader could e.g., easily trip up and think “r77f” was indicating that Lambda 039 (von Soden’s ε 77 in his I r group) was following this reading, when in fact the manuscript listings at Vol. I. I, p. 129 indicate this is not so. *But even now, the unpacking is not entirely complete*. Lest we fall upon the same rock that Moorman fell upon, i.e., there is also the residual element of von Soden’s 90% + of the non-itemized manuscripts in the “I” and “H” groups *that include this reading*.

Let us now consider this data with reference to the work of Robinson & Pierpont and Hodges & Farstad. For the majority Byzantine Text of Robinson & Pierpont (1991 & 2005) at Matt. 1:6, von Soden’s “**K**” group support would be as far as they would go. This means 90% + of the K group that includes Matt. 1:6, has the reading, “the king.”

<sup>319</sup> Von Soden’s Vol. I,I, pp. 38-39, 102-289.

With such overwhelming Byzantine Text support in the “K” group, their representative Byzantine text reads, “*o basileus*”. Additionally, unlike their 1991 edition, their 2005 edition which has a textual apparatus at the bottom referring to differences between their text and the NU Text, states that these words are omitted in the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993).

On the one hand, Hodges & Farstad say, “the generalized data” they use from “the other sources” they consulted, “such as Tischendorf or Legg” “were of little value.” “In the final analysis, if” their “edition was to be produced ... the statements of von Soden usually had to be accepted. However, where” the Hodges & Farstad “text differs from what von Soden considered the common (Koine) reading, it should be assumed that it is due to further research, or [due] to conflicting data within von Soden’s volumes<sup>320</sup>.” Thus one cannot assume that Hodges & Farstad’s Majority Text will necessarily be the same as von Soden’s “K” group i.e., necessarily the same as Robinson & Pierpont’s majority text which is based on von Soden’s “K” group (in Matt. – Jude). But on the other hand, on the basis of what I have seen in St. Matthew’s Gospel (Matt. 1-28), in practice, the majority text of Hodges & Farstad based on von Soden’s “K” and “I” groups is generally same as the majority text of Robinson & Pierpont based on von Soden’s “K” group.

For the “K” and “I” group based Majority Text of Hodges & Farstad (1982 & 1985) at Matt. 1:6, there is a clear consensus between the (more than 90% Byzantine) “K” group and (more than 2/3rds Byzantine) “I” group, which either individually or combined dwarf the size of the H group. It is clear that while the “I” group (like the “H” group) shows some support for the variant reading that omits “*o (the) basileus (king)*,” that support for this reading could not be said to “defect” in “substantial” numbers, and so Hodges and Farstad give the “*o (the) basileus (king)*” reading a large German, “M,” signifying that their Majority Text reading has “concurrence with all Majority Text subgroups.” After this they include “C” i.e., (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century, *Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus*), one of the four unicals of special interest to Hodges & Farstad (the other three are “A,” “X,” & “B,” *infra*). This is von Soden’s δ3; and while its absence from von Soden’s textual apparatus means *there is a very good chance* it is in the residual 90% plus group that includes the reading, “*o (the) basileus (king)*,” von Soden’s textual apparatus is still *too general* to be entirely confident of this. One cannot safely use it to reconstruct specific non-itemized manuscripts because one never knows if that manuscript is or is not in the 90% + residual group. Von Soden’s textual apparatus is good, but not *that* good (see e.g., comments on D 05, von Soden’s δ5, *supra*). It is broadly generalist where it is not specific in its itemizations, and therefore it is to be hoped that with their “C” footnote readings, and also their footnote readings for “A” (*Codex Alexandrinus*, A02, Byzantine in its incomplete Gospels, non-Byzantine elsewhere; von Soden’s δ4), that Hodges & Farstad relied upon something better than von Soden for determining these when they are not specifically itemized by him. (Of course, even if they did not, with the consequence that some of their “A” and “C” readings would quite possibly be wrong, that would not invalidate the general text

<sup>320</sup> Hodges & Farstad’s “Introduction,” p. xxiii; cf. Preface, p. vi.

constructed on their principles, since what is one or two lone manuscripts among so many?) Of special interest to Hodges & Farstad are also the two leading Alexandrian texts, von Soden's  $\delta 2$  (London Sinaiticus,  $\aleph$  / Aleph 01), their " $\aleph$ " and von Soden's  $\delta 1$  (Rome Vaticanus, B 03), their "B." Hence they show these at Matt. 1:6 omitting "*o* (the *basileus* (king))"<sup>321</sup>.

As per usual (in Matt.–Jude), the Majority Byzantine Text methodology of Pierpont and Robinson thus achieves the same reading as the Majority Text methodology of Hodges & Farstad. The existence of such overwhelming support for the "*o* (the *basileus* (king))" reading, means the variant is not even mentioned in Green's Textual Apparatus (1986). Under normal circumstances, at a passage like Matt. 1:6, I would simply consult Pierpont & Robinson, Hodges & Farstad, and Green's Textual Apparatus, i.e., consult von Soden in this second hand manner, without making any direct or first hand consultation of von Soden<sup>322</sup>.

---

<sup>321</sup> Hodges & Farstad's "Introduction," e.g., pp. vi, xvi, xxi.

<sup>322</sup> I shall not now go through any more examples of decoding von Soden's textual apparatus, although the interested reader will find two more modest instances of Luke 24:27,29 in Aland *et unum*, *The Text of the NT* (1987), *op. cit.*, pp. 41-3 (cf. p. 23). In what appears to be a desire to promote his own Nestle-Aland textual apparatus, Aland engages in an *overkill* of von Soden that at times smacks of pettiness. E.g., he says, "The system of symbols designed by von Soden ... makes his edition almost impossible to use," and "von Soden's edition was distinctly a failure" (*Ibid.*, p. 23). As one who thinks so highly of von Soden's textual apparatus, that I photocopied the Sydney University copy (Fisher Library 225.48 / 36) of von Soden's four volumes (at c. 90% reduction for A4 size sheets) on double-sided sheets, and then had the four volumes individually comb-bound with covers, I could never accept that it is "a failure," and consider Aland has too limited a view of "success." In saying this, I certainly admit that the symbols von Soden used could be improved upon; the main text he produced was not a good one, and his associated "K" "I" "H" textual theory needs to be criticized; and an edition with an English translation of the German and an Appendix with Gregory conversion charts is long overdue. Or Aland says von Soden's references to Minuscules 1582 and 2193 at Luke 24:27 "are inaccurate," since "in both" of these "only the first hand attests" to the reading. While Aland might have referred to the fact that von Soden should have put an asterisk next to these minuscules (so indicating this), it is too much to say that they "are inaccurate," since von Soden does in fact show the original reading of these minuscules. Likewise, Aland appears to have selected Luke 24:29 to help make his point of "errors" in von Soden's apparatus, saying that von Soden's "...  $\beta$  ... c1349 ..." i.e., Minuscule 1579, which is von Soden's  $\epsilon$  1349 in his I $\beta$ b group, is "a typographical error" since it should read, "...  $\beta$  ... b1349 ...". Nevertheless, this is a minor matter, and the correction can be made easily enough once looks the Minuscule up, since von Soden clearly classifies it in his I $\beta$ b group (Von Soden's Vol. I. IIA, p. 1147). Aland fails to say that this is a minor matter, easily corrected, and so makes a mountain out of a mole-hill here. Furthermore, on the one hand, Aland says that the unusual place von Soden has transposed to certain non-TR Greek words found in London Sinaiticus but not Rome Vaticanus, where he places them in a different position in brackets at Luke

This means that there may be manuscript +support for a reading that I do not refer to. E.g., for the purposes of this Volume 2 section, going through my Volume 1 variants to find some interesting examples of this, I took a comprehensive look at von Soden's readings for "*karpous* (fruits) *axious* (meet)" at Matt. 3:8 and "*eklelumenoi* (fainted)" at Matt. 9:36. These are both minority Byzantine readings where the commentary could benefit from knowledge of any extra Byzantine manuscripts supporting them.

In von Soden's textual apparatus at Matt. 3:8 I found that in addition to showing this reading inside the closed class of source for U 030 (Byzantine text; von Soden's ε 90 in his Io group) and old Latin a; and outside the closed class of sources, both the Syriac (von Soden's "sy") and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (von Soden's Ta), there were some further references of interest. In his "H" group, it is followed by 33 (non Byzantine, 9th century, von Soden's δ 48) and L 019 (non Byzantine, 8th century, von Soden's δ 48f = ε 56). In his "I" group, it is followed by 28 (Byzantine outside Mark; 11th century, von Soden's ε 168 in his Ia group), 828 (non-Byzantine, 12th century, von Soden's ε 219 in his Ilc group), 1675 (otherwise unclassified, 14th century, von Soden's ε 1444 in his Iϕa group), 267 (Byzantine, 12th century, von Soden's ε 1289 in his Iϕb group), 1010 (Byzantine, 12th century, von Soden's ε 1266 in his Iϕc group), 1194 (otherwise unclassified, 10th century, von Soden's ε 1094 in his Iϕr group), 726 (otherwise unclassified, 13th century, von Soden's ε 384 in his Ikb group), and 998 (Byzantine, 12th century, von Soden's ε 1385 in his I' group). (As well as the Palestinian Lectionary, von Soden's "pa.") He also shows the reading supported by the ancient church Latin writer, Tertullian (d. after 220) (von Soden's "Tert"). The residual element of von Soden's apparatus means that where the manuscripts cover this verse, c. 90% + of those in his "K," "H," and "I" groups follow the reading in his main text i.e., the majority Byzantine reading which is "*karpon* (fruit) *axion* (meet)."

Therefore of particular interest to the commentary at Matt. 3:8, inside the closed class of sources, this Received Text reading is additionally supported by a further four Byzantine Minuscules, and one ancient church writer, that I did not refer to in Volume 1. Thus having now so undertaken this work for the purposes of this Preface in Volume 2

---

24:27, "is inexplicable." But on the other hand, the very existence of these Alexandrian School added words for any good reason at Luke 24:27 is inexplicable, and for those following the religiously liberal "reconstruction" textual theories of von Soden, and which here have an inflated view of London Sinaiticus and display the common dilemma of neo-Alexandrians as to what to do when Rome Vaticanus and London Sinaiticus disagree, really, this type of transposition nonsense of von Soden is par for the course, as seen in e.g., the transposition of whole verses and chapters throughout Moffatt's Bible. Rather than using this matter to simply criticize *the main text* of von Soden, which I agree should be criticized as a very bad text, Aland should link this to the wider problem of religious liberalism and "form criticism," something he does not wish to do for obvious reasons.

(Matt. 15-20), I shall include some of these references at Matt. 3:8 in the revised Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14). I.e., inside the closed class of sources: Minuscules 28, 267, 998, & 1010, and Tertullian; and outside the closed class of sources: Minuscules 33 & 828.

In von Soden's textual apparatus at Matt. 9:36, I also found that in addition to showing this reading in V 031 (Byzantine Codex, 9th century; von Soden's ε 75 in his K 1 group) and L 019 (non-Byzantine Codex, 8th century; von Soden's ε 56 in his H group); von Soden says he has it for his I φb group except for ε 1389 and ε 1441 (= 1606, otherwise unclassified, 14th century), but since ε 1389 = 697 in the Iη group, I take "1389" to be a misprint for ε "1289" in the Iφab group = 267 (Byzantine text, 12th century). Those that remain which therefore have this reading in the Iφa and Iφb groups, are thus Minuscule 1424 (9th / 10th century, non-Byzantine in Matthew and Luke; von Soden's δ 30); together with that which in the Iφa group that are unclassified outside of von Soden's system: 517 (11th century, von Soden's ε 167 in his Iφa group; also α 214 which is "K" group in Acts & Pauline Epistles, and Io2 group in Revelation), 954 (14th century, von Soden's ε 1454), 1675 (14th century, von Soden's ε 1444); and in that which in the Iφb group that are unclassified outside of von Soden's system: e7 (12th century, von Soden's ε 287), 659 (12th century, von Soden's ε 1216), 1402 (13th century, von Soden's ε 1333), and 1391 (14th century, von Soden's ε 1413). The reading is also found in Minuscules 1194 (otherwise unclassified, 10th century; von Soden's ε 1094 in his I φr group). Since c. 4/5ths of von Soden's "I" group is Byzantine if one includes those manuscripts that are Byzantine only in specific parts, and c. 2/3rds of von Soden's "I" group are completely Byzantine; *prima facie* I know that there is a good chance, but not a definite certainty, that a number of these "I" group Minuscules are Byzantine. But if so, which ones? Therefore I cannot specifically cite any of them at Matt. 9:36.

But at Matt. 9:36, there is one remaining Iφa group manuscript. This is *Byzantine Minuscule* 1188 (11th / 12th century, von Soden's ε 1114). Having done the hard decoding work for the reader, this still gives him an idea of how hard it can be to track down just one extra Byzantine manuscript. Thus if I had undertaken this long task for Volume 1, I could have included it in Volume 1. Having now so undertaken this work for Vol. 2, I shall include it at Matt. 9:36 in the revised Volume 1. No doubt if more of von Soden's apparatus was worked through, more Byzantine readings could be adduced. But as seen from this example of Matt. 9:36, one must first convert these over to their Gregory numbers, and have to work through a lot of readings one cannot use, and sometimes detect an apparatus error (misprint, *supra*), just to find one extra manuscript that one can use. At a practical level, time constraints mean this is not generally feasible. Hence my more normative reliance on other textual apparatuses (including works based on the source book of von Soden).

Generally I find Robinson & Pierpont and Hodges and Farstad to be in agreement. But less commonly, there is disagreement among textual apparatuses. E.g., when undertaking my work in Volume 1, I found that at Matt. 9:27 and Matt. 11:16,17, Green's Majority Text Textual Apparatus says the texts are split in the 50%-50% range as to whether or not the texts read "Yie" or "Yios" (Matt. 9:27) and "etairos (fellows) or "eterois (others)" (Matt. 11:16). Since in practice the majority text is a near synonym for

the majority Byzantine Text, this means the Byzantine Text is fairly evenly divided between these readings. Robinson and Pierpont's (1991) *The New Testament ... According to the Byzantine / Majority Textform* (1991), says "Yie" is the majority reading, and does not give "Yios" as an alternative reading (Matt. 9:27); and further says at Matt. 11:16 "etairois" is the majority reading, and does not give "eterois" as an alternative reading. By contrast, Hodges and Farstad's *Greek NT According to the Majority Text*, goes the other way at Matt. 9:27, putting *Yios* in the main text as the majority text reading, and saying that while there is a major textual division, the manuscripts favour *Yios* over *Yie*; and at Matt. 11:16 putting *eterois* in the main text, and saying that while there is a major textual division, the manuscripts favour *eterois* over *etairois*. Under the circumstances, the position of Green's Textual Apparatus is the safest.

Notably though, a number of changes have been made in Robinson & Pierpont's *The New Testament in the ... Byzantine Textform* (2005), including a statement at Matt. 11:17 that "the manuscripts comprising the Byzantine Textform are significantly divided" between "etairois" in their main text, and "eterois." So too, this same qualification has now been made for "Yios" at Matt. 9:27. This means that in their 2005 edition, they have arrived at the same conclusion that I autonomously arrived at using their 1991 edition in a critical manner with wider reference to both Hodges & Farstad and Green's Textual Apparatus. As a safety mechanism, I shall continue to consult all three when determining the representative Byzantine text, but also directly consulting the source book of von Soden's Textual Apparatus (1913) if and when I think it necessary.

Therefore, closer inspection of von Soden's apparatus acts to vindicate the usage of it by Robinson & Pierpont, Hodges & Farstad, and Green's Textual Apparatus, against the type of claims made by Moorman (who only specifically refers to Hodges & Farstad). *It is clear that e.g., Moorman has failed to properly understand the residual quality of von Soden's textual apparatus*, which means 90% + of his manuscripts that cover a given reading support that reading, even though they are not specifically itemized in the textual apparatus, or if e.g., the K group is referred to in the textual apparatus as a group with 90% + unity, then one may simply read, "K." (Even though, somewhat inconsistently, on another occasion, K variants may be given from the remaining portion of c. 10% or less of K manuscripts. Alas, like other textual apparatuses, von Soden's is selective in its finer details.) Thus throughout von Soden's textual apparatus one finds general references to the K group (e.g., at Matt. 1:6 for including "the king," *supra*, or Matt. 8:7 for including "Jesus<sup>323</sup>," or at Rom. 1:16 for including "of Christ").

---

<sup>323</sup> According to my notes, Matt. 8:7 is one of about 1½ dozen passages that I directly consulted von Soden on in Volume 1. (This is in addition to an early larger study I did on von Soden with respect to his usage of "Tatian's Diatessaron," through reference to Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, and Ephraem the Syrian.)

In Acts to Jude, von Soden consulted *c.* 600 manuscripts<sup>324</sup>. This compares with *c.* 1400 manuscripts which contain just the Gospel's alone, or a total of *c.* 1600 manuscripts in the Gospels (i.e., *c.* 190 NT manuscripts are included in both counts, consisting of *c.* 10 Evangelion Lectionaries and *c.* 180  $\delta$  manuscripts). I.e., a total of *c.* 2500 manuscripts. The fact that of von Soden's *c.* 2500 manuscripts, *c.* 600 of them or *c.* 24% contain Acts to Jude, (and not even that, since many are either just Acts & the General Epistles, or just the Pauline Epistles,) whereas *c.* 1600 of them or *c.* 64% of them contain the Gospels, reflects the bias that existed in both east and west for selected Scripture readings from the Gospels. For while neither the apostate eastern nor western churches formally denied the NT canonicity of Romans to Revelation, i.e., the way the Samaritans formerly denied the OT canonicity of Joshua to Malachi, nevertheless, in practice, what the people knew of Christianity from the Scriptures was largely made to consist in *selected readings* from the Gospels, with some further reference to Acts. This is part of the reason why the Protestant Reformation, with its focus on the Gospel of justification by faith as found in the Pauline Epistles of Romans, Galatians, and Ephesians, and its exposure of the Pope as Antichrist found in II Thess. 2 and I & II John in the first instance, and thereafter in the Book of Revelation (as well as Daniel in the OT), all seemed so radical, "strange," and (with an incomplete knowledge of even the Gospels,) "wrong," to both eastern and western churches, for whom the study of these New Testament Biblical books had been greatly neglected.

Nevertheless, this smaller number of *c.* 600 manuscripts for Acts to Jude, is still substantially higher than the one finds in Moorman's claim that von Soden effectively used 22 manuscripts for Acts to Jude. E.g., Moorman's basic claim, which focuses on von Soden's K group<sup>325</sup>, that manuscripts not itemized in von Soden's textual apparatus had not been "individually" consulted, is simply not correct<sup>326</sup>. It reflects a failure to understand von Soden's textual apparatus, which in fairness to Moorman, is at times a difficult and intricate device, requiring a skilled and patient operator to decode. (I shall defer detailed consideration of the Book of Revelation for a later commentary volume.)

Moorman (1988) discusses Hodges & Farstad's text (1982 & 1985) but not Robinson & Pierpont's Text (1991 & 2005) which first came out three years after he wrote his work (1988), nor Green's Textual Apparatus (1986) which came out 2 years before he wrote. But all of these texts generally agree on the reading to go in the main text of a majority text, other than where the texts are fairly evenly divided. Thus

---

<sup>324</sup> In addition to *c.* 180  $\delta$  (NT Matt-Jude or Matt. to Rev.) manuscripts, most of which are Byzantine, von Soden also lists just over 400  $\alpha$  (Acts-Jude) manuscripts.

<sup>325</sup> Moorman, J.A., *When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text*, *op. cit.*, pp. 14,15.

<sup>326</sup> In addition to *c.* 10 Greek Lectionaries and *c.* 180  $\delta$  ("diatheke" = NT Matt-Jude or Matt. to Rev.) manuscripts, most of which are Byzantine, von Soden also lists just over 400  $\alpha$  ("apostolos" = Acts-Jude, in practice many are either just Acts & the General Epistles, or just the Pauline Epistles).

Moorman's specific attack on the von Soden based Hodges & Farstad's (Matt. – Jude) majority text, is in substance, though not in form, a more general attack on all three of these von Soden based works (in Matt. – Jude). I.e., Moorman's real issue is with the source book of von Soden, and his attack on Hodges & Farstad is simply a derivative attack based on the fact that Hodges & Farstad have based their majority text on von Soden's data.

Given that Moorman claims, like Hodges & Farstad, to support the Majority Text, he should, at least in theory, be happy about the fact that Hodges & Farstad also focus on von Soden's "I" group (their focus is on his "K" and "I" groups for the purposes of determining their text), and Hodges & Farstad's footnotes clearly refers to von Soden's "H" group with special reference to the two leading Alexandrian Texts,  $\aleph$  (Aleph 01 = London Sinaiticus; von Soden's  $\delta 2$  in his H group) and B (B 03 = Rome Vaticanus; von Soden's  $\delta 1$  in his H group) as well as C (C 04 = Codex Ephraemis Rescriptus; von Soden's  $\delta 3$  in his H group) (and A = A 02 = Codex Alexandrinus; von Soden's  $\delta 5$  in his I ka group for its Byzantine text Gospels; and von Soden's  $\delta 5$  in his H group in its Alexandrian text Acts to Revelation). On my figures, *infra*, there are c. 530 manuscripts in von Soden's "I" group (270 also classified outside of von Soden's "I" group and 262 otherwise unclassified with respect to text type outside von Soden's system). Of these c. 78% of von Soden's I group is either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, i.e., c. 68% of I group manuscripts are completely Byzantine, 10% are Byzantine only in specific parts, and c. 22 % are non-Byzantine. And there are c. 980 "K" group manuscripts. In von Soden's K group, *infra*, c. 96.5 % are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, i.e., c. 93% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine, c. 3.5% are Byzantine only in specific parts, and c. 3.5% are non-Byzantine. This means that in his "K" and "I" groups, von Soden upon whom Hodges & Farstad is based, consulted in his reference to these two larger "K" and "I" groups c. 1500 manuscripts, of which between them, c. 90% are Byzantine (i.e., including those that are Byzantine only in specific parts), and c. 85% are exclusively Byzantine. This is far more Byzantine manuscripts than Moorman admits.

But as I have said before, so say I now again. From my neo-Byzantine perspective, even if, as Moorman says, von Soden did in fact focus on only a low hundreds of manuscripts of which most were only "in the Gospels" and were Byzantine from his I and K groups, to the exclusion of all the other Byzantine manuscripts; and even if he did consult only a couple of dozen Byzantine manuscripts in Acts to Jude; *that would still be enough to construct the representative Byzantine text from as the starting point for constructing the Received Text.* Hence even on Moorman's faulty figures, I would consider von Soden's work useful and valuable. *After all, if a neo-Byzantine textual analyst like Erasmus, working with no more than about a dozen manuscripts (and possibly half this number), or later 16th century neo-Byzantine textual analysts working with several dozen Byzantine manuscripts, were able to compose their starting point of the representative Byzantine text from a dozen or several dozen Byzantine manuscripts, how much more can we now compose the representative Byzantine text as our starting point from the textual data of the manuscripts isolated by von Soden!*

While I would accept that e.g., Robinson & Pierpont's work is not based on all available manuscripts, but rather is focused on von Soden's "K" group which contains *c.* 980 manuscripts, of which *c.* 950 are Byzantine and *c.* 915 are exclusively Byzantine; I would consider that determining a representative Byzantine text from *c.* 900 Byzantine manuscripts is massively more than most 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantine textual analysts consulted to first compose the representative Byzantine text, something they did on no more than about 1/20<sup>th</sup> this number of Byzantine manuscripts, or even less again. I.e., von Soden's "K" group contains massively more manuscripts than necessary to safely extrapolate from what the still larger complete majority Byzantine Text is. And the same is true for Hodges & Farstad, which being based on von Soden's "K" group of *c.* 1,000 manuscripts and "I" group of *c.* 500 manuscripts, of which *c.* 350 are exclusively Byzantine text; this is massively more than used by the neo-Byzantines in the 16th and 17th centuries. Factoring in an error bar of up to 10% for von Soden's generalist groups, Hodges & Farstad would still have a majority text based on something in the order of *c.* 1,350 manuscripts, of which *c.* 1,200 are Byzantine text.

Therefore it is clear that e.g., Hembd and Moorman are badly misfocused in this criticism. If we were waiting for either Hembd's or Moorman's type of count, some 500 years after the Reformation, we would still be waiting to get a NT text! The Reformation, which in part was an outgrowth of the recovery of the Greek Received Text, could never have occurred if we first needed Hembd's or Moorman's idea of how one determines the representative Byzantine Text! *Put in blunt terms, the composers of the Received Text never counted the approximately 4,700 Greek manuscripts nor anything like it. In fact, they consulted only a small fraction of those consulted by von Soden; so that even if, in theoretical agreement with Moorman, one was to stipulate that von Soden only focused on several hundred Greek manuscripts, of which *c.* 300 were Byzantine, the 16th century neo-Byzantines working from several dozen Greek manuscripts would only have focused on something like about 10% to 15% of this figure, and some, like Erasmus, on even less!*

Though I now leave a more detailed discussion of Hoskier and how to first compose the representative Byzantine Text as one's starting point for the Book of Revelation to a future volume, (probably the first volume dealing with the Book of Revelation,) I shall make reference to one reading, Rev. 16:5, in order to highlight another element of Moorman's methodology (and also make a passing comment on Andreas of Caesarea, *infra*). Moorman refers favorably to Hoskier's *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse* (1929). Whereas von Soden used just under *c.* 2500 manuscripts for the NT, Hoskier used just under about 10% or 1/10<sup>th</sup> this number exclusively for the Book of Revelation. Thus while there are some significant differences between Hoskier's and von Soden's methodological approaches to the NT text, in broad brush overview with respect to the collation of Greek manuscripts, *Hoskier has done for the Book of Revelation what von Soden has done for the Books of Matthew to Jude.* Hence Herman Hoskier's work may be fairly celebrated. Moorman rightly recognizes this important status of Hoskier's work. E.g., he says, "Unlike von Soden we cannot argue that Hoskier looked at only a minority of the MSS [manuscripts], or that his work was characterized by low percentage collation, or that it was 'honeycombed' with error. In

fact, his work was very accurate and dealt with most of the extant MSS [manuscripts] containing Revelation<sup>327</sup>.”

But when e.g., we go to Moorman’s collations of manuscripts for Rev. 16:5, he lists for the “O Lord” (Greek, *Kurie*, masculine singular vocative noun, from *Kurios*), only two minuscules from Hoskier, 296 & 2049, though says it is also found in the Clementine Vulgate, Coptic Bohairic, and Ethiopic Versions<sup>328</sup>. This data comes from Hoskier<sup>329</sup>. Concerning these two Greek manuscripts, Minuscule 296 (Hoskier’s 57) is dated by him “in the xvi<sup>th</sup> century<sup>330</sup>,” and without considering the matter any further, a 17th century manuscript is too late in time and so outside the closed class of sources. Minuscule 2049 (Hoskier’s 141) is dated variously at the 15th or 16th centuries, and Hoskier undertakes a stylistic analysis of it to show that while it is quite similar to the 16th century neo-Byzantine texts of Erasmus (A.D. 1516, 1519, 1522, 1527, 1535), Aldus (1518 A.D.), and Colinaeus (1534 A.D.), it nevertheless has a number of dissimilarities from them, and appears to pre-date them<sup>331</sup>. On this basis, we can say that Minuscule 2049 (15th / 16th century) is Byzantine, and thus shows that the *Textus Receptus* (TR) here follows a minority Byzantine reading at Rev. 16:5. While none of the other sources Moorman mentions are inside the closed class of sources, the Latin of the Clementine Vulgate manifests its support as a minority Latin reading. Though Moorman does not refer to any Latin sources, this is found in, for instance, *Codex Armachanus* or the *Book of Armagh*, (Latin Codex D, early 9th century), as Latin, “*Domine* (masculine singular vocative noun, from *Dominus*).” It is also supported in the Latin by the ancient church father and doctor, St. Jerome (d. 420)<sup>332</sup>.

The reading “O Lord” at Rev. 16:5 thus has support as both a minority Greek Byzantine reading and a minority Latin reading. It therefore clearly entered the Received Text on the basis of textual analysis, and while I shall leave more detailed discussion of the matter till the relevant volume on Rev. 16:5, suffice to here say that I agree with the propriety of including this in the TR, and consider that this is the correct reading.

---

<sup>327</sup> Moorman, J.A., *When the KJV Departs from the “Majority” Text*, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

<sup>328</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 102.

<sup>329</sup> Hoskier, C., *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*, Bernard Quatritch, London, UK, 1929 (2 volumes), Vol 2, p. 419, citing for the reading, “57 141 bohG aeth.”

<sup>330</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 179.

<sup>331</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, pp. 474-477.

<sup>332</sup> St. Jerome in: Migne (Latin Writers Series) (1846 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 29, p. 863 (B. Joannis Apostoli Apocalypse, Cap. XVI, D) (Latin).

Moorman admits that in the Book of Revelation, reference to unsubstantiated claims about what the Lectionaries read will not help him, since he rightly says, “in the Greek speaking East ... it was not used in the Lectionary Services.” But how does Moorman then justify what, *on his reckoning*, has the support of only two Greek Minuscules, 2049 (15th / 16th century) and 296 (17th century), together with the Latin of the Clementine Vulgate, Coptic Bohairic Version, and Ethiopic Version? The answer here (and elsewhere on such minority readings in Revelation) is truly staggering. In considering it, we should remember that that Founder and President of the Dean Burgon Society, Donald Waite, says of “Jack Moorman,” that he “is the world’s greatest living scholar who is defending the King James Bible and its underlying Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek words ... .” Moorman says, “the majority of MSS [manuscripts] extant today may not reflect at every point what the true ... and majority reading was 500 years ago. ... The MSS [manuscripts] Hoskier gathered on Revelation should be viewed in this light. Though he collated a majority of the available MSS [manuscripts], yet his 200 plus can only be considered a small fraction of the total MS [manuscript] tradition of the book. They cannot be used to reconstruct the text ...<sup>333</sup>.”

*Now this really is very silly!* Moorman is here claiming that the Received Text is always the Majority Text. But if, as at e.g., Rev. 16:5 one cannot find even half a dozen Greek Byzantine manuscripts to support it, *the real reason he says is that the majority of manuscripts have disappeared during the last 500 years!* Hoskier lists more than 100 texts usable in a Byzantine majority text count. Though the number is greater than 100, for argument sake I shall simply refer to “c. 100.” Below, I have itemized 4335 Byzantine manuscripts (out of c. 4,740 manuscripts; of which 111 manuscripts are Byzantine text only in specific parts), or if we exclude c. 2,300 Lectionaries from the count, 2,035 Byzantine text manuscripts (of which 111 manuscripts are Byzantine text only in specific parts).

Therefore, working on the figures of c. 4,300 Byzantine manuscripts all up, or c. 100 for the Book of Revelation, this would require that for the Book of Revelation more than about 100 manuscripts have “vanished in a puff of smoke” over the last 500 years, and more widely with regard to minority readings in various parts of the NT, this would require that c. 4,300 Byzantine manuscripts, or if we exclude Lectionaries from the count, c. 2,000 Byzantine manuscripts, have all mysteriously disappeared in the last 500 years. Not only have these alleged c. 2000 to 4300 manuscripts “left no trace” of their “former existence” when performing this amazing “disappearing act,” but *there was a bias in this “disintegration” process towards disintegration of those manuscripts that supported the Received Text!* Where is the evidence for this nonsense! Where is the evidence that the compilers of the Received Text composed it on the basis of a “democratic” count of something between 8,000 and 9,500 manuscripts! We know from both primary and secondary sources that with the financing of his patroness, Elise King, over about 15 years, Hermann von Soden sent out about 40 research assistants all over Europe and the

---

<sup>333</sup> Moorman, J.A., *When the KJV Departs from the “Majority” Text*, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

Mediterranean world to collate data on the thousand of manuscripts he used in his work<sup>334</sup>. E.g., Moorman himself quotes from the secondary source of Hoskier, who refers to “the division of work among forty people” for “von Soden’s final volume of the text<sup>335</sup>.” But where is even one secondary source, let alone a primary source, in support of such a story about any 16th or 17th century neo-Byzantine doing anything even remotely similar?

Therefore this shows that Moorman and the Dean Burgon Society are *ideologically driven*. They do want to accept that men like Erasmus, Beza, and Elzevir were neo-Byzantine textual analysts, but want to believe they were Burgonite Byzantine text manuscript “democrats” who achieved the Received Text by a simple manuscript count; one which they in the Dean Burgon Society, or any Christian with basic mathematical skills, can replicate. Against the evidence, they want to believe that the Received Text is the Majority Text, and where they cannot find the evidence for this, they simply concoct it by claiming that so many hundreds or thousands of manuscripts have mysteriously disappeared in the last 500 years, that “the majority” of manuscripts that are said to support the TR, “can no longer be found.” *Moorman’s and the Dean Burgon’s Society’s belief that the Majority Text is the Received Text is thus shown to be an irrational indefensible belief (ideologically driven, it would seem, at a subconscious level by secular American “democratic” values), rather than a rational and defensible belief.*

At this point, it is also worth reminding the reader that Burgon claimed, “the ‘*Textus Receptus*’ ..., calls for ... revision,” “upon the” basis of the “majority of authorities;” and thus Burgon bragged, “Again and again we shall have occasion to point out ... that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction<sup>336</sup>” Burgon did not make the sort of claims that the so called “Dean Burgon Society” are making about the *Textus Receptus* being the work of a majority text; and in broad-brush terms, Burgon’s School is best represented by Hodges & Farstad’s Majority Text. Thus the “Dean Burgon Society” is greatly misrepresenting the views of Dean Burgon himself, whose “Society” they claim to be promoting. If a man wants to know where Dean Burgon’s textual theory will land him, in broad-brush terms, let him look at Hodges & Farstad’s Majority Text.

---

<sup>334</sup> *Primary Sources*: Von Soden’s *Die Schriften*, Vol. I, I, pp. iii (“Fraulein Elise Koenigs”), vi,vii; Vol. II, p. vii. *Secondary Sources*: “Elise Konig” (Aland, K., *et unum*, *The Text of the NT*, 1987, *op. cit.*, p. 23) = “Elise Koenigs” (Metzger, B., *The Text of the NT*, *op. cit.*, p. 139) = “Elise King” (“Hermann von Soden” *Wikipedia*, German, automatically translated into English) (2009) ([de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hermann\\_v](http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hermann_v)).

<sup>335</sup> Moorman, J.A., *When the KJV Departs from the “Majority” Text*, *op. cit.*, p. 9; quoting H.C. Hoskier in *Journal of Theological Studies* (JTS), Vol 15, 1914, p. 307.

<sup>336</sup> Burgon’s *Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, pp. 13,15; & *Revision Revised*, p. 21.

At this juncture, I would also remind the good Christian reader, that the Biblical promise, “The Word of the Lord endureth forever” (I Peter 1:25), means that under God, a good neo-Byzantine textual analyst must be able to compose the Received Text over time and through time. He must, by the grace of God, be able to do so in e.g., c. 500 or 600 A.D., in c. 1000 or 1100 A.D., in c. 1500 or 1600 A.D., or in c. 2000 or (if the Lord has not then come,) 2100 A.D., or later. While we could accept that some manuscripts may be destroyed or disintegrate over time, and doubtless have, the proposition that hundreds (Book of Revelation) and thousands (Matthew to Jude) of manuscripts would be preserved up till the 16th century, and then over the next 500 years mysteriously disappear without leaving a trace, and without even any secondary references to them, and do so in a way that was decidedly biased against the alleged “majority text” reading of the Received Text, is thus a fundamental attack on the doctrine of the Divine Preservation of Scripture. I.e., in Moorman’s words, “the majority of MSS [manuscripts] extant today may not reflect at every point what the true ... and majority reading was 500 years ago. ... The ... majority of the available MSS [manuscripts], ... can only be considered a small fraction of the total MS [manuscript] tradition ... . They cannot be used to reconstruct the text ...<sup>337</sup>.”

This is the same type of claim made by the neo-Alexandrians, who would have us believe that the majority of manuscripts have disappeared over the last 1500 or so years, and were “rediscovered” from the 19th century on, principally by Constantine Tischendorf. “Moorman” and “Mormon” are pronounced the same, and so in *an unavoidable* pun, *the Moorman claim* about Byzantine manuscripts disappearing without a trace over the last 500 years, is the same as *the Mormon claim* about “the Book Mormon” disappearing without a trace and being “rediscovered” in the 19th century by their “prophet,” Joseph Smith. For those who accept the doctrine of the Divine Preservation of Scripture, such a claim is untenable. Thus whilst the starting point of the Dean Burgon Society is that they believe in the Divine Preservation of Scripture, by harnessing this idea to the unsustainable claim that Burgon’s Majority Text theoretics will produce the Received Text of the Authorized Version, they in fact find it necessary to then subvert and undermine this very doctrine of Divine Preservation, by claiming that if and when a manuscript count shows the *Textus Receptus* (TR) to be a minority reading, then it is because the majority of manuscripts have mysteriously disappeared in the last 500 years. This alleged inexplicable disappearance of thousands and thousands of manuscripts in the last 500 years, not only left no primary trace of their existence, e.g., thousands and thousands of manuscript covers in which the pages had all been eaten by some insect; it also left no secondary trace of their existence e.g., library catalogues, or stories about either the 16th and 17th century composers of the TR such as Erasmus, Beza, or Elzevir, or research assistants appointed by them, going on long treks through hundreds of Greek Orthodox monasteries and other Byzantine Greek Libraries to “undertake a count of over 8,000 manuscripts,” or references to these thousands of “missing manuscripts” in the textual apparatuses of Stephanus (Stephens) or Elzevir. *Put simply, the claim is arrant nonsense! It is absolute balderdash!!*

---

<sup>337</sup> Moorman, J.A., *When the KJV Departs from the “Majority” Text*, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

Hembd, Khoo, Waite, and Moorman are trying to anachronistically squeeze the Received Text into some kind of “democratic” text count that produces a Byzantine Text which they claim equates the Received Text. The Biblical teaching of a catholic or universal church (Eph. 5:30-32), in which God has gifted some men to be “teachers” (Eph. 4:11) of the neo-Byzantine textual type, and most others not, including most other church “teachers” (Eph. 4:11), is both *too broad* for some of them to accept because it requires belief in the universal church or “the holy catholic church” (Article 10 of the *Apostles’ Creed* is denied by some, though not all, independent Arminian Baptists), and *too narrow* for all of them to accept, because it requires belief in “gifts” (Eph. 4:8) limited to quite small numbers of those in the catholic church. St. Paul says, “For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, ... . For ... we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office ... . Having then gifts differing according to the grace given to us, whether ... ministry, ... or ... teaching; or ... exhortation ...” (Rom. 12:3-8). If we as Protestants accept the authority of the Bible, we cannot ignore the words of Holy Scripture, “Are all teachers?” (I Cor. 12:29); nor the reality that there are different types of teachers, and not many teachers are given the office of a neo-Byzantine textual analyst. For since I am a neo-Byzantine textual analyst, like St. Paul did with his office, “I magnify mine office” (Rom. 11:13). I do so, in order to defend it, as part of my defence of the Received Text. Put bluntly, our Biblical God is not a “democrat;” and quite frankly, I am glad he is not!

Thus those following the *Dean Burgon Society* view, are in form and substance, though not in their precise terminology, anachronistically trying to say that the church does not need suitably gifted and talented textual analyst “teachers” of the *Textus Receptus* (TR) (Rom. 12:6,7; I Cor. 12:29; Eph. 4:11, I do not say these are the only type of “teachers” here referred to,) it just needs “numerically literate persons” i.e., very basic “mathematicians,” who can count texts, and that this is what the compilers of the TR did in the 16th and 17th centuries. But they are wrong on both counts. In the first place, nobody has ever, and certainly not the TR compilers, made such a mammoth detailed count of the over 4,300 manuscripts we have (let alone the much higher fictional number of Moorman, now said to have mysteriously vanished). And in the second place, God has indeed given various gifts “for the perfecting of the saints” (Eph. 4:11,12); and this was recognized by the Protestant Reformers in the honour they gave to e.g., Beza. We ought not to grieve God’s Holy Ghost by denying the presence of such gifts in those who have them. *Whether e.g., Hembd and Moorman like it or nor, textual analysis is an essential and integral part of determining the Received Text*, although it must also be said that the true neo-Byzantine form of textual analysis that underpins the *Textus Receptus* (TR) is not to be compared with the false and spurious neo-Alexandrian form of textual analysis.

Jeffrey Khoo of the *Far Eastern Bible College* in Singapore, says that he came to his views “through the writings of J.W. Burgon, E.F. Hills, and D.A. Waite.” More specifically, he says he formed them when “Waite, who is President of the Dean Burgin Society, visited Singapore in 1992,” and “spoke at ... FEBC [*Far Eastern Bible College*]

on the textual issue and defended the KJV and its underlying texts<sup>338</sup>.” Khoo is thus a follower of the teachings of the USA based *Dean Burgon Society* (rather than a more normative Majority Text Burgonite like e.g., William Pierpont & Maurice Robinson). Khoo likes to say, “Metzger ... is adored by modern day textual critics who hail him as a ‘legend.’ ... Metzger is practically worshipped, ‘Kathleen Maxwell told us ... in Edinburgh that she had phoned Bart Ehrman concerning a special feature in a manuscript... . Bart gave her the number and she got Metzger on the line. To us she remarked, <I felt like I was calling God!>.’ If this is not blasphemy (cf. Acts 12:2-23), it is surely idolatry! This is the curse of textual criticism – the glorification of the scholar and his mind, instead of Christ and his words<sup>339</sup>” (emphasis mine).

In the first place, who cares what “silly women laden with sins, led away with divers[e] lusts, ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth” (II Tim. 3:6,7), like Kathleen Maxwell, think anyway? “Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence” (I Tim. 2:11,12). In the second place, because there are “false teachers” (II Peter 2:1) like Metzger (d. 2007), does that mean there cannot be true teachers? Certainly any form of idolatry, including worship of a human being (Christ except, who is fully God and fully man, though we worship his Divinity, not his humanity), is idolatry forbidden by the first commandment (Exod. 20:2,3). However, if like Khoo we are going to deny that there are true and godly neo-Byzantine textual analysts, because there are also false neo-Alexandrians ones, then we will also have to deny every other office and ministry in the church as well. For instance, one can show that there are unorthodox pastors of churches and unorthodox Bible translators who do not e.g., believe in the doctrine of the *Apostles’* and *Nicene Creeds*<sup>340</sup>, or historically modern “prophets” who do not believe in the *Reformation Motto*.

---

<sup>338</sup> Khoo, J., “Bruce Metzger & the Curse of Textual Criticism,” *op. cit.*, p. 4.

<sup>339</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1.

<sup>340</sup> The *Apostles’ Creed* is named after, not written by, the Apostles. The *Nicene Creed* is named after the *Council of Nicea* (325 A.D.), though basically composed jointly by the *General Councils of Nicea* (325) and *Constantinople* (381); to which was later added the *filioque* (and the Son) from the *Athanasian Creed* (named after, not written by, Athanasius). Article 21 of the Anglican *39 Articles* says, “General Councils ... (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with Spirit and Word of God,) ... may err, and sometimes have erred, ... in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture;” and Article 8 of the Anglican *39 Articles* says, “The Three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius’s Creed, and ... Apostles’ Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.” Article 12 of the Lutheran *Formulae of Concord* (1576 & 1584) refers to The Three Creeds as “three approved symbols” of the faith.

There are e.g., Unitarian Ministers who deny the Trinity and so deny that the “Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God,” is “God” “incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary” (*Nicene Creed*), or that “the Holy Ghost” is “the Lord and giver of life,” “who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified” (*Nicene Creed*). Or e.g., Jehovah’s Witness or Seventh-day Adventist Ministers who claim that their sectarian church / cult is the only one that a person should join, and so deny the “one catholic (universal) and apostolic church” (*Nicene Creed*) or “the holy catholic (universal) church” (*Apostles’ Creed*). Or e.g., religiously liberal Ministers who deny the Second Advent of Christ and so deny that “Christ” “shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead: whose kingdom shall have no end” and “the resurrection of the dead” (*Nicene Creed*), for to be sure, “Jesus Christ” “shall come to judge the quick and the dead” and “I believe in ... the resurrection of the body” (*Apostles’ Creed*). Does that then mean that we cannot have true orthodox pastors of any church, or that all pastors seek to so abuse the office of “teacher” (Rom. 12:6,7; I Cor. 12:29; Eph. 4:11)? If an orthodox Minister preaches a good Biblical sermon, do we criticize him in Khoo’s type of words, by saying, “This is the curse of *sermon preaching* – the glorification of the *preacher* and his mind”?

The same is true of Bible translators. What of unorthodox Bible translators? E.g., the Jehovah’s Witnesses *New World Translation* (1961) of John 1:1 as, “the Word was a god,” is contextually designed so as to deny the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and so deny “Jesus” as “Lord” (*Apostles’ Creed*) in the true Biblical sense; by denying that the “Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God,” is “God of God” “very God of very God,” “incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary” (*Nicene Creed*). Or the religiously liberal Moffatt Bible, uses parenthesis at Matt. 1:16 to try and claim “Joseph” was “the father of Jesus” (Moffatt Bible), and then further denies the virgin birth by translating Matt. 1:23 as “maiden” (Moffatt Bible) rather than “virgin.” Thus the Moffatt Bible denies that Christ “was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary” (*Nicene Creed*) and so “born of the Virgin Mary” (*Apostles’ Creed*); and also denies that “the Holy Ghost ... spake by the prophets” (*Nicene Creed*) in Isa. 7:14, and hence at both Isa. 7:14 and Matt. 1:23 Moffatt denies the *Apostles’ Creed*, “I believe in the Holy Ghost.” Does that then mean that we cannot have true orthodox Bible translators, or that all Bible translators seek to so abuse the office of “teacher” (Rom. 12:6,7; I Cor. 12:29; Eph. 4:11)? If an orthodox Bible translator translates well, do we e.g., criticize William Tyndale (NT 1526) in Khoo’s type of words, by saying, “This is the curse of *Bible translating*– the glorification of the *translator* and his mind”?

What also of false prophets (Matt. 7:15-20)? We cannot e.g., deny the true prophets who wrote the Bible, because there were also false prophets. Do we say that because in historically modern times there are false prophets, who deny the “*sola Scriptura*” (Latin, “Scripture alone”) teaching of the *Reformation Motto* by claiming that the gift of prophesy exists outside of Bible times (contrary to e.g., Luke 11:49,50; Eph. 2:20) e.g., Joseph Smith of the Mormon Church / Cult or Mary Baker of the Christian Science Church / Cult, that therefore all the true prophets that under God wrote the Bible (II Tim. 3:16) cannot be listened to? Do we thus “despise” the true “prophesyings” (II Thess. 5:20) now set forth for us in Holy Writ, which as the Old Testament and New

Testament are “the two candlesticks standing before the God of the earth” (Rev. 11:4; cf. Pss. 19:8; 119:105,130; Prov. 6:23)?

*Khoo only applies his argument to “teachers” (Rom 12:6,7; I Cor. 12:29; Eph. 4:11) who are textual analysts, in what he calls, “the curse of textual criticism.” But when we use the same argument more widely for “teachers” (Rom. 12:6,7; I Cor. 12:29; Eph. 4:11) who are Church Ministers and Bible translators, or “prophets” (Rom. 12:6,7; I Cor. 12:29; Eph. 4:11), we more clearly see how this kind of argument by Khoo is absolutely ridiculous. Instead of derivatively criticizing a neo-Byzantine textual analyst like myself on the basis that all textual analysis is a “curse” and bad, Khoo should be distinguishing bad neo-Alexandrian “textual analysts” from good neo-Byzantine textual analysts, and e.g., doing what he can to help support our work!*

Among neo-Byzantine textual analysts of the 16th and 17th centuries, we cannot be certain as to the exact numbers of manuscripts consulted e.g., private libraries of a number of 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantines *may well have* included a relatively small number of Greek Lectionaries that we no longer have a record of. This however is speculative, and possibly they did not have any such Lectionaries. But to the extent that these were relatively abundant, relatively inexpensive, and we know some Greek Lectionaries were circulating through Europe at this time, since, for instance, the presence of some are referred to as being in Laud’s Library in his mid 17th century Puritan trial which refers to Laud’s possession of “Greek [Orthodox] liturgies,” this is a reasonable conjecture. Nevertheless, von Soden’s Byzantine manuscripts selection size dwarfs that of 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantines, which notably one can use to reach the same basic conclusion on what constitutes the representative Byzantine text, even though some 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantines probably consulted, at best, about 2% of the c. 1900-2040 Greek Byzantine manuscripts that von Soden did<sup>341</sup> i.e., about 38-41 Greek Byzantine manuscripts, or possibly c. 2.5% i.e., 47-51 Greek Byzantine manuscripts, and some, like Erasmus in his first edition, certainly consulted a good deal less than this.

Likewise, if we consider the von Soden based works of Hodges & Farstad or Robinson & Pierpont, we find their manuscript numbers dwarf those of the 16th and 17th centuries neo-Byzantines. Hodges & Farstad’s focus on von Soden’s “K” group (c. 1,000 manuscripts) and “I” group (c. 500 manuscripts, of which c. 350 are exclusively Byzantine text), means they used c. 1500 manuscripts of which c. 1,350 are Byzantine text. (Or if we factor in a 10% error bar for von Soden’s generalist groups, we are still looking at c. 1,350 manuscripts, of which c. 1,200 are Byzantine.) Or if we refer to the representative Byzantine text composed by Robinson & Pierpont from c. 900 Byzantine manuscripts in von Soden’s “K” group (i.e., at c. 90% + of them, 885 + manuscripts), we

---

<sup>341</sup> This c. 83.5% Byzantine group comprised of c. 78.9% of von Soden’s manuscripts being completely Byzantine, and c. 4.6% of von Soden’s manuscripts being Byzantine only in specific parts. Von Soden also consulted other non-Byzantine Greek manuscripts, *most of which were not Alexandrian, infra*. It should also be borne in mind that many manuscripts are fragmentary i.e., they contain portions of the NT only.

find that their basic methodology achieves the same starting point of a majority text that Hodges & Farstad's Majority Text method does; and also the same starting point of a representative Byzantine text that 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantines achieved after consulting c. 5% or less of their number i.e., c. 45 Greek Byzantine manuscripts. *If one is going to criticize e.g., Robinson & Pierpont for not consulting "enough" Byzantine manuscripts to determine the representative Byzantine text, then one must magnify this criticism greatly of those who composed the Received Text, which is the very opposite of what the Dean Burgon Society does in their claim that "the majority text" will yield the Received Text.*

The reality is, that in the same way that Constantine von Tischendorf (1815-1874) produced a bad Greek Text in his Greek NT 8th edition (1869-72), but nevertheless left behind in it a very good textual apparatus which I, like others, find very useful; so likewise, Hermann von Soden (1852-1914) produced a very poor Greek Text in his Greek NT (1913), which formed the basis of the Moffatt Bible (1926 & 1935); but nevertheless von Soden left behind a connected textual apparatus of much more enduring value. (I would also make this same observation with respect to e.g., Nestle-Aland's 27th edition of 1993, which also contains a useful textual apparatus.) Thus while the 1929 work of Herman Hoskier which uses over 200 manuscripts was consulted for the Book of Revelation, the Majority Texts of both Hodges & Farstad (1982 & 1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (1991 & 2005), like Green's Textual Apparatus (1986), were constructed primarily from von Soden's 1913 textual apparatus. And as Robinson & Pierpont point out in the title of their work, *The New Testament ... According to the Byzantine / Majority Textform* (1991), or *The New Testament in the ... Byzantine Textform* (2005), the Majority Text they use based on von Soden's "K" group with a total manuscript count of over 900 Byzantine manuscripts, and a K group count on any given reading of 885 + Byzantine manuscripts, is clearly a majority or representative Byzantine text, and divides where the Byzantine text divides.

On the one hand, I do not very often consult von Soden's textual apparatus on a *first-hand basis*. But on the other hand, indirectly, I am repeatedly consulting von Soden's textual apparatus on a *second-hand basis* constantly for every reading I look at. That is because I determine the representative Byzantine Text, which is always my starting point, through reference to the von Soden based (for St. Matthew to Jude) Majority Byzantine Text of Robinson & Pierpont (1991 & 2005), together with reference to the Majority Text of Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Green's Textual Apparatus (1986); and where a reading is fairly evenly divided between two or more of these majority text readings, I take this to mean that such a reading is also fairly evenly divided inside the Byzantine textual tradition. I.e., in broad terms this approach also holds true for Hodges & Farstad's divisions, although it must be used *with more caution* on this and other matters than is the case for Robinson & Pierpont's text. Thus von Soden's work is in fact foundational to my work, because it is foundational to my starting point of what constitutes the representative Byzantine text.

Thus while I do not generally consult von Soden's textual apparatus on a *first hand basis*; sometimes I do. E.g., at Matt. 19:19, neither Nestle-Aland's 27th edition nor

the UBS 3rd and 4th editions I generally use makes reference to the minority Byzantine reading, “thy,” which forms part of the Received Text (see commentary at Matt. 19:19) (and nor, I note, does Moorman’s *When the KJV Departs from the Majority Text*, 1988). I know of its presence in W 032 directly from my photocopy of a photolith copy of this manuscript; and from Swanson of Y 034 (who also mentions W 032 here). But my knowledge of some other Byzantine manuscripts which support this reading, comes from von Soden’s textual apparatus. Due to the time consuming nature of working through his textual apparatus, which includes decoding his symbols and converting it to the more commonly used Gregory numbers<sup>342</sup>; and then determining which ones of these manuscripts are Byzantine (or Byzantine in the relevant section I am looking at), which ones are not Byzantine, and which ones are unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden’s system (in which instance I would not usually refer to them, although I do make reference to all such manuscripts, *infra*); I frequently avoid this process. But because only a few Byzantine manuscripts for this Received Text reading are listed in the other textual apparatuses, on this occasion I thought it worth the time and effort to consult con Soden here at Matt.19:19.

Thus from von Soden’s truly excellent storehouse of information, I found that inside the closed class of sources at Matt. 19:19, this minority Byzantine reading is further supported by, for instance, Pi 041 (9th century; von Soden’s ε 73 in his Ika group), Minuscules 262 (10th century, von Soden’s ε 1020 in his I r group), 660 (11th century, von Soden’s ε 178 in his I’ group), 945 (11th century, Byzantine outside of independent text Acts & General Epistles; von Soden’s δ 362 in his I φc group), 1187 (11th century, von Soden’s ε 1083 in his I r group), 245 (12th century; von Soden’s ε 351ff, 2nd manuscript = ε 1226 in his Iσ group), 270 (12th century, von Soden’s ε 291 in his Ikb group), 280 (12th century, von Soden’s ε 294 in his Ikc group), 443 (12th century; von Soden’s ε 270 in his I o group), 1010 (12th century, Byzantine; von Soden’s ε 126, 2nd manuscript = 190f in his I φc group), 1200 (12th century, von Soden’s ε 1250 in his Ikb group), 1355 (12th century; von Soden’s ε 1246 in his I’ group), 1375 (12th century, von Soden’s ε 1225 in his Ikb group), 248 (13th century, von Soden’s ε 395 in his Ikc group), 473 (13th century, von Soden’s ε 329f, 2nd manuscript = ε 1390 in his Ikc group), 482 (13th century, von Soden’s ε 329 in his Ikc group), 1604 (13th century; von Soden’s ε 1353 in his I’ group), and 1354 (14th century, von Soden’s δ 470 in his Ikc group). These Byzantine text manuscripts are thus included in the commentary at Matt. 19:19.

Though von Soden also mentions that at Matt. 19:19 this reading is further found, for instance, in the non-Byzantine Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent text for Matthew, mixed text for Mark & Luke; von Soden’s ε 93 in his I α group); I did not include reference to this at Matt. 19:19 in the section Outside the Closed Class of Sources on the basis of von Soden’s textual apparatus, but rather because of its citation from another textual apparatus.

---

<sup>342</sup> Caspar Gregory’s *Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes*, Leipzig, Germany, 1909. Aland’s *Kurzgefasste, op. cit.*; & “Manuscript Number Conversion Table” ([www.skypoint.com/members/waltzmn/MSCConv.html](http://www.skypoint.com/members/waltzmn/MSCConv.html)).

And in von Soden's textual apparatus, manuscripts at Matt. 19:19 that are otherwise unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden's system, and which follow this minority Byzantine reading, include in his "I" group, Minuscules 1295 (5th to 9th centuries, ε 96 in von Soden's I' group), 1346 (10th century, von Soden's ε 1098 in his Ika group), 251 (11th century, ε 178f = ε 192 in his I' group), 213 (12th century, von Soden's ε 129 in his I o group), 265 (12th century, von Soden's ε 285 in his Ika group), 659 (12th century, von Soden's ε 1216 in his I φb group), 1573 (12th / 13th century, independent text in Pauline Epistles, thought to elsewhere "probably" be Byzantine, von Soden's δ 398 in his I r group), 1219 (12th century, ε 1121 in von Soden's Ika group), 1295 (5th to 9th centuries, ε 96 in von Soden's I' group), 2145 (12th century, von Soden's ε 1222 in his I o group), e4 (13th century; von Soden's ε 370f = ε 371 in his I' group), 273 (13th century; von Soden's ε 370 in his I' group), 544 (13th century; von Soden's ε 337 in his I α group), 726 (13th century, von Soden's ε 384 in his Ikb group), 1391 (13th century, von Soden's ε 1413 in his I φb group), 1555 (13th century, von Soden's ε 1341 in his I r group), 489 (14th century, von Soden's δ 459 in Gospels in his Ika group, in Acts & Pauline Epistles in his Ia2 group), 990 (14th century, von Soden's ε 1260 in his I φc group), 1093 (14th century, von Soden's ε 1442f = ε 1443 in his I' group), 1515 (14th century, von Soden's ε 1442 in his I' group), 1170 (15th century, von Soden's ε 541 in his I' group), and 1574 (15th century, von Soden's ε 1222f = ε 551 in his I o group).

While I am aware that inside von Soden's "I" group, *c.* 78% are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, *i.e.*, *c.* 68% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine in the I parts, 10% are Byzantine only in specific parts, and *c.* 22 % are non-Byzantine, *infra*; so that the minority Byzantine support for this reading here at Matt. 19:19 is in all likelihood even stronger than what I have stated in the commentary at Matt. 19:19; because I am not able to subdivide such "I" group manuscripts and say specifically which of about the 2/3rds of these 22 manuscripts are the completely Byzantine ones, and which of the about 4/5ths of them are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts (and if so, which are the Byzantine parts), and which of the about 1/5th of them are non-Byzantine, I therefore make no reference to these manuscripts in the commentary at Matt. 19:19. Thus when using von Soden's textual apparatus in a very specific neo-Byzantine way, such as here at Matt. 19:19, rather than a generalist Byzantine majority text way (as do Robinson & Pierpont) or generalist majority text way (as do Hodges & Farstad), one must discard a good deal of the information, because one requires a clear detailed demarcation between Byzantine and non-Byzantine manuscripts.

Let us now consider the important issue of what manuscripts von Soden used, and of crucial significance for we neo-Byzantines, whether their classification is Byzantine or non-Byzantine. In this count, to better get an overview of von Soden's work, I shall follow his format, which was to include 16 groups of ancient and mediaeval church writers, which he gave special symbols to. While some might wish to exclude such writers, *i.e.*, count them separately, it is necessary to stay inside von Soden's basic categories if one is to understand von Soden's textual apparatus. In doing this *i.e.*, including von Soden's 16 church writers, I wish in passing to also make an important

point, namely, that we neo-Byzantines use the citations of Scripture found in the works of Greek and Latin ancient or mediaeval church writers, if the latter, especially early mediaeval writers. Thus the Received Text may often be supported by an ancient witness or witnesses on this basis as well.

The church writers are admitted on the same basis as the texts. I.e., if they had general accessibility over time or through time; or if they agree with texts and writers that were so accessible. E.g., on this basis some reference may be made to Didymus the Blind (d. 398), providing they introduce nothing new. He was quite properly condemned by the *Third Council of Constantinople* (680-1), and his works re-emerged in 1941 (see commentary at Matt. 18:6, “Preliminary Textual Discussion,” “The Second Matter”).

So too, one may use the writings of Primasius (d. after 567). Based on an ancient manuscript from the Benedictine Monastery of Murbach in Upper Alsace, France, his works were freshly published in 1544 at Basel, Switzerland (and before that time, in 1535, Cologne, Germany, reprinted 1544, Paris, France). His works include a Latin Commentary on the Book of Revelation, and he is cited in the apparatuses of the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993) (e.g., Nestle-Aland at Rev. 11:5 and UBS at Rev. 11:17). As Bishop of Hadrumetum in North Africa, Primasius was one of those who condemned the Nestorian and Semi-Nestorian heresies. He quite properly rejected the Origenist teachings followed earlier by e.g., Didymus the Blind, as they were then being promoted by Theodorus Ascidas (d. 558), the bishop of Caesarea.

Primasius’s bishopric at Hadrumetum (modern day Sousse, Tunisia, North Africa,) is also of some further interest, because there has been discovered there a 3rd century Roman mosaic. In very good condition, it depicts Virgil (d. 19 B.C.), a well known Latin writing poet of the ancient Roman world, holding his work, the *Aeneid* (which e.g., tells the fictional pagan legend of Rome’s founding). To Virgil’s right stands, “Clio” (the mythical Greek pagan goddess patron of history), and to his left, “Melpomene” (the mythical Greek pagan goddess patron of tragedy and musical playing of the lyre). Though we Christians do not endorse or support the pagan religious connotations of this mosaic, indeed, we are repulsed by them; nevertheless, looking purely at its artistic values, it is a colourful looking Roman mosaic. It is now housed at the capital city of Tunisia, namely, Tunis, in the Bardo Museum. Of interest to readers of this commentary since I use Wheelock’s *Latin* (2005) as the standard basic Latin grammar reference work, is the fact that this Imperial Pagan Roman mosaic is featured as an artwork on the front cover of this work. (Alas, unlike so many Greek grammars which are Biblically based; Latin grammars are not Biblically based or Ecclesiastical Latin based, though I would like to see such a Latin grammar produced!<sup>343</sup>)

---

<sup>343</sup> Such a Latin grammar would be careful to prefix the word “pagan” before references to Imperial Roman pagan temples etc., and could be primarily based around examples from the canonical books of St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate and various old Latin versions, but with an emphasis on the New Testament so as to facilitate comparison with NT Greek (not that I deny the importance of the OT Greek Septuagint). Ecclesiastical

*I also wish to make a very important qualification with my categorization of the ancient and mediaeval church writers of von Soden's categories.* That is this. Because such church writers had general accessibility over the ages, their writings are inside the closed class of sources, whether as the correct reading of the TR, or as variants. Such an early mediaeval writer is John Damascus (d. before 754). But if their name is associated with a Minuscule, such as John Damascus's is with Minuscule 2110, and that manuscript is clearly non-Byzantine, then it is excluded on the same basis that 16th century neo-Byzantines excluded the clearly corrupt Western Greek Text. But since *we are looking at von Soden's textual apparatus, we must include them in the count in order to understand von Soden's apparatus; even though it must be clearly understood that the writings of church writers are more generally inside the closed class of sources.* While ancient ones in particular are consulted, mediaeval ones may be also be consulted, especially those from early mediaeval times such as John Damascus (also known as "John of Damascus" and "John Damascene").

On the one hand, of about 2,300 Greek Lectionaries, von Soden only makes use of 9 Evangelion (Gospels) Lectionaries; 8 of which are inside the closed class of sources. The 8 Byzantine text Lectionaries are (with von Soden's ε symbols for them in the brackets), Greek Lectionaries 668 (9th century, ε 39), 1355 (9th century, ε 74), 1384 (10th century, ε 66), 1385 (10th century, ε 67), 1386 (10th century, ε 68), 1417 (10th century, ε 98), 1485 (10th century, ε 65), and 351 (12th century, ε 2095). But on the other hand, while we cannot be sure of the full number of unrecorded Greek Lectionaries used by 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantines, it seems to me unlikely that any one such neo-Byzantine textual analyst would ever have used more than about 8 lectionaries, and may well have used less.

Von Soden considered that there had been three 4th century "revisions" of the NT text which he set about to "reconstruct" in the main text of his work, so that he distinguishes between a "K" group, "I" group," and "H" group. But for the initial purposes of showing Byzantine manuscripts von Soden used, I shall ignore his groupings. Having then made the point, I shall consider his groupings in greater detail, although because I am only here considering a general overview, I shall not do so with reference to the minute detail of his sub-groups that some may wish for. Hence while my analysis could be more detailed than it is by greater reference to his subgroups, it is nevertheless detailed enough *for my generalist purposes*, disappointing, as this may well be for the

---

Latin could include e.g., the three creeds, and examples from the Latin form of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*. The grammar could feature some pictures and excerpts from the writings of the four Western doctors, together with excerpts from various church Latin writers found e.g., in Migne. A good cover-jacket picture might be the colourful Roman mosaic I saw at the British Museum in December 2005 of the Lullingston Chapel (4th century A.D.). This mosaic from Roman Britain, shows that the family was Christian as seen in such Christian symbols as e.g., Alpha and Omega (Rev. 1:8; 21:6; 22:12) around the monogram of Greek letters Chi (χ) and rho (ρ) standing for "Christ" (Christos / χριστος), and the Christian cross.

reader wanting greater detail. (Of course, such a disappointed reader may always remedy this defect by working through von Soden himself.) At the end of this analysis of Byzantine to non-Byzantine text types in von Soden's manuscripts, I shall then make an overall tally in two separate charts, to determine the overall number of Byzantine to non-Byzantine manuscripts in von Soden's text. This may sometimes include a small amount of "double-counting" where a manuscript contains both a Byzantine and non-Byzantine component, though I shall try to minimize this by generally focusing on the Byzantine component which is the manuscript's section of interest to we neo-Byzantines since it is this which puts the manuscript, or at least its Byzantine part, inside the closed class of sources. (Some non-Byzantines may be unhappy with this neo-Byzantine bias in the figures. But it is only a small number in the overall greater numbers, and will not affect the broad-brush big picture we are seeking to determine.)

Of the 173 Codices used by von Soden, 46 are Byzantine (27% of codices), 3 are Byzantine in certain clearly parts (1.7% of codices), 112 are non-Byzantine (65% of codices)<sup>344</sup>, and 12 are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden's system (7% of codices)<sup>345</sup>.

Byzantine Codices, or Codices with certain clearly defined Byzantine parts, (either of which may contain only portions of the NT e.g., H 014 contains only Acts of the Apostles<sup>346</sup>), consulted by von Soden include the following manuscripts. (Converting von Soden's cryptic symbols to the more readily recognizable Gregory numbers, via Aland's conversion charts<sup>347</sup>.)

---

<sup>344</sup> Aleph 01 (London Sinaiticus), B 03 (Rome Vaticanus), C04, D 05, D 06, D 06 abs 1 & 2, E 08, F 010, G 012, H 015, I 016, L 019, P 025, T 029, Z 035, Delta 037, Theta 038, Xi 040, Pi 041, Psi 044, 048, 050, 051, 057, 058, 059, 060, 062, 066, 067, 068, 069, 070, 071, 072, 073, 075, 076, 077, 078, 079, 081, 082, 083, 084, 085, 086, 087, 088, 089, 091, 092a, 092b, 094, 095, 096, 097, 098, 099, 0101, 0102, 0105, 0106, 0107, 0108, 0109, 0110, 0111, 0112, 0113, 0114, 0115, 0119, 0120, 0121, 0122, 0123, 0124, 0125, 0126, 0127, 0128, 0130, 0131, 0132, 0138, 0139, 0140, 0141, 0143, 0145, 0146, 0147, 0148, 0150, 0155, 0156, 0159, 0160, 0161, 0162, 0163, 0164, 0165, 0166, 0169, 0170, 0171, 0172, 0173, 0187, 0234, & 0237.

<sup>345</sup> 053, 054, 080, 0100, 0118, 0129, 0136, 0137, 0144, 0154, 0157, & 0158.

<sup>346</sup> For more detail on these manuscripts, see e.g., Aland, K., *et unum, The Text of the NT* (1989), *op. cit.*, pp. 110-127 (Codices), 129-142 (Minuscules); UBS 3rd Corrected Edition Greek NT, (1983), pp. xix-xxvii (Minuscule 1354); and Aland's textual classifications with the dating system of Caspar Gregory's *Prolegomena* to Tischendorf's 8th edition, 1894 for: 169, 861, 1025, 1171, 1172, 1173. (Caspar Gregory revised an older manuscript numbering system to create "Gregory numbers," see Gregory, C.R., *Textkritik, op. cit.*.)

<sup>347</sup> Aland's *Kurzgefasste, op. cit.*, pp. 390-427.

*Byzantine Codices (three of which are Byzantine only in specific parts) from the 5th to 10th centuries (Total codices for these centuries = 49).*

*5th century Byzantine Codices used by von Soden: A 02 (Codex Alexandrinus, Byzantine in its incomplete Gospels); Q 026 (Codex Guelferbytanus), and W 032 (Codex Freerianus, Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53). (Total codices for this century = 3, of which 2 are Byzantine only in specific parts.)*

*5th / 6th century Byzantine Codices used by von Soden: Sigma 042 (Codex Rossanensis, late 5th / 6th century). (Total codices for this century = 1.)*

*6th century Byzantine Codices used by von Soden: N 022 (Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus), O 023 (Codex Sinopensis), P 024 (Codex Guelferbytanus), R 027 (Codex Nitriensis), Phi 043 (Codex Beratinus), 061, 064, 065, 074, 093 (Byzantine in Acts), and 0104. (Total codices for this century = 11, of which 1 is Byzantine only in specific parts.)*

*7th century Byzantine Codices used by von Soden: 0103 and 0211. (Total codices for this century = 2.)*

*8th century Byzantine Codices used by von Soden: E 07 (Codex Basilensis), 047, 0116, and 0134. (Total codices for this century = 4.)*

*9th century Byzantine Codices used by von Soden: F 09 (Codex Borelianus), G 011 (Codex Seidelianus), G 012 (Codex Boernerianus), H 013 (Codex Seidelianus), H 014 (Codex Mutinensis), K 017 (Codex Cyprius), K 018 (Codex Mosquensis), L 020 (Codex Angelicus), M 021 (Codex Campianus), U 030 (Codex Nanianus), V 031 (Codex Mozquensis), Y 034 (Codex Macedoniensis), Pi 041 (Codex Petropolitanus), Lambda 039 (Codex Oxoniensis Bodleianus), Omega 045, 049, 063, 0117, 0133, 0135, and 0151. (Total codices for this century = 21.)*

*10th century Byzantine Codices used by von Soden: S 028 (Codex Vaticanus), X 033 (Codex Monacensis), Gamma 036 (Codex Oxoniensis Bodleianus), 046, 052, 056, and 0142. (Total codices for this century = 7.)*

Of the Minuscules used by von Soden, 11 are 17th century or later Byzantine text types and so excluded from the Byzantine count (as they are outside the closed class of sources)<sup>348</sup>; and there are 9 Byzantine Minuscules undated outside of von Soden's system, and so I have used von Soden's dates for them, and omitted one<sup>349</sup>.

<sup>348</sup> 289, 868, 956, 963, 988, 1044, 1063, 1101, 1104, 1303, 1748.

<sup>349</sup> I have generally used the dates of Aland or Gregory (in Tischendorf's 8th edition, *Prolegomena* 1894). But I use von Soden's dates for 852 (ε 406 = 14th century), 1296 (ε 3032 = 13th century), 1297 (ε 3042 = 13th century), 1298 (ε 3033 = 13th century), 1299 (ε 451 = 14th century), 1305 (ε 1167 = 11th century), 1743 (α 276 = 12th

Byzantine Minuscules, or Minuscules with certain clearly defined Byzantine parts, consulted by von Soden include the following manuscripts. (Converting von Soden's symbols to Gregory numbers.)

*Byzantine Minuscules from the 9th to 16th centuries. (Total minuscules for these centuries = 1047, of which 55 are only Byzantine in specific parts. )*

*9th century Byzantine Minuscules used by von Soden: 461 (835 A.D., the oldest known Minuscule bearing a date on it, held at St. Petersburg Public Library, Russia), 1080, 1862, and 2142. (Total minuscules for this century = 4.)*

*9th / 10th century Byzantine Minuscules used by von Soden: 399, 424 (Byzantine outside of Matthew's & Luke's Gospels), and 1841 (Byzantine outside of Revelation). (Total minuscules for this century = 3, of which 2 are Byzantine only in specific parts.)*

*Byzantine Minuscules used by von Soden (10th century): 14, 27, 29, 34, 63, 82, 92, 100, 135, 144, 221, 237, 262, 278b, 344, 364, 371, 405, 411, 450, 454, 457, 478, 481, 564, 568, 584, 602, 605, 626, 627, 669, 920, 1055, 1076, 1077, 1078, 1172, 1203, 1223, 1225, 1323, 1347, 1351, 1357, 1392, 1417, 1452, 1662, 1720, 1829, 1851, 1874 (Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles), 1880, 1891 (Byzantine outside of Acts), 1905, 1920, 1927, 1954, 1997, 1998, 2125, 2273. (Total minuscules for this century = 63, of which 2 are Byzantine only in specific parts.)*

*Byzantine Minuscules used by von Soden (10th / 11th century): 994, 1073, and 1701. (Total minuscules for these centuries = 3.)*

*Byzantine Minuscules used by von Soden (11th century): 7, 8, 12, 20, 23, 24, 25, 28 (Byzantine other than in Mark), 37, 39, 40, 50, 65, 68, 75, 77, 83, 89, 98, 103, 104 (1087 A.D., Byzantine in Acts & Revelation), 108, 112, 123, 125, 126, 127, 133, 137, 142, 143, 148, 150, 151, 169, 177, 186, 194, 195, 197, 200, 207, 208, 210, 212, 215, 236, 250, 259, 272, 276, 277, 278a, 300, 301, 302, 314, 325, 331, 343, 350, 352, 354, 357, 360, 375, 376, 398 (Byzantine outside General Epistles), 422, 431 (Byzantine outside Acts & General Epistles), 451 (Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles), 458, 459 (1092 A.D., an interesting Minuscule as it bears a date on it, Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles), 465, 466, 470, 474, 475, 476, 490, 491, 497, 504, 506, 507, 516, 526, 527, 528, 530, 547, 548, 549, 559, 560, 583, 585, 596, 607, 624, 625, 638, 639, 640, 651, 672, 699, 707, 708, 711, 746, 754, 756, 773, 785, 809, 831, 870, 884, 887, 894, 901, 910, 919, 937, 942, 943,*

---

century), 1759 ( $\alpha$  387 = 13th century), 1860 ( $\alpha$  377 = 13th century), 2300 ( $\epsilon$  3065 = 13th century). Von Soden dates every manuscript by a system unique to his numbering scheme, relating to the first number(s) of his classification e.g., with the "2" signifying the "2" in 12th century,  $\delta$  200-299,  $\epsilon$  200-299,  $\epsilon$  1200-1299,  $\epsilon$  2000 ff, &  $\alpha$  200-299 are 12th century; or with the "3" signifying "3" in 13th century,  $\delta$  300-399,  $\epsilon$  300-399,  $\epsilon$  1300-1399,  $\epsilon$  3000 ff, &  $\alpha$  300-399 are 13th century (Von Soden's *Die Schriften*, I, I, pp. 38-9). But the reader should be aware that dates are sometimes disputed.

944, 945 (Byzantine outside of Acts & General Epistles), 964, 965, 991, 1006 (Byzantine outside of Revelation), 1014, 1028, 1045, 1054, 1056, 1074, 1110, 1123, 1168, 1174, 1187, 1207, 1209, 1211, 1212, 1214, 1221, 1222, 1244, 1277, 1300, 1305, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1317, 1320, 1324, 1340, 1343, 1373, 1384, 1438, 1444, 1448 (Byzantine outside of General Epistles), 1449, 1470, 1483, 1505 (1084 A.D., Byzantine in Gospels), 1513, 1514, 1517, 1520, 1521, 1545, 1556, 1570, 1607, 1668, 1672, 1693, 1730, 1734, 1738, 1770, 1828, 1835, 1846 (Byzantine in Acts), 1847, 1849, 1870, 1878, 1879, 1888, 1906, 1907, 1916, 1919, 1921, 1923, 1924, 1925, 1932, 1933, 1934, 1946, 1955, 1980, 1981, 1982, 2001, 2007, 2098, 2132, 2133, 2138 (1072 A.D., Byzantine in Revelation), 2144, 2147 (Byzantine outside of General Epistles), 2172, 2176, 2181, 2183, 2199, 2275, 2277, 2281, 2295, 2298 (Byzantine in Pauline Epistles), 2381. (*Total minuscules for this century = 231, of which are 14 Byzantine only in specific parts.*)

*Byzantine Minuscules used by von Soden (11th / 12th century):* 256 (Byzantine outside of Pauline Epistles), 655, 657, 660, 1013, 1188, 1191, 1309, 1358, 1540, 1566. (*Total minuscules for these centuries = 11, of which 1 is Byzantine only in specific parts.*)

*Byzantine Minuscules used by von Soden (12th century):* 2, 3, 9, 11, 15, 21, 32, 44, 46, 49, 57, 73, 76, 78, 80, 84, 95, 97, 105, 110, 111, 116, 119, 120, 122, 129, 132, 134, 138, 139, 140, 146, 156, 159, 162, 180 (Byzantine outside Acts), 183, 187, 193, 196, 199, 202, 203, 217, 224, 226, 231, 240, 244, 245, 247, 261, 264, 267, 268, 269, 270, 275, 280, 281, 282, 297, 304, 306, 319, 320, 329, 330 (Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles), 334, 337, 347, 351, 353, 355, 356, 374, 378 (Byzantine outside of General Epistles), 387, 392, 395, 396, 401, 407, 408, 419, 438, 439, 443, 452, 471, 485, 499, 502, 505, 509, 510, 518, 520, 524, 529, 531, 535, 538, 550, 551, 556, 570, 571, 580, 587, 610 (Byzantine in General Epistles), 618, 620, 622, 637, 650, 662, 673, 674, 688, 692, 721, 736, 748, 750, 760, 765, 768, 770, 774, 777, 778, 779, 782, 787, 793, 799, 808, 843, 857, 860, 862, 877, 893, 902, 911, 916, 917 (Byzantine outside of Pauline Epistles), 918 (Byzantine in Pauline Epistles), 922, 924, 936, 950, 967, 971, 973, 975, 980, 987, 993, 998, 1007, 1010 (a member of the family 1424 manuscripts), 1046, 1081, 1083, 1085, 1169, 1176, 1186, 1190, 1197, 1198, 1199, 1200, 1217, 1218, 1224, 1231, 1240, 1241 (Byzantine in Acts), 1301, 1315, 1316, 1318, 1319 (Byzantine outside of Pauline Epistles), 1355, 1359 (Byzantine outside of General Epistles), 1360, 1364, 1375, 1385, 1437, 1539, 1583, 1673, 1683, 1714, 1737, 1743, 1752, 1754, 1800, 1821, 1826, 1872, 1889, 1914, 1915, 1917, 1926, 1951, 1970, 1971, 1974, 1986, 1988, 2013, 2096, 2126, 2127 (Byzantine outside of Pauline Epistles), 2135, 2139, 2173, 2177, 2189, 2191, 2289. (*Total minuscules for this century = 227, of which 10 are Byzantine only in specific parts.*)

*Byzantine Minuscules used by von Soden (12th / 13th century):* 905, 906, 1310, 1341, 1897. (*Total minuscules for these centuries = 5.*)

*Byzantine Minuscules used by von Soden (composites of parts from 12th to 14th centuries):* 632 and 1227. (*Total minuscules for these centuries = 2.*)

*Byzantine Minuscules used by von Soden (12th & 14th centuries):* 189 (Gospels 14th century; Acts & Pauline Epistles 12th century). (*Total minuscules for these centuries = 1, and this is Byzantine only in specific parts.*)

*Byzantine Minuscules used by von Soden (13th century):* 6 (Byzantine in Gospels & Acts), 52, 55, 60, 74, 107, 121, 128, 136, 141, 147, 167, 170, 192, 198, 204, 206 (Byzantine outside General / Catholic Epistles), 218 (Byzantine outside of General & Pauline Epistles), 219, 220, 227, 248, 260, 263 (Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles), 283, 284, 291, 292, 293, 303, 305, 309, 327, 328, 342, 359, 361, 362, 365 (Byzantine outside of Pauline Epistles), 366, 384, 388, 390, 410, 449, 469, 473, 477, 479, 482, 483, 484, 496, 500, 501, 511, 514, 519, 533, 534, 546, 553, 554, 558, 573, 574, 592, 593, 597, 601, 663, 666, 677, 684, 685, 691, 696, 705, 714, 715, 717, 725, 729, 737, 757, 759, 775, 811, 820, 825, 830, 835, 840, 897, 898, 900, 912, 914, 966, 969, 970, 981, 995, 997, 999, 1000, 1004, 1008, 1011, 1015, 1016, 1025, 1031, 1050, 1052, 1053, 1057, 1069, 1070, 1072, 1087, 1089, 1094, 1103, 1107, 1129, 1148, 1150, 1161, 1149, 1171, 1173, 1177, 1201, 1205, 1206, 1208, 1213, 1215, 1226, 1238, 1242, 1251 (Byzantine outside General Epistles), 1285, 1292 (Byzantine outside General Epistles), 1296, 1297, 1339, 1398 (Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles), 1400, 1594, 1597, 1604, 1622, 1642 (1278 A.D., Byzantine outside Acts), 1717, 1727, 1728, 1731, 1736, 1740, 1742, 1759, 1772, 1852 (Byzantine in Revelation), 1855, 1858, 1860, 1922, 1938, 1941, 1956, 1972, 1992, 2111, 2119, 2140, 2141, 2236, 2300. (*Total minuscules for this century = 180, of which 10 are Byzantine only in specific parts.*)

*Byzantine Minuscules used by von Soden (13th / 14th century):* 266, 656, 668, 1334. (*Total minuscules for these centuries = 4.*)

*Byzantine Minuscules used by von Soden (14th century):* 18, 45, 53, 54, 66, 109, 155, 171, 182, 185, 190, 201, 206 (Byzantine outside of General Epistles), 209 (Byzantine in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 214, 223, 232, 235, 243, 246, 254 (Byzantine outside of General Epistles), 290, 308, 316, 324, 358, 367, 369, 381, 386, 393, 394, 402, 404, 409, 412, 413, 414, 415, 417, 425, 426, 429 (Byzantine in Pauline Epistles & Revelation), 480, 492, 494, 498, 512, 521, 523, 540, 577, 578, 586, 588, 594, 600, 603, 604, 628, 633, 634, 644, 645, 648, 649, 680, 686, 690, 698, 718, 727, 730, 731, 734, 741, 758, 761, 762, 763, 764, 769, 781, 783, 784, 786, 789, 790, 794, 797, 798, 802, 806, 818, 819, 824, 833, 834, 836, 839, 845, 846, 848, 852, 858, 864, 866a, 867, 889, 890, 904, 921, 928, 938, 951, 952, 953, 959, 960, 977, 978, 1020, 1023, 1032, 1033, 1036, 1061, 1062, 1067 (Byzantine outside of General Epistles), 1075, 1099, 1100, 1119, 1121, 1189, 1196, 1234, 1235, 1236, 1248, 1249, 1252, 1283, 1299, 1328, 1330, 1331, 1345, 1354, 1356, 1377, 1395, 1445, 1447, 1476, 1492, 1503, 1504, 1506 (1320 A.D., Byzantine in Gospels), 1516, 1523 (Byzantine in Pauline Epistles), 1543, 1547, 1548, 1572, 1577, 1605, 1613, 1614, 1619, 1637, 1723, 1725, 1726, 1732, 1733, 1741, 1746, 1747, 1761, 1762, 1771, 1856, 1859, 1877 (Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles), 1899, 1902, 1918, 1928, 1929, 1952, 1975, 2200 (Byzantine in Gospels & Revelation), 2261, 2266, 2303, 2466. (*Total minuscules for this century = 197, of which 9 are Byzantine only in specific parts.*)

*Byzantine Minuscules used by von Soden (14th & 15th centuries): 492 (Byzantine in 14th century Pauline Epistles & 15th century Revelation). (Total minuscules for these centuries = 1, and this is Byzantine only in specific parts.)*

*Byzantine Minuscules used by von Soden (15th century): 30, 47, 58, 70, 149, 181 (Byzantine in Revelation), 205 (Byzantine outside of Gospels & Revelation), 285, 287, 287, 288, 313, 368, 373, 379, 380, 385, 418, 432, 446, 448, 493, 525, 541, 575, 616, 642 (Byzantine outside General Epistles), 664, 694, 739, 801, 841, 844, 853, 880, 886 (1454 A.D.), 955, 958, 961, 962, 1003, 1017, 1018, 1024, 1026, 1059, 1060, 1105, 1202, 1232, 1233, 1247, 1250, 1260, 1264, 1482, 1508, 1617, 1626, 1628, 1636, 1649, 1656, 1745, 1750, 1757, 1763, 1767, 1876, 1882, 1948, 1957, 1958, 1964, 1978, 2003, 2175, 2178, 2221. (Total minuscules for this century = 79, of which 3 are Byzantine only in specific parts.)*

*Byzantine Minuscules used by von Soden (15th / 16th century): 99 and 1367. (Total minuscules for these centuries = 2.)*

*Byzantine Minuscules used by von Soden (16th century): 61 (Byzantine in Gospels & Acts), 90, 335, 445, 522 (1515 A.D., Byzantine outside Acts & General Epistles), 724, 745, 755, 861, 957, 1019, 1030, 1065, 1068, 1088, 1239, 1362, 1370, 1374, 1618, 1749, 1768, 1861, 1883, 1911, 1930, 1931, 1936, 1937, 1979, 2009, 2218, 2573. (Total minuscules for this century = 33, of which 2 are Byzantine only in specific parts.)*

Therefore, tallying up this selection of only some of the Byzantine Minuscules used by von Soden, but here itemized as a sample of them, the total number of Byzantine minuscules in this sample is 1047 from the 9th to 16th centuries (of which 55 are Byzantine only in specific parts).

From this *limited selection* of von Soden, we may thus itemize 46 Byzantine Codices (of which 3 are Byzantine only in specific parts) and 1047 Byzantine Minuscules (of which 55 are Byzantine only in specific parts) i.e., a total of 1093 Byzantine manuscripts (of which 58 are Byzantine only in specific parts). *Hence it must also be said that on the basis of this limited selection alone, von Soden's general selection of Byzantine manuscripts clearly includes a good range of Codices and Minuscules over various centuries. This accomplishment alone, and this is only a selection of the larger number of Byzantine manuscripts* i.e., of over 1,000 Byzantine manuscripts spanning a period of eleven centuries from the 5th to 16th centuries A.D., is itself without rival in comparison to the Greek manuscript testimony of the Western Text or Alexandrian Text. Clearly this is a broad basis for showing the existence of the Byzantine text over time and through time. It is also clear from these figures alone, that Hermann von Soden consulted more Byzantine Greek manuscripts than anyone else has. It is further clear by a generalist deduction, to conclude that the Byzantine manuscripts must predominate in the two largest groupings of his textual apparatus i.e., his "K" and "I" groups. But let us now give some closer consideration to von Soden's groups.

Von Soden's K (Koine) 1 Group is his most important Byzantine group. It is the group used by Robinson & Pierpont to construct their Majority Byzantine Text; and it is also important in Hodges & Farstad's methodology (which in their majority selections is used as an important witness to determine their majority text, or a major split in it, though they give a more specific preference to von Soden's Kx subgroup of the K group in the Gospels, then give a wider preference to von Soden's K group in Acts and the Epistles<sup>350</sup>.)

As further discussed, below, it should be understood that von Soden places a number of Byzantine manuscripts outside of his K groups<sup>351</sup>. But while *c.* 1000 manuscripts are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden's system (some manuscripts are in more than one group), it is notable that *c.* 400 of them, or *c.* 40% of these otherwise unclassified *c.* 1000 manuscripts, belong to one of von Soden's "K" groups. There is some doubt as to what grouping a small number of von Soden's manuscripts are meant by him to belong to with regard to the K group<sup>352</sup>.

---

<sup>350</sup> Hodges & Farstad's "Introduction," pp. xv,xxi-xxiii. E.g., they consider that in the Gospels, "a seriously divided Kx testimony suffices to produce M pt" i.e., "part" support only in their Majority Text apparatus. In such "decisions about M pt readings," "essentially the same procedure was followed in the Acts and the Epistles, with preference going to von Soden's **K** (as over against his Kc and K r) in much the same way as preference was given to Kx in the Gospels."

<sup>351</sup> There are numerous examples of this e.g., placing von Soden's symbols after their Gregory numbers, and considering just the first 50 Minuscules which are Byzantine but not in one of von Soden's K (Koine) groups, there are Minuscules: 7 (Byzantine in Pauline Epistles) = von Soden's Oπ18; 20 = von Soden's A138 (A group), 21 = von Soden's ε 286 (Iα group), 23 = von Soden's ε 1183 (Iφc group), 24 = von Soden's A18 (Ac group), 25 = von Soden's A 139 (Ac group), 27 = von Soden's ε 1023 (Iφr group), 28 (Byzantine outside of Mark) = von Soden's ε 168 (Iα group), 30 = von Soden's ε 522 (Iβ group), 32 = von Soden's ε 296 (Ak group), 34 = von Soden's A19 (Ab group), 36 (Gospels) = von Soden's A20 (Ac group), 37 = von Soden's A154 (Ac group), 39 = von Soden's A140 (Ab group), 40 = von Soden's A155 (Ac group), and 50 = von Soden's A152 (Aa group).

<sup>352</sup> Aland (*Kurzgefasste, op. cit.*) asks if von Soden includes in his general K group: 568 (von Soden's ε 189) (Byzantine), 580 (ε 1291) (Byzantine), 792 (ε 585 & α 1575) (unclassified outside of von Soden's system) and 948 (ε 1452) (Byzantine) in his *K ak* group; or 690 (ε 435) (Byzantine) in his *K l* group, or 1323 (von Soden's ε 1268) (Byzantine), 1658 (von Soden's ε 1509) (unclassified outside of von Soden's system), 1990 (von Soden's ε 1171) (unclassified outside of von Soden's system) in his *K r* group; or 1448 (δ 256) (Byzantine outside General Epistles), 1782 (von Soden's ε 1502) (unclassified outside of von Soden's system), and 1989 (von Soden's ε 1170) (unclassified outside of von Soden's system) in his *K x* group; or 1718 (α 272) (non-Byzantine)?

In von Soden's K (Koine) group, there are *c.* 400 manuscripts that are otherwise classified outside of von Soden's system. But 580 manuscripts that are also classified outside of von Soden's system are to be found in von Soden's K group manuscripts. Of the 580 group manuscripts that are classified outside of von Soden's system, 560 manuscripts or *c.* 96.5 % are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, i.e., 539 manuscripts or *c.* 93% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine<sup>353</sup>, 21 manuscripts or *c.*

---

<sup>353</sup> (These have already been counted in the previous Byzantine classification count of von Soden's manuscripts.) Codices E07, F 09, G 011, H 013, L 020, S 028, V 031, Omega 045, 046, 049, 0117, 0133, 0134, 0135; Minuscules e2, 3 (K outside of Acts), 8, 11, 14, 18, 29, 44 (K in Gospels), 45, 46, 47, 49, 51, 52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 65, 66, 75, 76 (K in Gospels), 78, 83, 84, 89, 90 (K in Acts), 97, 98, 99, 105, 107, 109, 110, 112, 121, 122, 123, 125, 126, 128, 132, 133, 134, 135, 140, 141, 142, 144, 147, 148, 149, 150, 155, 156, 159, 167, 170, 183, 189, 190, 193, 198, 200, 201, 204, 207, 208, 212, 214, 219, 223, 224, 226 (K in Gospels), 227, 231, 236, 246, 247, 260, 261, 272, 275, 277, 278b, 282, 283, 284, 285, 290, 293, 302, 308, 309, 314, 324, 328, 335, 337 (K in Revelation), 342, 343, 344, 347, 350, 352, 355, 358, 359, 360, 361, 364, 367, 369, 371, 375, 380, 384, 385 (K in Revelation), 386, 387, 388, 390, 393, 394, 396, 399, 401, 402, 404, 405, 407, 409, 410, 411, 413, 414, 415, 417, 418, 419, 422, 425, 432 (K in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 438, 439, 445, 446, 452, 457, 458, 461, 465, 466, 469 (K in Revelation), 475, 476, 479, 480, 492, 493, 494, 497, 498, 500, 501, 502, 504, 505, 506 (K in Gospels), 507, 509, 510, 511, 512, 514, 516, 519, 520, 521, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 533, 535, 538, 541, 547 (K in Gospels), 548, 550, 553, 554, 559, 564, 570, 571, 574, 575, 577, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 592, 594, 597, 601, 602, 604, 625, 626, 627, 628 (K in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 632, 633, 634, 637, 638 (K in Acts), 644, 650, 651, 655, 656, 657, 663, 664, 669, 672, 673, 677, 680, 685, 688, 689, 694, 696, 698, 699, 705, 707, 712, 714, 717, 724, 725, 750, 756, 757, 758, 759, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 768, 769, 774, 777, 778, 779, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 789, 790, 793, 794, 797, 798, 799, 801, 802, 806, 808 (K in Gospels), 824, 825, 830, 831, 839, 843, 844, 845, 864, 867, 877, 897, 900, 901 (K in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 905, 906, 912, 914, 919 (K in Revelation), 920 (K in Revelation), 922 (K in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 928, 929, 936, 937, 938, 942, 943, 944, 950, 952, 955, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 966, 967, 971, 973, 975, 977, 991, 999 (K in Gospels), 1000, 1003, 1013, 1017, 1018, 1019, 1020, 1025, 1030, 1031, 1033, 1036, 1045, 1046, 1050, 1052, 1053, 1054, 1055, 1057, 1059, 1060, 1062, 1065, 1068, 1072, 1073, 1074, 1075, 1076, 1077, 1081, 1083, 1087, 1088, 1089, 1094, 1100, 1110, 1119, 1123, 1149 (K in Gospels), 1161, 1168, 1169, 1172, 1173, 1174, 1186, 1189, 1190, 1191, 1197, 1199, 1201, 1203, 1206, 1208, 1212, 1213, 1214, 1215, 1217, 1218, 1221, 1224, 1225, 1226, 1232, 1233, 1234, 1235, 1238, 1240, 1244, 1247, 1248, 1249, 1250, 1277, 1285, 1297, 1298, 1300, 1305, 1309, 1310, 1315, 1316, 1317, 1318, 1320, 1324, 1328, 1330, 1331, 1334, 1339, 1340, 1341, 1343, 1345, 1350, 1351, 1356, 1357, 1358, 1362, 1364, 1367, 1385, 1395, 1400, 1417, 1438, 1444, 1445, 1449, 1452, 1470, 1476, 1482, 1483, 1492, 1503, 1504, 1508, 1513, 1514, 1517, 1520, 1539, 1540, 1543, 1548, 1556, 1572, 1577, 1583, 1594 (K in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 1597, 1614, 1617, 1619, 1622, 1626, 1628, 1636, 1637 (K in Gospels), 1649, 1656, 1662, 1668, 1672, 1683, 1693, 1714, 1720, 1725, 1730, 1732, 1749, 1752, 1836 (K in Revelation), 1847, 1849 (K in Acts & Revelation), 1855, 1856, 1859, 1860, 1870, 1872 (K in Revelation), 1918, 1934, 1954,

3.5% are Byzantine only in specific parts<sup>354</sup>, and 20 manuscripts or *c.* 3.5% are non-Byzantine<sup>355</sup>. Applying these as projections to the 403 manuscripts of the “K” group, which are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden’s system<sup>356</sup>, means we can add 389 manuscripts to the Byzantine count, of which 14 may

---

1955 (K in Revelation), 2119, 2125, 2126, 2133, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2172, 2175, 2177, 2178, 2181, 2199, 2218, 2221, 2236, 2266, 2275, 2281, & 2295.

<sup>354</sup> (These have already been counted in the previous Byzantine classification count of von Soden’s manuscripts.) Minuscules 61 (Byzantine in Gospels & Acts), 180 (Byzantine outside of Acts), 256 (Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles & K in Revelation), 263 (Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles & K in Gospels), 330 (Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles & K in Gospels), 365 (Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles & K in Acts; n.b. e.g., 365 is also K in Pauline Epistles, showing some of the difficulties of this projection methodology), 398 (Byzantine outside General Epistles), 429 (Byzantine in Pauline Epistles & Revelation), 451 (Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles), 522 (Byzantine outside Acts & General Epistles & K in Gospels), 1006 (Byzantine outside Revelation), 1251 (Byzantine outside Gospels), 1292 (Byzantine outside General Epistles & K in Pauline Epistles), 1359 (Byzantine outside General Epistles), 1505 (Byzantine in Gospels), 1642 (Byzantine outside Acts), 1841 (Byzantine outside Revelation), 2127 (Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles & K in General Epistles), 2138 (Byzantine in Revelation & K in Revelation), 2147 (Byzantine outside General Epistles & K in Gospels), & 2200 (Byzantine in Gospels & Revelation & K in Gospels).

<sup>355</sup> Here and in subsequent footnotes, any manuscripts already counted due to a previous classification count, will have an asterisk, “\*” next to their number. Codices \*P 025 (K in Acts), \*0101, \*0102, \*0105, \*0106, \*0107, \*0115, \*0119, \*0122, \*0132, \*0138, \*0148, \*0155, \*0234; Minuscules 467 (K in Revelation), 629, 1243 (K in Acts), 1563, 1735, & 2030.

<sup>356</sup> Codices, 0136, 0137, 0144, 0154; Minuscules 35 (K in Gospels), 42 (K in Acts, Pauline Epistles, & General Epistles), 43 (K in Gospels), 51, 56, 59, 62, 91 (K in Revelation), 93 (K in Acts, Pauline Epistles, & Revelation), 96, 102, 130, 145, 158, 163, 165, 173, 175, 176, 188, 191, 228, 234 (K in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 241 (K in Gospels), 242 (K in Gospels & Revelation), 252, 258, 274, 294, 296 (K in Gospels), 298, 312, 321 (K in Acts), 336 (K in Acts), 338, 340, 341, 345, 363, 382, 400, 403, 417, 433, 444, 447, 456, 464, 486, 503, 517 (K in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 532, 536 (K in Gospels), 542, 561, 562, 563, 567, 582 (K in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 609, 612, 613 (K in Pauline Epistles), 617 (K in Revelation), 652, 653, 654, 658, 661, 676, 678, 681, 682, 710, 751, 791, 795, 796 (K in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 803, 805, 823 (K in Gospels), 871, 873, 875, 909, 923, 925, 926, 927 (K in Gospels), 929, 930, 932, 933, 934, 935 (K in Gospels), 939, 940, 941 (K in Gospels), 972, 974, 982, 985, 986, 996, 1001, 1002, 1022, 1034, 1035, 1037, 1039, 1040, 1041, 1042, 1051, 1086, 1090, 1092, 1095, 1097, 1098, 1111, 1114, 1117, 1120, 1122, 1125, 1131, 1132, 1133, 1134, 1135, 1136, 1138, 1140, 1141, 1142, 1143, 1145, 1147, 1152, 1155, 1157, 1158, 1165, 1179, 1180, 1193, 1195, 1204, 1228, 1257, 1258, 1269, 1280, 1286, 1288, 1292 (K in Pauline Epistles), 1294, 1322, 1326, 1329, 1333, 1335, 1338, 1344, 1348, 1349, 1353, 1361, 1363, 1372, 1379,

be regarded as Byzantine only in specific parts; and add 14 manuscripts to the non-Byzantine group. This is in addition to the otherwise uncounted K group 6 manuscripts that are non-Byzantine. Thus von Soden's K groups are *generally* but *not monolithically* Byzantine

Given the fragmentary nature of the papyri, I would like to be able to go over copies of them to consider for myself what text type they are, or if their readings are too small to make such a determination. But I am unable to do this, and since there small numbers will not affect my overall calculations, I shall simply stipulate that their classifications are, at least for my generalist purposes, correct. (Nevertheless, this factor makes me reluctant to cite them at the readings in the textual commentary<sup>357</sup>.) Of 21 papyri used by von Soden<sup>358</sup>, 19 are non-Byzantine (90% of papyri)<sup>359</sup>, and 2 are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden's system (10% of

---

1390, 1393, 1397, 1399, 1401, 1404, 1405, 1406, 1407, 1410, 1413, 1414, 1415, 1416, 1418, 1425, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1431, 1432, 1433, 1436, 1440, 1442, 1450, 1453, 1456, 1458, 1459, 1460, 1461, 1462, 1464, 1465, 1466, 1467, 1471, 1472, 1473, 1474, 1477, 1479, 1480, 1485, 1486, 1487, 1488, 1489, 1490, 1491, 1493, 1494, 1495 (K in Acts), 1496, 1497, 1499, 1501, 1509, 1511, 1519, 1526 (K in James), 1532, 1538, 1541, 1544, 1549, 1550, 1551, 1552, 1553, 1558, 1559, 1560, 1564, 1565, 1567, 1568, 1569, 1571, 1575, 1576, 1580, 1581, 1584, 1585, 1586, 1587, 1589, 1590, 1591, 1592, 1595, 1596, 1598, 1599, 1600, 1601, 1603, 1608, 1609, 1620, 1621, 1623, 1624, 1625, 1629, 1630, 1632, 1633, 1634, 1635, 1638, 1639, 1641, 1643, 1645, 1646, 1647, 1648, 1650, 1651, 1652, 1653, 1655, 1659, 1660, 1661, 1664, 1665, 1666, 1667, 1669, 1670, 1671, 1676, 1679, 1680, 1686, 1687, 1688, 1691, 1694, 1696, 1697, 1698, 1700, 1705, 1709, 1712, 1713, 1716, 1719, 1724, 1753, 1760, 1766, 1779, 1783, 1785, 1786, 1787, 1788, 1789, 1790, 1791, 1792, 1794, 1823, 1848 (K in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 1854 (K in Acts, Pauline & General Epistles), 1865, 1893, 1904, 1966, 2016, 2017, 2024, 2025, 2027, 2039, 2041, 2048, 2080 (K in Acts), 2085, 2086, 2095, 2099, 2112, 2115, 2117, 2118, 2120, 2122, 2124, 2134, 2146, 2180 (K in General / Catholic Epistles), 2198, 2201, 2204, 2213, 2216, 2217, 2220, 2224, 2226, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2233 (K in Acts), 2234, 2235, 2247, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2255, 2263, 2268, 2282, 2292, 2296, & 2297.

<sup>357</sup> For instance at Matt. 19:10, the variant that omits "His" and so reads, "The disciples," is the most probable reading of (what is usually, and perhaps correctly regarded as, the mixed text type) Papyrus 71 (Matt. 19:10,11,17,18; 4th century), although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain.

<sup>358</sup> For classifications of text-types, *infra*, see Aland, K., *et unum*, *The Text of the New Testament*, translated by E.F. Rhodes, 2nd ed., Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA, 1989, pp. 96-142.

<sup>359</sup> P1, P2, P4, P5, P6, P8, P9, P10, P11, P13, P14, P15, P16, P17, P18, P19, P20, P35, & P36.

papyri)<sup>360</sup>. As per the system of classification described, *infra*, for classification purposes the fact that all other papyri are non-Byzantine, means that we can extrapolate that these remaining 2 are also non-Byzantine, and thus add 2 manuscripts to the non-Byzantine group. (See my comments on this classification of the papyri, *infra*.)

What of the remaining *c.* 60% of Minuscules presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden's system, i.e., the *c.* 640 minuscules used by von Soden from the *c.* 1000 manuscripts which are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden's system? Once again, the grouping of a small number are *in dubio*<sup>361</sup>. Some of von Soden's manuscript groupings are open to criticism, and certainly not the system that I would use were I classifying these manuscripts. In particular his "I" grouping should have been split up with the Byzantine manuscripts classified as part of his "K" group (in his "I" group, *c.* 78% are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, i.e., *c.* 68% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine in the "I" parts, 10% are Byzantine only in specific parts); and the *c.* 22% which are non-Byzantine further subdivided into such classifications as e.g., Western Text or mixed text type. Unfortunately, his threefold "K," "I," and "H" groupings reflect his faulty textual theory of three "revised" text-types appearing in the 4th century, and so we must unravel this erroneous element of his work from his wider classification of manuscripts as best we can under the circumstances.

*Whatever one thinks of von Soden's groupings, they are nevertheless groupings where von Soden considers he has found internal affinities.* In this context, it is notable that the manuscripts he isolates in his "H" group are generally those of interest to neo-Alexandrians in the construction of a neo-Alexandrian text; and the manuscripts he isolates in his "K" group are those of interest to Robinson & Pierpont in the construction of a majority Byzantine Text. Furthermore, as seen by von Soden's classification of his "K" group, *supra*, which in those parts that can be checked with another classification system are *c.* 96.5% either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, *he appears to have had some level of general skill in this area, albeit one that was clearly susceptible to error.* This means that we can, *with some level of general confidence*, make extrapolations as to the Byzantine to non-Byzantine manuscript count in a given group, on the basis of the Byzantine to non-Byzantine manuscript count in that part of the group that is classified outside of von Soden's system.

Thus notwithstanding my criticism of von Soden's groupings, in particular his "I" group which contains in its non-Byzantine component e.g., the Western Text, D 05; nevertheless, in a broad sense the "I" group, *infra*, which in those parts that can be checked with another classification system are *c.* 78% either Byzantine or Byzantine in

---

<sup>360</sup> Papyrus 7 (P7) & Papyrus 12 (P12).

<sup>361</sup> Aland (*Kurzgefasste, op. cit.*) asks if von Soden includes in his *I'* Group or *I*  $\sigma$  Group: 281 (von Soden's  $\epsilon$  295) (Byzantine) in his *I'* group, or 322 ( $\alpha$  550) (non-Byzantine) in his *I b* group, or 616 ( $\alpha$  503) (Byzantine) and 1717 ( $\alpha$  487) (Byzantine) in his *I c* group, or 1342 ( $\epsilon$  1311) (non-Byzantine)?

specific parts, have the sterling advantage that we can use them to deal with a large number of manuscripts, and distinguish a Byzantine from a non-Byzantine component in them. In short, the fact that in the “I” group, *c.* 68% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine in the I parts, and beyond this a total of *c.* 78% are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, means that in a broad-brush sense they seem to be part of a textual classification system of sufficient integrity *as a two-thirds to three-quarters Byzantine Text group* to be usable for these generalist purposes. But to this I make some qualifications. If the extrapolations I make from the known Byzantine to non-Byzantine component in von Soden’s groups to the unknown Byzantine to non-Byzantine component in his groups are in error, it is more likely to be in a group where there are only a small number of manuscripts, in which case it will not greatly affect the overall count; or if this error occurs in the unusual instance of Andreas of Caesarea (von Soden’s Av group) discussed below, in that instance we are still dealing with a relatively small number of manuscripts which will not affect the overall general picture. Thus while Hodges & Farstad fairly call von Soden’s “I” group highly “amorphous,” it is still about a two-thirds to three-quarters Byzantine textual group.

But if an error is made in the “I” group, it would, if anything, probably be in overstating the strength of the non-Byzantine group, since the classification of the known component of the “I” group that is non-Byzantine, to some extent reflects neo-Alexandrian priorities, since they generally hold the academic positions etc., and so would be more focused on non-Byzantine texts. Thus if there is a discernable calculation error in the “I” group, and possibly there is and possibly there is not, it is more likely to be in my overstating rather than my understating the strength of the Byzantine group; with the consequence that in all likelihood the broad figures I arrive at are not thereby biased in any major way towards my own neo-Byzantine position. *Like it or lump it, von Soden’s textual apparatus is the only one we have giving any textual groupings to so large a number of manuscripts; and so while I am prepared to revise my calculations upon receipt of better information if that is forthcoming at some future point in time, at least for the present I make the following calculations based on von Soden on the basis that we must do the best we can under the circumstances that we find ourselves in.*

I would also remind the reader that for my purposes of determining the representative Byzantine text as my starting point, my consultation (for Matt.-Jude) of Robinson & Pierpont who use only von Soden’s “K” group, which on all accounts is clearly a generally Byzantine group; means I have “fire-proofed” my commentary methodology from the flaming problems of not only von Soden’s “I” group, but also the extrapolations made with respect to all his other groups, other than the “K” group. I.e., I would scrutinize, if necessary by direct consultation with von Soden, any textual variation, or indication of a substantial split from, the majority text of Robinson & Pierpont. (However, the “I” group is still more than 2/3rds Byzantine, and so if Robinson & Pierpont are in disagreement with Hodges & Farstad, and upon investigation this is due to a fairly even split in the texts, evident in e.g., Green’s Textual Apparatus, then textual analysis will be required to determine the better reading.)

Whatever criticisms one may validly make of von Soden's textual apparatus, at the end of the day, its benefits far outweigh its deficits. The manuscript information that von Soden records in his textual apparatus can be found in no other textual apparatus for St. Matthew to Jude, *a fact making his work extremely important, valuable, and greatly appreciated*. Other than the Lectionaries, discussed, *supra*, von Soden refers to virtually all the Codices and Minuscules (for Matt. –Jude<sup>362</sup>), a fact making his work very impressive, very valuable, and to this day, unique. *Whatever criticisms I make of von Soden's "reconstructed" faulty NT text, faulty textual theory, or textual apparatus, the reader would be wrong to misconstrue these criticisms in such a way as to doubt or deny that I am very grateful for von Soden's excellent work on so large a number of Byzantine manuscripts, or to deny that I also hold von Soden's textual apparatus in very high regard for constituting a most impressive and valuable work.*

Though von Soden was certainly not a neo-Byzantine, let us therefore use his textual classification system for our neo-Byzantine purposes. I.e., of fundamental importance to we neo-Byzantines, let us use von Soden's work to better understand the ratio of Byzantine to non-Byzantine manuscripts in his very impressive and valuable work, which to this day, is still without peer. Thus on the basis that these groups were found by him to have some level of internal affinity amongst themselves, let us continue to make projections inside each given group, just as has already been done for von Soden's K group, *supra*, as to what the Byzantine to non-Byzantine manuscript count is, extrapolating our figures for the Byzantine to non-Byzantine manuscript count in that part of the group that is not classified outside of von Soden's system, on the basis of that part of each given group that is classified outside of von Soden's system. While such projections will necessarily be approximations and contain some "rubbery" figures, they nevertheless should be good enough to give us an accurate *broad-brush* picture, which for our purposes is all we need. Thus while I am certainly prepared to modify these figures if better textual information becomes available, in the absence of such better information, this methodology will still yield us the required information, and should be correct in its general, although not its exactly precise, figures.

In von Soden's "I" group, there are 262 manuscripts that are otherwise not in a von Soden group<sup>363</sup>. There is some doubt as to what grouping a small number of von Soden's manuscripts are meant by him to belong to with regard to the "I" group<sup>364</sup>.

---

<sup>362</sup> For Revelation, cf. Hoskier, C., *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*, Bernard Quatritch, London, UK, 1929.

<sup>363</sup> There are *c.* 530 manuscripts, both codices and minuscules, in the "I" group; together with a small number whose place either in or outside of the I group is *in dubio*.

<sup>364</sup> Aland (*Kurzgefasste, op. cit.*) asks if von Soden includes: 281 (von Soden's ε 295) (Byzantine) in his I' group; 322 (von Soden's α 550) (non-Byzantine) in his I b group; 616 (von Soden's α 503) (Byzantine), 1717 (von Soden's α 487) (Byzantine), and 1832 (von Soden's α 471) (non-Byzantine) in his I c group; 903 (von Soden's ε 4002) (otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden's system) in his I φ group; or 1342 (von Soden's ε 1311) (non-Byzantine) in either his I' or Iσ group?

(A complicating factor of von Soden's system is that seven otherwise unclassified manuscripts are classified in both I and K Groups, and so already counted in the K group, *supra*<sup>365</sup>.) But 270 manuscripts that are also classified outside of von Soden's system, are to be found in von Soden's I group manuscripts. Of the 270 I group manuscripts that are classified outside of von Soden's system, 210 manuscripts or *c.* 78% are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, i.e., 182 manuscripts or *c.* 68% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine in the I parts<sup>366</sup>, 27 manuscripts or 10% are Byzantine only in specific parts<sup>367</sup>, and 60 manuscripts or *c.* 22 % are non-Byzantine<sup>368</sup>.

---

<sup>365</sup> Unclassified and in both I & K, and so not here counted again as dealt with in K group, Minuscules \*93 (I & K in Acts), \*163, \*345, \*536 (K in Gospels, I in Acts), \*909, \*1854 (I & K in Acts), & \*2016.

<sup>366</sup> As elsewhere, some manuscripts are classified in more than one grouping e.g., Codex H 014 is classified in both K and I groups, as is Codex 049, or Minuscule 302. Codices A02 (Byzantine in the Gospels), H 014, K 017, L 020, M021, N 022, O 023, P 024, Q 026, R 027, U 030, Y 034, Gamma 036, Lambda 039, Pi 041, Sigma 042, Phi 043, 047, 049, 064, 074, 090, 0116; Minuscules ap2, 3 (I in Acts), 6 (Byzantine in Gospels & Acts, and I group in Gospels), 9, 21, 23, 27, 30, 30abs, 68, 76 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 104 (Byzantine in Acts & Revelation & I in Revelation), 111, 116, 119, 120, 162, 171, 177 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles, K in General Epistles & Revelation), 182, 185, 187, 192, 199, 203 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles, K in Revelation), 217, 220, 221, 232, 235, 245, 248, 250 (I in Revelation), 262, 264, 266, 267, 268, 270, 276, 278a, 280, 287, 288, 291, 302, 325, 376, 385 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles, K in Revelation), 399 (I in Matt., K elsewhere), 432 (I in Revelation), 443, 449, 469 (I in Acts & General Epistles), 473, 474, 477, 481, 482, 485, 491, 496 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 498 (I in Gospels), 506 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 518, 547 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles, K in Gospels), 551, 578, 592, 593, 603, 618, 626, 628 (I in Revelation, K in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 638 (I in Acts), 639, 648, 660, 686, 692, 708, 718, 745, 748, 775, 787, 794 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 808 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 901 (I in Gospels), 910, 919, 920 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 922 (I in Gospels & Revelation), 924, 957, 965, 969, 980, 995, 998, 999 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 1004, 1007, 1008, 1010, 1014, 1024, 1026, 1032, 1056, 1061, 1099, 1107, 1121, 1129, 1148, 1149 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 1187, 1188, 1196, 1198, 1200, 1202, 1205, 1207, 1209, 1222, 1223, 1233, 1242, 1292 (Byzantine outside General Epistles & I in Gospels), 1301, 1314, 1319 (Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles & I in Gospels), 1347, 1354, 1375, 1447, 1521, 1545, 1604, 1605, 1738, 1828, 1829, 1835 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 1849 (I in General & Pauline Epistles), 1862, 1872 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 1876, 1880, 1882, 1891 (Byzantine outside Acts), 1931, 1974, 2135, 2144, 2173, & 2191.

<sup>367</sup> Minuscules 1 (Byzantine outside of Gospels), 28 (Byzantine outside of Mark), 69 (Byzantine outside of Pauline Epistles, and I in Gospels, Acts, Pauline Epistles, & Revelation), 181 (Byzantine in Revelation), 205 (Byzantine outside of Gospels and Revelation, and I in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 206 (Byzantine outside of General Epistles), 209 (Byzantine outside Gospels & Revelation), 218 (Byzantine outside General & Pauline Epistles), 263 (Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles & I in Acts &

Applying these as projections to the 262 manuscripts of the “T” group, which are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden’s system<sup>369</sup>, means

---

Pauline Epistles), 330 (Byzantine outside of Pauline Epistles, & I on Acts), 365 (Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles & I in Gospels), 378 (Byzantine outside General Epistles), 395, 429 (Byzantine in Pauline Epistles & Revelation), 431 (Byzantine outside of Acts & General Epistles, and I in Pauline Epistles), 459 (Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles & I in Revelation), 522 (Byzantine outside Acts & General Epistles & I in Pauline Epistles & Revelation), 610 (Byzantine in General Epistles), 642 (Byzantine outside General Epistles), 917 (Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles), 945 (Byzantine outside Acts & General Epistles), 1398 (Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles), 1424 (Byzantine outside Matthew & Luke), 1874 (Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles), 2127 (Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles & I in Gospels & Acts), 2147 (Byzantine outside General Epistles & I in Acts & Pauline Epistles), & 2298 (Byzantine in Pauline Epistles).

<sup>368</sup> Codices Dea 05 (I groups in Gospels and Acts), Dp 06abs1, E 08, F 010, G 012, \* P 025, Theta 038, 058, 066, 067, 078, 079, 081, 082, 087, 089, 097, 0108, 0120, 0126, 0130, 0131, 0143, 0146, 0147, 0159, 0171, 0234; Minuscules a36, 88, 157, 346, 436, 467 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 543, 565, 614, 623, 630, 700, 788, 826, 828, 915, 1071, 1079, 1243 (I in Gospels), 1582, 1611 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 1739 (I in Pauline Epistles), 1836, 1838, 1845, 1912, 2005, 2138 (non-Byzantine outside Revelation & I in General Epistles), 2193, 2200 (non-Byzantine outside Gospels & Revelation & I in Acts), 2329, & 2351.

<sup>369</sup> (As elsewhere, some manuscripts are classified in more than one grouping e.g., Codex 054 is classified in both H and I groups, as are 081 & 082). Codex 054; Minuscules e4, 5 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles), e7, 10, 13, 16, 17, 22, 26, 31, 35 (I in Acts, Pauline Epistles, & Revelation), 38, 42 (I in Revelation), 67, 71, 72, 79, 86, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 124, 131, 152, 153, 160, 161, 164, 166, 172 (I in Revelation), 174, 178, 179, 184, 211, 213, 216, 229, 230, 241 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 242 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 251, 255, 257, 265, 273, 279, 295, 296 (I in Acts, Pauline Epistles, & Revelation), 321 (I in Pauline Epistles), 366 (I in Pauline Epistles), 339, 348, 349, 372, 383, 389, 406, 435, 440, 453, 460, 462, 468, 472, 489, 495, 508, 513, 515, 517, 537, 544, 545, 552, 557, 566, 581, 582 (I in Gospels), 595, 587, 635, 636, 646, 647, 665, 679, 686, 693, 695, 697, 706, 716, 726, 743, 776, 780, 796 (I in Gospels), 804, 827, 829, 837, 851, 872, 876, 899, 907, 908, 913, 927 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 931, 935 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 941 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 947, 954, 979, 990, 992, 1005, 1009, 1012, 1037, 1047, 1048, 1049, 1082, 1084, 1093, 1108, 1113, 1118, 1124, 1126, 1127, 1128, 1154, 1159, 1162, 1166, 1170, 1181, 1192, 1194, 1216, 1219, 1229, 1237, 1245, 1270, 1272, 1278, 1281, 1295, 1306, 1311, 1321 (I in John), 1365, 1386, 1391, 1396, 1402, 1408, 1434, 1441, 1443, 1446, 1451, 1454, 1455, 1457, 1463, 1468, 1469, 1475, 1478, 1495 (I in Gospels), 1500, 1510, 1512, 1515, 1518, 1522, 1525, 1526, 1542, 1555, 1557, 1561, 1562, 1573 (partly classified as non-Byzantine in Pauline Epistles), 1574, 1578, 1579, 1588, 1593, 1610, 1615, 1654, 1663, 1675, 1682, 1685, 1689, 1695, 1699, 1715, 1758, 1765, 1778, 1781, 1784, 1799, 1816, 1827, 1831, 1837, 1843, 1850, 1867, 1868, 1873, 1894, 1898, 2004, 2014, 2015, 2020, 2023, 2026, 2028, 2029, 2031, 2033, 2043, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2059, 2060, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2080 (I

we can add 204 manuscripts to the Byzantine count, of which 26 may be regarded as Byzantine only in specific parts; and add 58 manuscripts to the non-Byzantine group. This is in addition to the otherwise uncounted I group 59 manuscripts that are non-Byzantine.

An interesting contrast may be made between von Soden's H group and Hag group<sup>370</sup>. In von Soden's H group, there are 2 manuscripts that are otherwise not in a von Soden group<sup>371</sup>; and in his Hag group there are 2 manuscripts that are otherwise not in a von Soden group<sup>372</sup>. Once again, a small number are *in dubio*<sup>373</sup>. But 82 manuscripts that are also classified outside of von Soden's system, are to be found in von Soden's H group manuscripts; and 6 manuscripts that are also classified outside of von Soden's system, are to be found in von Soden's Hag group manuscripts.

The H group manuscripts are of most interest to neo-Alexandrians and are (at least by those who follow Aland's methodology,) divided by neo-Alexandrians into three broad categories<sup>374</sup>. Category 1 are regarded by neo-Alexandrians as their best manuscripts "of a very special quality." Category 2 are mixed text type (especially showing some Byzantine text influence), but still "of a special quality" used by neo-Alexandrians to determine their texts. Category 3 are "independent" texts regarded as "usually important for establishing the" neo-Alexandrian "text."

---

in Revelation), 2081, 2093 (I in Gospels), 2121, 2132, 2143, 2145, 2174, 2180 (I in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 2194, 2233 (I in Pauline Epistles), 2244, 2245, 2286, & 2288.

<sup>370</sup> H = Hesychian. Hag = Theodorus Hagiopetrita (schreibt 1278-1307) (Benedikt Kraft's *Die Zeichen für die wichtigeren Handschriften des griechischen Neuen Testaments*, 1927, 3rd edition, Verlag Herder Freiburg, Germany, 1955, pp. 10,39; University of Western Australia copy, 225.48 ZEI). Thus amidst von Soden's plethora of cryptic symbols, the weary reader ought not to think that the "ag" suffix of "Hag" indicates that "Hag" is a subgroup of von Soden's "H" group.

<sup>371</sup> There are *c.* 85 manuscripts, papyri, codices, and minuscules, in the H group; dividing into *c.* 75 papyri and codices (double-counting distinctive parts W 032, 6, 104), with all 16 classified papyri (out of 21 papyri) being "H" Group (P11 is also I group), and *c.* 15 Minuscules.

<sup>372</sup> There are 8 minuscules in the Hag group

<sup>373</sup> Aland (*Kurzgefasste, op. cit.*) asks if von Soden includes 0145 (von Soden's ε 013) (non-Byzantine, and in his K Group) also in his H Group; or if 459 (von Soden's α104) (Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles) is in his H group for Acts and the Pauline Epistles?

<sup>374</sup> Aland, *The Text of the NT* (1989), *op. cit.*, p. 106.

Given that 30 of the 77 H group manuscripts classified outside of von Soden's system as non-Byzantine, are Category 3 or "independent" texts, Moorman's equation of von Soden's "H" group with the Alexandrian text-type in his reference to "the Alexandrian (H) Text," is clearly an overstatement of the strength of the Alexandrian text-type in this H Group<sup>375</sup>; although his general sentiment is still correct in that it is this H group which is of most interest to the neo-Alexandrians. Moreover, Category 1 may be made on the basis of date e.g., early papyri, in which the neo-Alexandrians assume the largely lost text outside of what we have left in the fragmentary papyri, in fact supported the Alexandrian text. Unfortunately, I am not in a position to check the texts of these fragmentary papyri manuscripts for myself, and so for my purposes I shall simply have to assume, perhaps rightly and perhaps wrongly, that they are correctly classified. Furthermore, Category 2, rather than representing, as the neo-Alexandrian claim, "corruptions" of the Alexandrian text by e.g., Byzantines, would in fact represent in such instances corruptions of the Byzantine text by Alexandrians. Thus in stipulating that for the purposes of my count, I will simply act as though the neo-Alexandrians are always correct in their classification of the papyri i.e., always classifying the 21 papyri in von Soden's H group as "non-Byzantine," I am helping to "bump up the numbers of the non-Byzantine group," and may well be criticized for doing so on the grounds that I am being "overly generous" towards my neo-Alexandrian opponents. However, in reply, I note that the overall numbers of such papyri is so small, that it will not affect my general statistical conclusions, *infra*.

We cannot doubt that even as for we Byzantines von Soden's "K" group is his most important group, by contrast, for the neo-Alexandrians, von Soden's "H" Group is his most important group (and a relatively small number of manuscripts have been added to it later, that are not found in von Soden). Von Soden considered that in the fourth century, there were three "revised" texts, the "K" Group (over 90% Byzantine texts), the "I" Group (over 2/3rds Byzantine texts), and the "H" Group. Given the importance of these H Group manuscripts to neo-Alexandrians, I shall in the footnote itemizing them, include in brackets after each of the 77 manuscripts also classified outside of von Soden's groupings, its neo-Alexandrian Aland category, *supra*, other than for a small number of unclassified manuscripts. It should also be understood that many are fragmentary e.g., all the papyri.

Of the H group manuscripts that are classified outside of von Soden's system, 5 manuscripts or *c.* 6% are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, i.e., 4 manuscripts or *c.* 5 % of manuscripts are completely Byzantine<sup>376</sup>, 1 manuscript or *c.* 1% is Byzantine only in specific parts<sup>377</sup>, and 77 manuscripts or *c.* 94% are non-Byzantine<sup>378</sup>.

---

<sup>375</sup> Moorman's *When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text*, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

<sup>376</sup> Already counted due to a previous classification count. Codex W 032 (Byzantine in Luke 8:13-24:53, & H in Luke), 052, 065; Minuscules 6 (Byzantine in Gospels & Acts, & H in Acts), & 104 (Byzantine in Acts & Revelation, H in Acts).

<sup>377</sup> Minuscule 1241 (Byzantine in Acts), .

<sup>378</sup> Aland's Category 1 = neo-Alexandrians best manuscripts "of a very special quality;" Aland's Category 2 are mixed text type (especially with Byzantine text), but still "of a special quality" for neo-Alexandrians to determine their texts; & Aland's Category 3 are "independent" texts regarded as "usually important for establishing the" neo-Alexandrian "text." Papyri \*1 (Category 1, Matt. 1:1-9,12,14-20), \*2 (Category 3, John 12:12-15 in Greek, and Luke 7:22-26,50 in Egyptian Coptic), \*4 (Category 1, Luke 1:58,59, 62-2:1,6,7; 3:8-4:2,29-32,34-35, 5:3-8, 30-6:16), \*5 (Category 1, John 1:23-31,33-40), \*7 (Luke 4:1,2), \*8 (Category 2, Acts 4:31-37; 5:2-9; 6:1-6, 8-15), \*11 (Category 2, I Cor. 1:17-22; 2:9-12; 3:1-3,5,6; 4:3-5:5,7,8; 6:5-9,11-18; 7:3-6,10-14), \*13 (Category 1, Heb. 2:14-5:15; 10:8-22,29-11:13; 11:28-12:17), \*14 (Category 2, I Cor. 1:25-27; 2:6-8; 3:8-10,20), \*15 (Category 1, I Cor. 7:18-8:4), \*16 (Category 1, Philp. 3:10-17; 4:2-8), \*18 (Category 1, Rev. 1:4-7), \*19 (Category 2, Matt. 10:32-11:5), \*20 (Category 1, Jas. 2:19-3:9), \*35 (Category 1, Matt. 25:12-15,2-23), \*36 (Category 3, John 3:14-18,31,32,34,35); Codices \*Aleph 01 (Category 1, London Sinaiticus), \*A 02 (Category 1 in H sections, H in Acts, Pauline Epistles, & Revelation), \*B 03 (Category 1, Rome Vaticanus), \*C04 (Category 2), \*H 015 (Category 3), \*I 016 (Category 2), \*L 019 (Category 2), \*P 025 (Category 3 in H, H outside of Acts & Revelation), \*T 029 (Category 2), W 032 (Category 3 in H, and H in Luke 1:1-8:13 & John), \*Z 035 (Category 3), \*Delta 037 (Category 3), \*Psi 044 (Category 2 in General Epistles & Category 3 elsewhere), \*051 (Category 3, Rev. 11-22), \*059 (Category 3, Mark 15:29-38), \*060 (Category 3, John 14), \*062 (Category 3, Gal. 4:15-5:14), \*068 (Category 3, John 13:16-27), \*070 (Category 3, Luke 9:9-17; 10:40-11:6; 12:15-13:32; John 5:31-42; 8:33-42; 12:27-36), \*071 (Category 2, Matt. 1:21-24,25-2:2), \*073 (Category 2, Matt. 14:28-31), \*076 (Category 2, Acts 2:11-22), \*081 (Category 2, II Cor. 1:20-2:12), \*082 (Category 3, Eph. 4:2-18), \*083 (Category 2, John 1:25-41; 2:9-4:14,34-49), \*084 (Category 2), \*085 (Category 2, Matt. 20:3-32; 22:3-16), \*086 (Category 3, John 1, 3, & 4), \*088 (Category 2, I Cor. 15:53-16:9), \*091 (Category 2, John 6:13,14,22-24), \*092a (Category 2, Matt. 26:4-7,10-12), \*095 (Category 3, Acts 2:45-3:8), \*096 (Category 3, Acts 2:6-17; 26:7-18), \*098 (Category 1, II Cor. 11:9-19), \*099 (Category 3, Mark 16:6-8), \*0109 (Category 3, John 16:30-17:9; 18:31-40), \*0112 (Category 2, Mark 14:29-45; 15:27-16:8), \*0113 (Category 2, Sahidic-Greek diglot in same manuscript as T 029, Luke & John), \*0114 (Category 2, John 20:4-10), \*0121 (Category 3, I Cor. 15:52 to II Cor. 1:15; 10:13-12:5; Heb. 1:1-4:3; 12:20-13:25), \*0124 (Category 3, Luke 3:19-30; 10:21-30; 11:24-42; 22:54-65; 23:4-24,26; John 5:22-31; 8:42-9:39; 11:48-56; 12:46-13:4), \*0125 (same manuscript as 0113), \*0127 (Category 3, John 2:2-11), \*0128 (Category 3, Matt. 25:32-45), \*0139 (Category same manuscript as 0113), \*0159 (Category 3, Eph. 4:21-24; 5:1-3), \*0162 (Category 1, John 2:11-22), \*0169 (Category 3, Rev. 3:19-4:3), \*0170 (Category 3, Matt. 6:5,6,8-10,13-15,17), \*0172 (Category 2, Rom. 1:27-30,32-2:2), \*0173 (Category 2, Jas. 1:25-27); Minuscules 6 (Category 3 in H, and H in Pauline Epistles), 33 (Category 2 in Gospels & Category 1 elsewhere), 104 (Category 3 in H, & H in Pauline Epistles), 326 (Category 3), 424 (unclassified for 424\* but Category 3 for 424c in parts of Acts & Pauline Epistles, & H in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 579 (Category 2 in Mark & Luke), 892 (Category 2), 1175 (Category 1, Acts, Pauline, & General Epistles), 1739 (Category 2 in H, & H in Acts), & 1852 (non-Byzantine outside of Revelation, & H [ & I ] in Acts & Pauline Epistles).

Applying these as projections to the 3 minuscules of the “H” group, which are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden’s system<sup>379</sup>, means we can add all 3 manuscripts to the non-Byzantine group; this is in addition to the otherwise uncounted H group 11 manuscripts that are non-Byzantine.

Of the Hag group manuscripts<sup>380</sup> that are classified outside of von Soden’s system, 6 manuscripts or 100% are completely Byzantine<sup>381</sup>. Applying these as projections to the 2 minuscules of the “Hag” group, which are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden’s system<sup>382</sup>, means we can add 2 manuscripts to the Byzantine count.

*The H and Hag groupings thus provide a notable contrast. Both have only a small number of minuscules unclassified out of von Soden’s system. But whereas all three unclassified minuscules out of von Soden’s system H Group manuscripts are projected to be non-Byzantine, by contrast, all 2 unclassified minuscules out of von Soden’s system Hag Group manuscripts are projected to be Byzantine. The H group reflects the type of manuscripts more generally of interest to those of the Neo-Alexandrian School, whereas the Hag group reflects the type of manuscripts more generally of interest to those of the Neo-Byzantine School.*

---

<sup>379</sup> Codices \*054 (H & I groups, this will be double-counted), 0118, & 0129.

<sup>380</sup> Von Soden’s Vol. I. II. A, pp. 781-788 (section 150) and Vol. I. III. B, pp. 2162-76; itemizes the “Theodorus Hagiopetrita” (Hag) group in the late 13th and early 14th centuries, as 234 (von Soden’s δ 365, Hag in Gospels, 1278 A.D.), 856 (von Soden’s θε 300, 1280 A.D.), 1594 (von Soden’s δ 375, Hag in Gospels, 1284 A.D.), 74 (von Soden’s ε 321, 1292 A.D.), 484 (von Soden’s ε 322, 1292 A.D.), 90 (von Soden’s δ 652, Hag in Gospels, 1293 A.D.), 483 (δ 376, Hag in Gospels, 1295 A.D.), 412 (von Soden’s ε 419, 1301 A.D.), and 1394 (von Soden’s ε 1415, 1301 A.D.). But for my purposes, I have here excluded from the Theodore Hagiopetrites’ “Hag” count, 856 (von Soden’s θε 300) which in von Soden’s 16 ancient and mediaeval church writers groups, *infra*, is in his 11th group, “θ” (Theta), for the mediaeval (Greek Orthodox) Archbishop Theophylact of Ochrida’s (d. 1109) Commentaries on the Gospels (θε) and Pauline Epistles (θπ). In addition to remembering there are a number of “Theo’s,” (i.e., church writers with names like Theophylact, Theodorus, etc.,) the weary reader should not think “θδ” is any kind of combination of “θ” for e.g., Theophylact and δ for the von Soden’s delta group, *infra*; nor in any other way confuse these with the “θδ” (Theta-delta) symbols, which represent von Soden’s twelfth group, *infra*, the ancient Bishop Theodoret of Cyrus’s (d. 460) Commentary on the Pauline Epistles.

<sup>381</sup> Minuscules 74, 90 (Hag in Gospels), 412, 483 (Hag in Gospels), 484, & 1594.

<sup>382</sup> Minuscules 234 (Hag in Gospels) & 1394.

What of the remaining *c.* 40% of Minuscules i.e., the *c.* 400 minuscules used by von Soden from the *c.* 1000 manuscripts, which are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden's system? Since some rounded numbers are being used, some manuscripts are in more than one group, and due to certain vagaries in von Soden's classifications<sup>383</sup>, there is some small amount of fluidity in and around this number of *c.* 400 manuscripts left (i.e., 40% of *c.* 1000 = 400), (including in that count about half a dozen codices<sup>384</sup>). These *c.* 400 manuscripts are from a variety of von Soden's many groups.

As discussed with von Soden's 2 papyri, 12 codices, and "I" Group manuscripts which are not completely Byzantine, *supra*, when dealing with small numbers of manuscripts, projections based on a general trend are more likely to be incorrect. Hence in dealing with the smaller remaining groups, the overall projection of Byzantine manuscripts will be used, with adjustments based on this figure for manuscripts not completely Byzantine as required along similar lines to the "I" group, *supra*. Moreover, it should clearly be understood that what has already been said for the "I" group, applies with equal force to the larger groups, if not greater force to the smaller groups. I.e., *these figures based on projections from those parts of these respective groupings that have been classified outside of von Soden's system, are somewhat "rubbery," but under the circumstances they are the best we can do. They should be understood only as a broad-brush guide, which may have to be revised if better information on these otherwise unclassified manuscripts becomes available.*

Having considered von Soden's K, I, H and Hag groups; the remaining manuscripts that he used can be analyzed through sub-division into 20 broad von Soden groups.

---

<sup>383</sup> E.g., Aland (*Kurzgefasste, op. cit.*) observes Minuscule 2219 = Minuscule 1715 (unclassified outside of von Soden's system; von Soden's ε 2091 in his I κ group); Minuscule 2222 = 2265 (unclassified outside of von Soden's system; von Soden's ε 4019 = von Soden's ε 646); or Minuscule 2136 (unclassified outside of von Soden's system; von Soden's δ 700 = von Soden's ε 700). Or e.g., Aland asks if Minuscule 2246 (unclassified outside of von Soden's system,) which is von Soden's ε 295, is also von Soden's θ ε14?

<sup>384</sup> For my *mathematical purposes* of calculation, I shall include Codices 053 (von Soden's A 4) in his wider A group of Minuscules; 054 (von Soden's ε 59, classified in both von Soden's "I" and "H" Groups), 0100 (von Soden's ε 070), 0118 (von Soden's ε 62), and 0129 (von Soden's α 1037) in the wider H group of just 2 Minuscules unclassified outside of von Soden's system; and Codices 0157 (von Soden's α 1007) and 1058 (von Soden's α 1039) with his otherwise ungrouped α Minuscules. (In doing so, obviously I am not thereby suggesting that these codices are minuscules.)

In von Soden's first group, his "δ" (delta) group for NT manuscripts<sup>385</sup>, there are 5 "δ" manuscripts that are otherwise not in a von Soden group<sup>386</sup>. Most of von Soden's "δ" manuscripts are in other groups<sup>387</sup>. But 2 minuscules that are also classified outside of von Soden's system, are to be found in von Soden's otherwise non-grouped "δ" manuscripts. Of the 2 "δ" manuscripts that are otherwise not in a von Soden group, and which are classified outside of von Soden's system, 2 or 100 % are completely Byzantine<sup>388</sup>. Applying this as a projections to the 5 minuscules of the "δ" (delta) group, would make all remaining 5 Byzantine. But bearing in mind that some from the wider otherwise classified "δ" (delta) group are non-Byzantine, I shall estimate that 1 of the 5 be added to the non-Byzantine group, and 4 of the 5 be added to the Byzantine count.

In von Soden's second group, his "ε" (epsilon) group<sup>389</sup>, there are 80 manuscripts that are otherwise not in a von Soden group<sup>390</sup>. Most of von Soden's "ε" manuscripts are in other groups<sup>391</sup>. But 33 manuscripts that are also classified outside of von Soden's system, are to be found in von Soden's otherwise non-grouped "ε" manuscripts. Of the 33 "ε" manuscripts that are otherwise not in a von Soden group, and which are classified

---

<sup>385</sup> German, "Hss. Des Neuen Testaments." Von Soden used "δ" (= "d" for Greek, *diatheke* = "testament" of "new testament"). In von Soden's system, δ is used for entire (Matt.-Rev.), or near entire (Matt.-Jude), NT manuscripts. If the δ number ends with a 1-49 (i.e., 1-49, 101-149, 201-249, etc.), then the Revelation is included e.g., δ48, δ103, δ104, δ206, δ 309, δ 605. If however the δ number ends with a 50-99 (i.e., 50-99, 150-199, 250-299, etc.), then Revelation is not in the manuscript e.g., δ95, δ180, δ252, δ457, δ 653. But the first numeral is part of his dating system, *supra*. Thus the δ numbers jump, missing numbers e.g., δ104 is followed by δ150; or δ 414 is followed by δ450.

<sup>386</sup> Minuscules 205abs, 1382, 1780, 2131, 2136.

<sup>387</sup> There are c. 170 manuscripts, both codices and minuscules, in the δ group.

<sup>388</sup> Minuscules 1384 & 2261.

<sup>389</sup> German, "Evangelien-Hss." Von Soden used "ε" (= "e" for Greek, *evangelion* = "gospel") for the four gospels (Matt.- John).

<sup>390</sup> Minuscules 64, 85, 87, 488, 539, 555, 572, 576, 667, 670, 671, 675, 687, 701, 702, 1116, 1259, 1273, 1274a, 1275, 1276, 1282, 1289, 1290, 1308, 1380, 1381, 1388, 1389, 1403, 1421, 1528, 1529, 1530, 1531, 1612, 1681, 1793, 1797, 1801, 1803, 1804, 1805, 1807, 1808, 1810, 1811, 1813, 2108, 2138, 2195, 2209, 2210, 2212, 2215, 2223, 2227, 2228, 2232, 2237, 2238, 2260, 2076, 2265, 2077, 2078, 2280, 2283, 2284, 2287, 2290, 2291, 2299, 2304, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2285, & 2622.

<sup>391</sup> There are c. 1400 manuscripts, both codices and minuscules, in the ε group.

outside of von Soden's system, 26 manuscripts or *c.* 79% are completely Byzantine<sup>392</sup>, and 7 manuscripts or *c.* 21% are non-Byzantine<sup>393</sup>. Applying these as projections to the 80 minuscules of the "ε" group, which are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden's system, means we can add 63 manuscripts to the Byzantine count; and add 17 manuscripts to the non-Byzantine group. This is in addition to the otherwise uncounted "ε" group 6 manuscripts that are non-Byzantine.

In von Soden's third group, his "α" (alpha) group<sup>394</sup>, there are 47 manuscripts that are otherwise not in a von Soden group<sup>395</sup>. Most of von Soden's "α" manuscripts are in other groups<sup>396</sup>. But 62 manuscripts that are also classified outside of von Soden's system, are to be found in von Soden's otherwise non-grouped "α" manuscripts<sup>397</sup>. Of the 62 "α" manuscripts that are otherwise not in a von Soden group, and which are classified outside of von Soden's system, 53 manuscripts or *c.* 85.5% are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, i.e., 50 manuscripts or *c.* 80.5% of manuscripts are

---

<sup>392</sup> Codices 0103, 0104; Minuscules 9abs, 286, 368, 540, 560, 662, 666, 668, 674, 811, 866a, 870, 894, 898, 1231, 1239, 1283, 1547, 1607, 1701, 1826, 2273, 2277, & 2300.

<sup>393</sup> Any already counted due to a previous classification count, will have a \* next to their number. \*P (Papyri) 6; Codices 094, 0160, 0161, 0164, 0187, & 0237.

<sup>394</sup> German, "Apostolos-Hss." Von Soden used "α" (= "a" for Greek, *apostolos* = "apostle," or *apostoloi* = "apostles") for Acts to Jude although in practice, a number of them are either just Acts & the General Epistles, or just the Pauline Epistles.

<sup>395</sup> Codices 1057, 1058; Minuscules ap4, 615, 631, 643 (showing some of the complexities of von Soden's system, this is both von Soden's α 14502 and X 40), 866b, 1102.

<sup>396</sup> There are *c.* 440 manuscripts, both codices and minuscules, in the α group.

<sup>397</sup> Though I have not included them in the count of otherwise ungrouped α group manuscripts, showing some of the unnecessary complexities in the maze of von Soden's system, 180 (Byzantine outside of Acts) = von Soden's α 300 and is otherwise ungrouped with regard to the α group, but it is otherwise grouped in von Soden's K x group as his ε 1498. So likewise, 1003 = von Soden's α 484, and is otherwise ungrouped with regard to the α group; but it is otherwise grouped in von Soden's K r group as his ε 1346; or 1006 (Byzantine outside of Revelation) = von Soden's α 1174, and is otherwise ungrouped with regard to the α group; but it is otherwise grouped in von Soden's K 1 group as his ε 1156; or 1328 = von Soden's α 1470, and is otherwise ungrouped with regard to the α group; but it is nevertheless otherwise grouped in von Soden's K x group as his ε 1419.

completely Byzantine<sup>398</sup>, 3 manuscripts or *c.* 5% are Byzantine only in specific parts<sup>399</sup>, and 9 manuscripts or *c.* 14.5% are non-Byzantine<sup>400</sup>. Applying these as projections to the 47 minuscules of the “α” group, which are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden’s system, means we can add 40 manuscripts to the Byzantine count, of which 2 may be regarded as Byzantine only in specific parts; and add 7 manuscripts to the non-Byzantine group. This is in addition to the otherwise uncounted “α” group 9 manuscripts that are non-Byzantine.

Von Soden also draws from a specially selected group of commentary manuscripts i.e., 16 church writers, generally ancient (such as “Kyrill von Alexandrien” = Cyril of Alexandria, d. 444), if not, mediaeval (such as “Johannes Damascenus” = John of Damascus, d. before 754). These will now be considered in his fourth to twentieth groups<sup>401</sup>, before finally considering the Lectionaries he used. I shall count these in order to better understand von Soden’s system, but it should be understood that is not necessarily the way another man may categorize them. These generally have Gregory numbers, and so it is therefore in accordance with my general methodology to include them, as well as my specific methodology of better understanding von Soden’s textual apparatus.

In von Soden’s fourth group, his “A” Group<sup>402</sup>, there are 50 manuscripts that are otherwise not in a von Soden group<sup>403</sup>. But 68 manuscripts that are also classified outside of von Soden’s system, are to be found in von Soden’s “A” group manuscripts. Of the 68 “A” group manuscripts that are classified outside of von Soden’s system, 66 manuscripts or *c.* 97% are completely Byzantine<sup>404</sup>, and 2 manuscripts or *c.* 3% are non-

---

<sup>398</sup> Codex 061; Minuscules 368 (showing some of the unnecessary complexities in the labyrinth of von Soden’s system, this is both von Soden’s α 1501 & α 1571 in his α group, and also his ε 531 in his ε group), 450, 624, 921, 1069, 1070, 1103, 1105, 1723, 1726, 1727, 1728, 1729, 1731, 1733, 1734, 1736, 1737, 1736, 1737, 1740, 1741, 1742, 1745, 1746, 1747, 1750, 1754, 1757, 1761, 1762, 1767, 1768, 1770, 1771, 1858, 1861, 1883, 1889, 1897, 1899, 1902, 1948, 1957, 1958, 1975, 2003, 2009, & 2289.

<sup>399</sup> Codex 093 (Byzantine in Acts); Minuscules 1846 (Byzantine in Acts) & 1877 (Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles).

<sup>400</sup> Codices 048, 077, 0111, 0123, 0140, 0156; Minuscules 1881, 1884, & 1959.

<sup>401</sup> Von Soden’s *Die Schriften, op. cit.*, I, I [Vol. 1, Part 1 = Vol. 1 of his 4 volumes], pp. 39-40.

<sup>402</sup> German, “Antiochener Kommentar zu den Evv. .”

<sup>403</sup> There are *c.* 100 manuscripts, both codices and minuscules, in the “A” group.

<sup>404</sup> Codex X 033; and Minuscules 12, 20, 24, 25, 34, e36, 37, 39, 40, 50, 63, 77, 92, 95, 100, 108, 127, 129, 137, 138, 139, 143, 146, 151, 186, 194, 195, 197, 210, 215, 237, 259, 300, 301, 304, 308, 329, 353, 357, 373, 374, 381, 549, 556, 746, 754, 770, 773,

Byzantine<sup>405</sup>. Applying these as projections to the 50 manuscripts of the “A” group, which are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden’s system<sup>406</sup>, means we can add 48 manuscripts to the Byzantine count, of which 1 may be regarded as Byzantine only in specific parts (since one manuscript is only “A” in parts); and add 2 manuscripts to the non-Byzantine group. This is in addition to the otherwise uncounted A group 2 manuscripts that are non-Byzantine.

In von Soden’s fifth group, his A  $\pi\rho$  group<sup>407</sup>, there are about a dozen manuscripts that are otherwise not in a von Soden group<sup>408</sup>. But 7 manuscripts that are also classified outside of von Soden’s system, are to be found in von Soden’s A  $\pi\rho$  group manuscripts. Of the A  $\pi\rho$  group manuscripts that are classified outside of von Soden’s system, 3 manuscripts or *c.* 43% are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, i.e., 2 manuscripts or *c.* 29% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine<sup>409</sup>, 1 manuscript or *c.* 14% is Byzantine only in specific parts<sup>410</sup>, and 4 manuscripts or *c.* 57% are non-Byzantine<sup>411</sup>. Applying these as projections to the 4 minuscules of the A  $\pi\rho$  group, which are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden’s system<sup>412</sup>, means we can add 2 manuscripts to the Byzantine count, of which 1 might possibly be Byzantine only in specific parts; and add 2 manuscripts to the non-Byzantine

---

809, 861, 884, 951, 964, 978, 994, 1028, 1078, 1080, 1312, 1313, 1392, 1437, 1570, 1800, & 2111.

<sup>405</sup> Codex 040 & Minuscule 307 (von Soden’s A 217 in his A a group).

<sup>406</sup> In A group, Codex 053; Minuscules 19, 48, 222, 233, 238, 239, 253, 271, 299, 332, 377, 391, 416, 487, 569, 591, 599, 747, 752, 771, 800, 807, 832 (classified as both von Soden’s A 127 & A  $\pi\rho$ 2), 865, 946, 968, 989, 1028, 1058, 1091, 1096, 1163, 1164, 1167, 1230, 1266, 1291, 1321, 1422, 1423, 1439, 1481, 1484, 1535, 1684, 1814, 2097, 2211; and A in part, Minuscules 5 (this manuscript is also classified as  $\delta$  453, and is in the “A” k group in the Gospels).

<sup>407</sup> German, “Andreas (Presbyter), Kommentar zu Act.-Kath.-Br.”

<sup>408</sup> There are 12 manuscripts, one codex and 11 minuscules, in the A  $\pi\rho$  group; but reference is excluded to A  $\pi\rho$  60, whose identity is unclear.

<sup>409</sup> Codex K 018 & Minuscule 886.

<sup>410</sup> Minuscule 610 (Byzantine in General Epistles).

<sup>411</sup> Minuscules \*a36, \*307, \*453 (A  $\pi\rho$ 40 in his I a1 group), and 1678 (von Soden’s A  $\pi\rho$ 41 = von Soden’s Av 402 = von Soden’s  $\theta$   $\epsilon$ 404 = von Soden’s  $\theta$   $\pi$ 404).

<sup>412</sup> Minuscules 437, 832 (classified as both von Soden’s A  $\pi\rho$ 2 & A 127), 1895, & 2186.

group. This is in addition to the otherwise uncounted A  $\pi\rho$  group 1 manuscript that is non-Byzantine.

In von Soden's sixth group, his Av group<sup>413</sup>, there are 34 manuscripts that are otherwise not in a von Soden group (3 of which are Av only in Revelation) i.e., the majority of them<sup>414</sup>. But 6 manuscripts that are also classified outside of von Soden's system, are to be found in von Soden's Av group manuscripts. Of the 6 Av group manuscripts that are classified outside of von Soden's system, 3 manuscripts or 50% are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, i.e., 2 manuscripts or c. 33 % of manuscripts are completely Byzantine<sup>415</sup>, 1 manuscript or c. 17% is Byzantine only in specific parts<sup>416</sup>, and 3 manuscripts or 50% are non-Byzantine<sup>417</sup>. Applying these as

---

<sup>413</sup> German, "Andreas v. Casarea, Kommentar zur Apok. ."

<sup>414</sup> There are 62 manuscripts, 2 codices and 60 minuscules, in the Av group. Minuscule 743 is an example of the complexities of counting von Soden's manuscripts, as this is not only classified by von Soden as Av 43 in his I  $\alpha 6$  group but as  $\alpha$  1401 (ungrouped) and N L40 in his N Group. I have omitted it from the count of manuscripts unclassified outside of von Soden's system here. In order to better show the reader my methodology, (and to better understand how, working through the labyrinth of von Soden's elongated system, it is possible that here and there I may have inadvertently missed a small number of manuscripts or double-counted them, although this would not be in so wide a margin so as to affect my broad and basic von Soden figures), having e.g., already covered von Soden's I group and A  $\pi\rho$  group (which generally includes those omitted), *on this occasion* I also advise that I have likewise omitted from the unclassified Av group (as already covered by the I and A  $\pi\rho$  groups counts), Minuscules 1685 (von Soden's  $\alpha$  1370 in his Av group, and also von Soden's  $\epsilon$  3048 in his I  $\phi\beta$  group), 2014 (von Soden's Av 51 in his Ia 4 group), 2023 (von Soden's Av 56 in his I a7 Group), 2026 (von Soden's Av 501 in his I a1 Group), 2028 (von Soden's Av 54 in his I a5 Group), 2029 (von Soden's Av 66 in his I a5 Group), 2031 (von Soden's Av 41 in his I a3 Group), 2033 (von Soden's Av 60 in his I a5 Group), 2036 (von Soden's Av 40 in his I a4 Group), 2043 (von Soden's Av 57 in his I a4 Group), 2054 (von Soden's Av 500 in his I a5 Group), 2055 (von Soden's Av 53 in his I a6 Group), 2056 (von Soden's Av 49 in his I a3 Group), 2059 (von Soden's Av 52 in his I a6 Group), 2060 (von Soden's Av 42 in his I a1 Group), 2064 (von Soden's Av 62 in his I a6 Group), 2065 (von Soden's Av 503 in his I a1 Group), 2066 (von Soden's Av 63 in his I a2 Group), 2067 (von Soden's Av 21 in his I a1 Group), 2068 (von Soden's Av 65 in his I a5 Group), 2069 (von Soden's Av 59 in his I a5 Group), 2081 (von Soden's Av 21 in his I a1 Group), 2186 (von Soden's Av 23 = von Soden's A  $\pi\rho 22$ ), & 2286 (von Soden's Av 22 in his I a1 Group).

<sup>415</sup> Codex 052 & Minuscule 911.

<sup>416</sup> Minuscule r1 (Byzantine outside of Gospels).

<sup>417</sup> Codex \*051; Minuscules 94 (von Soden's Av 24 = von Soden's O 31) & 1678 (von Soden's Av 402 = von Soden's A  $\pi\rho 41$  = von Soden's  $\theta$   $\epsilon 404$  = von Soden's  $\pi 404$ ).

projections to the 34 minuscules of the Av group is hazardous, since from so small a sample of 6 manuscripts we hope to predict what a number 6 times that size will be, and so we multiply by 6 any error factor. The hazardous nature of this is further magnified by the fact that this is von Soden's *Andreas von Casarea* group i.e., *Andreas (Andrew) of Caesarea*, a bishop of Caesarea, whose Commentary on the Book of Revelation appears to have influenced one line of manuscripts on that Book. Andreas of Caesarea is thus relevant to the issue of determining the text for the Book of Revelation. Nevertheless, working on the available data, and applying these figures to the 34 manuscripts which are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden's system<sup>418</sup>, means we can add 17 manuscripts to the Byzantine count, of which 6 may be regarded as Byzantine only in specific parts; and add 17 manuscripts to the non-Byzantine group. This is in addition to the otherwise uncounted Av group 2 manuscripts that are non-Byzantine.

In von Soden's seventh grouping, his Ap grouping<sup>419</sup>, there is only one manuscript in toto, Minuscule 2116. This is unclassified. Due to such vagaries, I shall therefore include it in the residual odds'n'ends' group, and so add 1 manuscript to the non-Byzantine group.

In von Soden's eighth group, his "C" group<sup>420</sup>, there are 8 manuscripts that are otherwise not in a von Soden group<sup>421</sup>. But 16 manuscripts that are also classified outside of von Soden's system, are to be found in von Soden's C group manuscripts. Of the C group manuscripts that are classified outside of von Soden's system, 14 manuscripts or 93% are completely Byzantine<sup>422</sup>, and 1 manuscripts or 7% are non-Byzantine<sup>423</sup>. Applying these as projections to the 14 minuscules of the "C" group, which are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden's system<sup>424</sup>, means we can add 13 manuscripts to the Byzantine count; and add 1 manuscript to the non-Byzantine group. This is in addition to the otherwise uncounted C group 1 manuscript that is non-Byzantine.

---

<sup>418</sup> Minuscules 241 (Av in Revelation), 582 (Av in Revelation), 1773, 1854 (Av in Revelation), 2018, 2019, 2022, 2032, 2034, 2035, 2036abs, 2037, 2038, 2042, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2051, 2052, 2063, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2077, 2083, 2091, 2254, 2259, 2302, 2595.

<sup>419</sup> German, "Arethas, Kommentar zur Apok. ."

<sup>420</sup> German, "Anonyme Katenen: a) zu Joh., b) zu Matth., c) zu Paulus."

<sup>421</sup> There are 22 manuscripts, both codices and minuscules, in the C group.

<sup>422</sup> Codex 050; Minuscules 138, 139, 304, 366, 884, 887, 994, 1370, 1772, 1925, 1937, 1949, 2013.

<sup>423</sup> Codex 0141.

<sup>424</sup> Minuscules 87, 397, 821, 869, 1909, 1949, 2103, & 2482.

In von Soden's ninth group, his E group<sup>425</sup>, there is only a total of 2 minuscules we can count. There is 1 manuscript that is otherwise not in a von Soden group. But the other manuscript that is also classified outside of von Soden's system, is completely Byzantine<sup>426</sup>. Applying these as projections to the 1 minuscule of the "E" group, which is presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden's system<sup>427</sup> is at best, very uncertain given this very small number. Nevertheless, it means we can add 1 more manuscript to the Byzantine count.

In von Soden's tenth group, his Z group<sup>428</sup>, there are 7 manuscripts that are otherwise not in a von Soden group<sup>429</sup>. But 9 manuscripts that are also classified outside of von Soden's system are to be found in von Soden's Z group manuscripts. It is notable that all 9 of these Zigabenus or "Z" group manuscripts are completely Byzantine<sup>430</sup>. Though this is a small group, and projections with such number are more likely to contain errors, as already noted, *supra*, for our general purposes this methodology will still yield a generally correct result precisely because any error factor will itself be correspondingly small in the overall count of manuscripts. Therefore, applying these as projections to the 7 minuscules of the "Z" group, which are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden's system<sup>431</sup>, means we can add 7 manuscripts to the Byzantine count.

In von Soden's eleventh group, his "θ" (Theta) group<sup>432</sup>, there are 100 manuscripts that are otherwise not in a von Soden group<sup>433</sup>. But 56 manuscripts that are

---

<sup>425</sup> German, "Anonyme Hermenien: a) zum Praxapostolos, b) zu den Evv., c) zu Paulus."

<sup>426</sup> Minuscule 1373 (von Soden's E ε 10). What Aland means in his generally very useful conversion charts by a third manuscript, von Soden's E π being "C π (8c)," is not sufficiently clear to me to classify it, though if this is a reference to Minuscule 8, it too is Byzantine. Either way, the "C π" manuscripts have been dealt with in the "C" group.

<sup>427</sup> Minuscule 1900.

<sup>428</sup> German, "Zigabenus: a) Kommentar zu den Evv., b) zu Paulus."

<sup>429</sup> There are 16 minuscules in the Z group.

<sup>430</sup> Minuscules 136, 196, 240, 244, 305, 334, 379, 600, & 730.

<sup>431</sup> Minuscules 1178, 1840, 1991, 2008, 2101, 2109, & 2285.

<sup>432</sup> German, "Theophylakt: a) Kommentar zu den Evv., b) zu Paulus."

<sup>433</sup> There are *c.* 160 minuscules in the θ group (but it should be remembered that some are in more than one group e.g., Minuscule 1160 = θ ε201 in von Soden's θ group,

also classified outside of von Soden's system, are to be found in von Soden's  $\theta$  group manuscripts. Of the 56  $\theta$  group manuscripts that are classified outside of von Soden's system, 53 manuscripts or *c.* 95% are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, i.e., 52 manuscripts or *c.* 93% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine<sup>434</sup>, 1 manuscripts or *c.* 2% are Byzantine only in specific parts<sup>435</sup>, and 3 manuscripts or *c.* 5% are non-Byzantine<sup>436</sup>. Applying these as projections to the 100 minuscules of the " $\theta$ " group, which are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden's system<sup>437</sup>, means we can add 95 manuscripts to the Byzantine count, of which 1 may be regarded as Byzantine only in specific parts; and add 3 manuscripts to the non-Byzantine group. This is in addition to the otherwise uncounted " $\theta$ " group's 2 minuscules that are non-Byzantine.

In von Soden's twelfth group, his  $\theta\delta$  group<sup>438</sup>, there are seven manuscripts in toto, all of which are otherwise not in a von Soden group<sup>439</sup>, and otherwise unclassified. What can we do with this? In the absence of better information, in order to generally neutralize the effect of this uncertainty, I shall simply add approximately half in even numbers to both groups, i.e., 3 manuscripts to the Byzantine count, and 3 manuscripts to the non-Byzantine group.

---

is also A 224 in von Soden's A c group, and so already considered in the A group, *supra*; or Minuscule 1991 =  $\theta$   $\pi$ 30 in von Soden's  $\theta$  group, is also Z  $\pi$ 31, and so already considered in the Z group, *supra*).

<sup>434</sup> Minuscules 243, 303, 306, 316, 320, 354, 392, 596, 649, 684, 721, 727, 729, 731, 734, 736, 737, 739, 741, 818, 819, 820, 833, 834, 835, 836, 840, 841, 848, 857, 858, 862, 886, 889, 890, 993, 970, 1252, 1374, 1516, 1613, 1926, 1928, 1929, 1930, 1964, 1978, 1979, 1988, 1992, 2381, & 2573.

<sup>435</sup> Minuscule 1506 (Byzantine in the Gospels).

<sup>436</sup> Minuscules 720, \*1678, & 2197.

<sup>437</sup> Minuscules 154, 168, 315, 318, 370, 427, 428, 589, 590, 719, 722, 723, 728, 732, 733, 735, 738, 740, 742, 744, 749, 772, 817, 842, 854, 855, 856, 863, 874, 878, 881, 883, 888, 890, 891, 949, 1021, 1027, 1029, 1130, 1137, 1156, 1182, 1253, 1261, 1262, 1263, 1265, 1267, 1268, 1271, 1302, 1304, 1387, 1527, 1533, 1534, 1536, 1537, 1616, 1677, 1707, 1798, 1913, 1935, 1943, 1947, 1950, 1961, 1965, 1973, 1976, 1977, 1984, 1985, 1987, 1994, 1995, 2000, 2002, 2092, 2100, 2102, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2148, 2184, 2185, 2188, 2192, 2202, 2203, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2214, 2248, & 2257.

<sup>438</sup> German, "Theodoret: Kommentar zu Paulus."

<sup>439</sup> Minuscules 1939, 1945, 1963, 1967, 1996, 1999, & 2012.

Von Soden's thirteenth group of I 1 and I 2<sup>440</sup>, comes from one of the early mediaeval Greek church writers I also sometimes cite in these commentaries, the heretical iconolater (icon idolater), John Damascus (d. before 754). It consists of just two manuscripts, Codex 018 (I 1, Byzantine) also considered earlier as it is also classified as von Soden's A  $\pi\rho 1$ ; and Minuscule 2110 (non-Byzantine). I shall thus add one minuscule to the non-Byzantine group from this group.

Von Soden's fourteenth group, his K L group<sup>441</sup>, consists of just five manuscripts in toto. One of these is non-Byzantine<sup>442</sup>, and four of these are otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden's system. Applying what we know of one manuscript to 4 others is at best, a highly hazardous and uncertain extrapolation since the numbers are so small. But this same factor preserves us from major error, since they only constitute a small percentage of the overall total. Hence, working on this projection methodology means we can add 4 manuscripts to the non-Byzantine group.

Von Soden's fifteenth group, his M group<sup>443</sup>, consists of only 3 manuscripts. The identity of two is unclear<sup>444</sup>; and one<sup>445</sup>, is otherwise unclassified. Given such vagaries, I think it best to add 1 manuscript to the non-Byzantine group.

In von Soden's sixteenth group, his N group<sup>446</sup>, there are 14 manuscripts that are otherwise not classified<sup>447</sup>. But 14 other manuscripts in the N Group that are also classified outside of von Soden's system, are completely Byzantine<sup>448</sup>. Applying these

---

<sup>440</sup> German, "Johannes Damascenus: Kommentar zu Paulus."

<sup>441</sup> German, "Kyrill von Alex.: Kommentary zu J."

<sup>442</sup> Minuscule 849 (von Soden's K L60).

<sup>443</sup> German, "Maximus: Kommentar zur Apk."

<sup>444</sup> M 80 is unidentified; M70 = r 173 (which is?).

<sup>445</sup> Minuscule 2114 (von Soden's M71).

<sup>446</sup> German, "Niketas: a) Kommentar zu J., b) zu Luk., c) zu Matth., d) zu Paulus."

<sup>447</sup> There are *c.* 30 minuscules, in the N group. Some of the otherwise unclassified manuscripts have already been considered. To help the reader better understand some of the complexities of von Soden's system, *on this occasion* I itemize them: Minuscule 743 (von Soden's N L40 =  $\alpha$  1401 = Av 43 in the I  $\alpha 6$  group), or Minuscule 598 (von Soden's N  $\lambda 35$  = Av 31 in the I  $\alpha 1$  group). Unidentified by Gregory number: N  $\lambda 67$ .

<sup>448</sup> Minuscules 302, 313, 362, 381, 426, 846, 853, 893, 1016, 1177, 1264, 1821, 1938, & 2187.

as projections to the 14 minuscules of the “N” group which are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden’s system<sup>449</sup>, we can add 14 manuscripts to the Byzantine count.

We now come to von Soden’s seventeenth group, his O group<sup>450</sup>. The reader who thinks he has at last mastered the intricacies of von Soden’s complex classification system, should be warned of some “wild cards in the pack” that unexpectedly and suddenly crop up in von Soden’s O group. This means he may suffer from some initial confusion in seeking to unravel the cryptic symbols of von Soden’s O group. These may lead him to exclaim in exasperation, “Oh O!”. That is because by O9 von Soden actually means O π9 (in the O group manuscripts from the Pauline Epistles, Minuscule 619), and not O9 in between O 8 and O 10 (in the O group manuscripts from Acts to Jude), and indeed there is no O 9 as such in the O group. Moreover, O 28 is actually Oθ 28 (Minuscule 103) in the Oθ group (von Soden’s 18th group, *infra*), and once again, there is no O 28 before O 29 in the O group. Furthermore, O θδ11 is not, as it appears to be, a manuscript in von Soden’s O θδ group (von Soden’s 19th group, *infra*), but is in fact O 19 (Minuscule 607) in the O group. But in a classification system with as many complicated groups and symbols as von Soden’s, these further avoidable difficulties in the O Group seem almost expected and in place. “Oh O!”

In von Soden’s O group, there are 19 manuscripts that are otherwise not in a von Soden group<sup>451</sup>. But 65 manuscripts that are also classified outside of von Soden’s system, are to be found in von Soden’s O group manuscripts. Of the 65 “O” group manuscripts that are classified outside of von Soden’s system, 53 manuscripts or *c.* 81.5% are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, i.e., 52 manuscripts or 80% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine<sup>452</sup>, 1 manuscript or *c.* 1.5% are Byzantine only in specific parts<sup>453</sup>, and 12 manuscripts or *c.* 18.5% are non-Byzantine<sup>454</sup>. Applying these

---

<sup>449</sup> Minuscules 249, 310, 317, 333, 423, 430, 434, 822, 859, 879, 1822, 1983, 1983abs, & 2190.

<sup>450</sup> German, “Oikumenios: a) Kommentar zum Praxapostolos, b) zur Apok., c) zu Paulus, d) zu Act. Kath.-Br. .”

<sup>451</sup> There are 85 manuscripts, 3 codices and 82 minuscules, in the O group. (As elsewhere, the overall number is smaller as some have already been considered, for instance, unclassified Minuscule 1162 = von Soden’s O π29 = von Soden’s α 152 in his I α group.)

<sup>452</sup> Codices 056, 0142; and minuscules p7, 82, 250, 314, 327, 454, 605, 607, 622, 640, 911, 916, 1360, 1862, 1878, 1879, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, 1923, 1924, 1927, 1932, 1933, 1934, 1941, 1946, 1951, 1952, 1956, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1986, 1997, 1998, 2001, 2007, 2183, & 2189.

<sup>453</sup> 918 (Byzantine in Pauline Epistles).

as projections to the 19 minuscules of the “O” group, which are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden’s system<sup>455</sup>, means we can add 15 manuscripts to the Byzantine count; and add 4 manuscripts to the non-Byzantine group. This is in addition to the otherwise uncounted O group 10 manuscripts that are non-Byzantine.

In von Soden’s eighteenth group, his O $\theta$  group<sup>456</sup>, there are 4 manuscripts that are otherwise not in a von Soden group<sup>457</sup>. But 4 manuscripts that are also classified outside of von Soden’s system, are to be found in von Soden’s O $\theta$  group manuscripts. Of the 4 O $\theta$  group manuscripts that are classified outside of von Soden’s system, 3 manuscripts or 75% are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, i.e., 1 manuscript or 25% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine<sup>458</sup>, 2 manuscripts or 50% are Byzantine only in specific parts<sup>459</sup>, and 1 manuscripts or 25% are non-Byzantine<sup>460</sup>. Applying these as projections to the 4 minuscules of the “O $\theta$ ” group, which are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden’s system<sup>461</sup>, means we can add 3 manuscripts to the Byzantine count, of which 2 may be Byzantine only in specific parts (a particularly precarious prediction given these small numbers); and add 1 manuscripts to the non-Byzantine group.

---

<sup>454</sup> Codex 075; and minuscules \*94, \*424, 441, 442, 621, 1842, 1844, 1908, 1910, 2053, & 2062.

<sup>455</sup> Minuscules 101, 468, 617, 619 (von Soden’s O  $\pi$ 9 =  $\alpha$  57, but I consider it here, rather than in the  $\alpha$  group), 641, 1066, 1589, 1778, 1824, 1839, 1871, 1953, 1968, 1993, 2011, 2058, 2130, 2239, & 2240.

<sup>456</sup> German, “Oikumenios-Theophylakt: Oilumenios-Komm. Zu Acts.Kath.-Br.; Theophylakt-Komm. Zu Paulus.”

<sup>457</sup> There are 8 minuscules in the O $\theta$  group.

<sup>458</sup> Minuscules 103.

<sup>459</sup> Minuscules 254 (Byzantine outside General Epistles) & 1523 (Byzantine in Pauline Epistles).

<sup>460</sup> Minuscule 720.

<sup>461</sup> Minuscules 455, 608, 1524, 1769. I include in this unclassified group, Minuscule 1524 (14th century, von Soden’s O  $\theta$ 40), which is partly classified outside of von Soden’s system since it is known to be non-Byzantine in the General Epistles, and of which Aland asks, is it Byzantine elsewhere? (Aland, *The Text of the NT*, 1989, *op. cit.*, p. 135).

Von Soden's nineteenth grouping, his O0δ grouping<sup>462</sup>, contains just one manuscript<sup>463</sup>. This 16th century Minuscule (Cairae Monasterii Sinaitici 100, in fol. chart: *Evv. Psalmi.*) is unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden's system. Under the circumstances, I think it safest to include it in the residual odds'n'ends' group, and so add 1 manuscript to the non-Byzantine group.

In von Soden's twentieth group, his X group<sup>464</sup>, there are 11 manuscripts that are otherwise not in a von Soden group<sup>465</sup>. But 5 manuscripts that are also classified outside of von Soden's system, are to be found in von Soden's X group manuscripts. Of the 5 X group manuscripts that are classified outside of von Soden's system, 2 manuscripts or c. 40% are completely Byzantine<sup>466</sup>, and 3 manuscripts or 60% are non-Byzantine<sup>467</sup>. Applying these as projections to the 11 minuscules of the "X" group, which are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden's system<sup>468</sup>, means we can add 4 manuscripts to the Byzantine count; and add 7 manuscripts to the non-Byzantine group. This is in addition to the otherwise uncounted X group 3 manuscripts that are non-Byzantine.

Von Soden also includes 9 Evangelion Lectionaries (Matt.-John) in his Gospel manuscripts i.e., none of these Lectionaries cover the Apostolos (Acts-Jude). Eight of these are Byzantine Text. The one outside the closed class of sources is a Greek-Coptic diglot with independent Greek text, evidently corrupted by, or in conjunction with, those also using the Coptic text. It is not listed as a Lectionary in Aland's *Kurzgefasste*, which at the number "349" simply says this "= 0237." It is thus more commonly classified as Codex 0237, and only contains four verses from Matthew's Gospel (6th century, Vienna, Austria, Matt. 15:12-15,17-19; von Soden's ε 349). The remaining 8 Greek Lectionaries inside the closed class of sources are: Lectionaries 668 (9th century, Athos, Greece; von Soden's ε 39), 1355 (9th century, Oxford University, England, UK; von Soden's ε 74), 1384 (10th century, Moscow, Russia; von Soden's ε 66), 1385 (10th century, Moscow, Russia; von Soden's ε 67), 1386 (10th century, Moscow, Russia; von Soden's ε 68), 1417

---

<sup>462</sup> German, "Oikomenios-Theodoret: Oikumenios-Komm. Zu Act. Kath.-Br.; Theodoret-Komm. Zu Paulus."

<sup>463</sup> Minuscule 606 is von Soden's O0δ 10. Any reference to O0δ 11 is actually a reference to O 19.

<sup>464</sup> German, "Chrysostomos: Kommentar zu Paulus."

<sup>465</sup> There are 11 manuscripts, 2 codices and 9 minuscules, in the X group. I include 643 (von Soden's X 40 = von Soden's α 1402), not previously considered.

<sup>466</sup> Codex 0151 & Minuscule 1936.

<sup>467</sup> Codex 0150; Minuscules 1942, 1962.

<sup>468</sup> Minuscules 643, 1817, 1818, 1969, 2006, & 2128.

(10th century, St. Petersburg, Russia; von Soden's ε 98), 1485 (10th century, St. Petersburg, Russia; von Soden's ε 65), and 351 (12th century, Paris, France; von Soden's ε 2095).

Making an overall tally on the principles and figures already given, *supra*, yields the following calculations. (Many manuscripts are fragmentary i.e., they contain portions of the NT only.)

In the non-Byzantine groups, there are:

113 non-Byzantine Codices	+
6 otherwise uncounted non-Byzantine manuscripts also classified outside of von Soden's groupings from "K" Group	+
14 additional non-Byzantine Minuscules from "K" Group	+
19 non-Byzantine Papyri also classified outside of von Soden's groupings	+
2 additional non-Byzantine papyri from the Papyri Group	+
59 otherwise uncounted non-Byzantine manuscripts also classified outside of von Soden's groupings from "I" Group	+
58 additional non-Byzantine Minuscules from "I" Group	+
11 otherwise uncounted non-Byzantine Minuscules also classified outside of von Soden's groupings from "H" Group	+
3 additional non-Byzantine Minuscules from "H" Group	+
2 additional non-Byzantine Minuscules from "δ" Group	+
6 otherwise uncounted non-Byzantine manuscripts also classified outside of von Soden's groupings from "ε" Group	+
17 additional non-Byzantine Minuscules from "ε" Group	+
9 otherwise uncounted non-Byzantine manuscripts also classified outside of von Soden's groupings from "α" Group	+
7 additional non-Byzantine Minuscules from "α" Group	+
2 otherwise uncounted non-Byzantine manuscripts also classified outside of von Soden's groupings from "A" Group	+
1 additional non-Byzantine Minuscule from "A" Group	+
1 otherwise uncounted non-Byzantine manuscript also classified outside of von Soden's groupings from "A πρ" Group	+
2 additional non-Byzantine Minuscules from "A πρ" Group	+
2 otherwise uncounted non-Byzantine manuscripts also classified outside of von Soden's groupings from "Av" Group	+
17 additional non-Byzantine Minuscules from "Av" Group	+
1 otherwise uncounted non-Byzantine manuscript also classified outside of von Soden's groupings from "C" Group	+
1 additional non-Byzantine Minuscule from "C" Group	+
2 otherwise uncounted non-Byzantine minuscules also classified outside of von Soden's groupings from "θ" Group	+
3 additional non-Byzantine Minuscules from "θ" Group	+
3 additional non-Byzantine Minuscules from "θδ" Group	+

1 additional non-Byzantine Minuscule (I 2) from the “I 1 & I 2” Group	+
4 additional non-Byzantine Minuscules from “K L” Group	+
1 additional non-Byzantine Minuscule from “M” Group	+
10 otherwise uncounted non-Byzantine minuscules also classified outside of von Soden’s groupings from “O” Group	+
4 additional non-Byzantine Minuscules from “O” Group	+
1 additional non-Byzantine Minuscule from “Oθ” Group	+
3 otherwise uncounted non-Byzantine minuscules also classified outside of von Soden’s groupings from “X” Group	+
7 additional non-Byzantine Minuscules from “X” Group	+
1 Greek-Coptic Gospel Lectionary	+

Non-used & thus in a residual odds’ n’ ends’ group, included in  
the “non-Byzantine” count:

11 Byzantine text-type minuscules from the 17th century or later	+
1 unclassified minuscule (possibly Byzantine, from the “Ap” Grouping	+
1 unclassified minuscule (possibly Byzantine, from the “Oθδ” Grouping	+

Total: Non-Byzantine Count:

406 Manuscripts (out of 2440 Manuscripts)

Or 16.5% of von Soden manuscripts.

In the Byzantine group there are:

49 Byzantine Codices from the 5th to 10th centuries (3 of which are Byzantine only in parts)	+
1047 Minuscules from the 9th to 16th centuries (55 of which are Byzantine only in parts)	+
389 additional Byzantine Manuscripts from “K” Group (14 of which may be Byzantine only in parts)	+
204 additional Byzantine Manuscripts from “I” Group (26 of which may be Byzantine only in parts)	+
2 additional Byzantine Minuscules from “Hag” Group	+
4 additional Byzantine Minuscules from “δ” Group	+
63 additional Byzantine Minuscules from “ε” Group	+
47 additional Byzantine Minuscules from “α” Group (2 of which may be Byzantine only in parts)	+
48 additional Byzantine Manuscripts from “A” Group (1 of which is Byzantine only in parts)	+
2 additional Byzantine Manuscripts from “A πρ” Group (1 of which may be Byzantine only in parts)	+

17 additional Byzantine Manuscripts from “Av” Group (6 of which may be Byzantine only in parts)	+
13 additional Byzantine Minuscules from “C” Group	+
1 additional Byzantine Minuscule from “E” Group	+
7 additional Byzantine Minuscules from “Z” Group	+
95 additional Byzantine Minuscules from “θ” Group (1 of which may be Byzantine only in parts)	+
3 additional Byzantine Minuscules from “θδ” Group	+
14 additional Byzantine Minuscules from “N” Group	+
15 additional Byzantine Minuscules from “O” Group	+
3 additional Byzantine Minuscules from “Oθ” Group (2 of which may be Byzantine only in parts)	+
4 additional Byzantine Minuscules from “X” Group	+
8 Greek Gospel Lectionaries	

Total: Byzantine Count:

2035 Manuscripts (out of 2440 Manuscripts) or *c.* 83.5%.

Of these, 1924 manuscripts or *c.* 78.9% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine, and 111 manuscripts or *c.* 4.6% are Byzantine only in specific parts.

In rounded numbers, von Soden used just under *c.* 2500 manuscripts (*c.* 10 lectionaries, *c.* 180 manuscripts covering the NT, *c.* 1400 Gospel manuscripts, *c.* 400 Acts to Jude manuscripts, and *c.* 500 from 16 church writers in commentaries). As stated above, some of these figures are somewhat “rubbery,” in that they include projections of Byzantine to non-Byzantine manuscripts in some of the groups where the manuscripts are unclassified outside of von Soden’s system. Furthermore, our count here is of “2440” Manuscripts, which is slightly lower than the number of manuscripts von Soden actually consulted, but this is of no statistical consequence for our purposes<sup>469</sup>. Additionally, while there is some value in this technique to better understand von Soden’s system, it must be borne in mind that some dispute exists over the writings of Andreas of Caesarea, which I shall further discuss in my Volume on Revelation; but for my immediate purposes, I have simply followed von Soden’s categories, and the way they are generally classified.

Moreover, since Robinson & Pierpont’s methodology focuses on von Soden’s “K” group, this means they are only using *c.* 1,000 of von Soden’s manuscripts; and since

---

<sup>469</sup> Cf. e.g., the identification issues of 307 (Aπρ11 in Ia1), [307] (A 217 in Aa), [308] (A 158 in Aa), 308 (α 456 in Kx); 356 (α 255) & [356] (A 605 in Ac); [704] see 2284, 2284 (ε 3040 = ε 359); compared with those itemized above of uncertain grouping inside of von Soden’s system which are unclassified outside of von Soden’s system i.e., 1782 (von Soden’s ε 1502), 1989 (von Soden’s ε 1170), 1658 (von Soden’s ε 1509), 1990 (von Soden’s ε 1171), 792 (ε 585 & α 1575), 1658 (von Soden’s ε 1509), 1990 (von Soden’s ε 1171), 1782 (von Soden’s ε 1502), 1989 (von Soden’s ε 1170), 903 (von Soden’s ε 4002), 2246 (von Soden’s ε 295; and θ ε14?).

Hodges & Farstad's methodology focuses on von Soden's "K" and "I" groups, this means they are only using *c.* 1,500 of von Soden's manuscripts. Furthermore, many manuscripts are fragmentary *i.e.*, they contain portions of the NT only. Additionally, the "non- Byzantine" group includes 11 Byzantine text-type minuscules from the 17th century or later, which are not "non-Byzantine" in text type, even though they are outside the closed class of sources as coming too late in time. Moreover, when dealing with as many manuscripts symbols as I have had to, bearing in mind time constraints that I work under, my own human imperfections, and the complex nature of von Soden's textual apparatus, it is certainly possible that I have missed a relatively small number of manuscripts here and there in my calculations. *And as noted already, my technique of extrapolations may be in error, and if so, especially in von Soden's "I" group, since in first gaining figures of Byzantine to non-Byzantine manuscripts in a group, I may be absorbing the bias of neo-Alexandrians who are more interested in classifying the non-Byzantine manuscripts, so that the part of the group of manuscripts that is uncounted may in fact be higher in Byzantine text manuscripts than the part of the group that is counted and categorized outside of von Soden's system. Thus I may have overstated the strength of non-Byzantine manuscripts, or put the other way round, I may have understated the strength of Byzantine Text manuscripts among the Codices and Minuscules von Soden used. Nevertheless, I can only work on the data presently available to me, and I am prepared to revise it if better information comes my way.*

Therefore, it should be borne in mind that the calculations I have made include some definite numbering of Byzantine manuscripts in addition to the projections, and the general picture that I have derived from these calculations is correct as a broad-brush guide. Thus my calculations would not be out by so great a factor as to undermine their basic integrity. Providing they are used as a general rather than a precise guide, understood to have been composed *on the data presently known to me and subject to the qualifications I make*, they are perfectly valid. I have undertaken the task of making this compilation of figures because I think we are better off with them than without them, in making our assessment on the usefulness of von Soden's textual apparatus. That textual apparatus, notwithstanding its complexity of symbols and groups, is nevertheless without peer (other than for Revelation) in the fact that von Soden consulted virtually all of the NT Greek manuscripts for St. Matthew to Jude other than the Lectionaries. No other NT textual apparatus for the first 26 of the New Testament's 27 Books comes even close to matching this mammoth feat (unless it is in some way using von Soden's work *e.g.*, summarizing von Soden's work by reference to a reading being a Majority Text or Majority Byzantine Text reading.) *For textual information on the New Testament Greek manuscripts, von Soden's work is the cake, and any other manuscript data we presently have on top of it is simply icing on the cake.* Thus the ongoing importance and value of von Soden's work is clear.

Those who would criticize a neo-Byzantine such as myself for using von Soden's work on a first hand basis, or on a second hand basis through works based on von Soden's textual apparatus, such as Robinson & Pierpont's Majority Byzantine Text (1991 & 2005), with reference also to Hodges and Farstad's Majority Text (1982 & 1985) and Green's Textual Apparatus (1986), on the basis that von Soden's textual apparatus

excludes reference to c. 2,300 lectionaries, are quite wrong. The absence of this lectionary data in von Soden's textual apparatus (other than nine Gospel Lectionaries of which eight are Byzantine text,) is by no means fatal to the value of his work, or the associated von Soden based majority text work of Hodges & Farstad, Robinson & Pierpont, or Pierpont as endorsed and promoted by Green in Green's Textual Apparatus. *After all, if a neo-Byzantine textual analyst like Erasmus, working with no more than about a dozen manuscripts (and possibly half this number), or later 16th century neo-Byzantine textual analysts working with several dozen Byzantine manuscripts, were able to compose their starting point of the representative Byzantine text from a dozen or several dozen Byzantine manuscripts, how much more can I compose my starting point of the representative Byzantine text today principally from the von Soden based works of Robinson & Pierpont which is underpinned by 885 plus Byzantine manuscripts from von Soden, and Hodges & Farstad which is underpinned by 1300 plus Byzantine manuscripts from von Soden!*

The objections of e.g., Moorman, Hembd, Khoo, and Watts, that the representative Byzantine text has not really been counted because any such count is largely based on von Soden's textual apparatus, and this excludes c. 2,300 Lectionaries, are simply unsustainable. The salient point that such critics of von Soden's textual apparatus miss, and a text based on it like e.g., Robinson & Pierpont's is that *in fact, von Soden has actually used many times more Byzantine manuscripts than what is necessary in order to compose the representative Byzantine text as one's starting point.* If e.g., Moorman, Hembd, Khoo, and Watts were correct, they would have to magnify their criticism of von Soden many times over for the Received Text, which was composed in the 16th and 17th centuries on only a slim fraction of the number of texts used by von Soden (notwithstanding the unsubstantiated and fictional claims of Moorman and the Dean Burgon Society that they counted many thousands of Greek manuscripts that have now mysteriously disappeared). Therefore, it has to be frankly said that using von Soden's textual apparatus to compose a Burgonite majority text on Burgon's simple count methodology (which is not precisely what Hodges & Farstad did, although their methodology is close enough to it for their text to still be broadly classified as a Burgonite majority text), which in practice will necessarily be the same as a majority Byzantine text other than where the manuscript count is fairly evenly divided, (and even here it will show the same general type of split,) is certainly a valid methodology.

While it is true that there has never been a detailed collation of all the variants in all the Lectionaries (or for that matter an entirely detailed collations in other Byzantine text manuscripts,) as already discussed, *supra*, enough work has been undertaken on the Lectionaries to confidently classify them as conforming to the Byzantine text type, and repeating a number of variants. With regard to the issue of the c. 2300 Greek Lectionaries, we know that some 100 to 200 of them have scoured by the neo-Alexandrians in the desperate hope of finding some minority Byzantine readings that correlate with Alexandrian readings. (An endeavor which even if occasionally successful, is of no concern to we neo-Byzantines who acknowledge that a large number of neo-Alexandrian variants can be found inside the closed class of sources, whether as minority Byzantine readings or readings otherwise inside the closed class of sources.)

Nevertheless, these same neo-Alexandrians have generally come away exasperated. Thus e.g., the deeply frustrated Kurt Aland, as it were “throwing up his hands in the air,” exclaimed, “only five lectionary manuscripts are ... listed in Appendix I of Nestle-Aland<sup>470</sup>.”

Nevertheless, it is true that these von Soden figures do not take into account most of the *c.* 2300 Greek Lectionaries<sup>471</sup>, of which von Soden deliberately used only 9, and of which only 8 are inside the closed class of sources. (The 9th being a Greek-Coptic diglot, that only has seven Greek verses from Matt. 15; and which is more commonly classified as a codex, i.e., Codex 0237). But as discussed, *supra*, the evidence such as we have it, clearly indicates that these 2,300 Lectionaries generally follow the representative Byzantine text, and where they occasionally do not, their variants are minority Byzantine readings. These Lectionaries are all fragmentary i.e., they contain portions of the NT only, since they are selections from Scripture used on certain liturgical days (and none contain any readings from the Book of Revelation). This therefore means that the totals calculated above out 2440 manuscripts, should really be calculated out of a further *c.* 2,300 manuscripts i.e., out of a total of *c.* 4,740 manuscripts, in which the additional *c.* 2,300 are all Byzantine text, including in them a small number of Byzantine minority readings.

Therefore the total non-Byzantine count of 406 Manuscripts out of *c.* 4,740 Manuscripts is 8.5% (not 16.5%, *supra*). The greater part of this non-Byzantine group of *c.* 400 manuscripts is *not Alexandrian*; since those of interest to the neo-Alexandrians number at about 100 manuscripts. As to what the remaining 300 are is unclear; and quite possibly some of this number are in fact Byzantine text types wrongly placed in this group for the reasons mentioned above. As for the rest, they would be either mixed text types; or so called “independent” texts i.e., where the Greek was *independently* corrupted by *individual* non-Alexandrian text and non-Western text scribes, who like the Alexandrian text, Western text, and mixed-text scribes, were among the “many which corrupt the Word of God” (II Cor. 2:17). Likewise, the total Byzantine count of *c.* 2035 Byzantine Manuscripts in von Soden, plus 2300 Greek Lectionaries, i.e., 4335 Byzantine manuscripts out of *c.* 4740 manuscripts, is 91.5% (not *c.* 83.5%, *supra*), and the known 111 manuscripts (codices and minuscules) that are Byzantine only in specific parts are *c.* 2.4% (not 4.6%, *supra*) of the total, making the count of completely Byzantine (4335 minus 11 = 4224) to be *c.* 89.1% (not *c.* 78.9%, *supra*).

What of the works referred to in this commentary composed from von Soden’s work i.e., Hodges & Farstad, Robinson & Pierpont, and Green’s Textual Apparatus? 16.5% of von Soden’s manuscripts are non-Byzantine (*c.* 400 out of *c.* 2440 manuscripts), and *c.* 83.5% are Byzantine (*c.* 2440 manuscripts) of which *c.* 78.9% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine (1924 manuscripts) and *c.* 4.6% are Byzantine only in specific parts (*c.* 110 manuscripts). This compares with his “K” group in which

---

<sup>470</sup> Aland, K., *et unum*, *The Text of the NT* (1989), *op. cit.*, p. 169.

<sup>471</sup> The Lectionaries are listed in Aland, K., *Kurzgefasste*, *op. cit.*, pp. 219-370.

c. 3.5% are non-Byzantine (c. 35 manuscripts), and c. 96.5 % are Byzantine (c. 980 manuscripts) of which c. 93% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine (c. 950 manuscripts) and c. 3.5% are Byzantine only in specific parts (c. 35 manuscripts); and his Kx subgroup in which c. 2% are non-Byzantine (15 manuscripts), and c. 98% are Byzantine (c. 500 manuscripts) of which c. 94% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine (c. 480 manuscripts) and c. 4% are Byzantine only in specific parts (c. 20 manuscripts).

The ramifications of this for any majority text based on Hermann von Soden's textual apparatus (1913), such as Hodges and Fasted (1985), are notable. It means that (in Matt to Jude) the majority text of Hodges and Fasted (1982 & 1985) which uses von Soden's textual apparatus more generally than does Robinson & Pierpont, will generally be the same as the Majority Byzantine Text of Robinson & Pierpont (1991 & 2005) which is just based on von Soden's K group. And notwithstanding some level of relatively small statistical differences; it also means that in broad terms Pierpont's work in Green's Textual Apparatus (1986) could in a generalist way be used for guidance in either a Majority Text or Majority Byzantine Text. E.g., Green's Textual Apparatus has a special section for an "about evenly divided" text in the "40-60% support" range, and so if this shows such a split, it would be applicable to both a Majority Text and a Majority Byzantine Text alike<sup>472</sup>. (Of course, on a critical usage of Green's Textual Apparatus, these figures should be understood as being in the upper range. So that unlike Pierpont when he constructed this apparatus, we should allow a 10% error bar on the figures Pierpont uses.)

On the one hand, the type of general groupings used by von Soden has not produced a textual apparatus with the type of detailed collation of all variants that would be of definite interest to we neo-Byzantines. But on the other hand, we have enough general information on manuscripts to say that they are Byzantine text, and usually representative Byzantine text, as we find them collated chiefly, though not exclusively, in von Soden. Thus the generalist information we have on these manuscripts is enough for us to confirm that von Soden's 20th century textual apparatus may be used, as it is in e.g., Robinson & Pierpont's *Byzantine Textform* (2005) and Green's Textual Apparatus (1986), to determine the same basic representative Byzantine text starting point (or evenly divided Byzantine text requiring textual analysis,) that was achieved as the representative Byzantine text starting point by neo-Byzantine textual analysts in the 16th and 17th centuries.

Indeed, it is precisely because the general perusal and analysis of these Byzantine Minuscules and Lectionaries confirms this fact, that the neo-Alexandrian controlled

---

<sup>472</sup> Pierpont's rating are: Level 1 i.e., 61-79% manuscript support, Level 2, i.e., 80-94% manuscript support, or Level 3 i.e., 95-100% manuscript support. However, where Green's Textual Apparatus (1986) gives "Alternatives" considering "the evidence is about evenly divided" i.e., 40-60% manuscript support, and / or where it is clear from any other source that the manuscript evidence is fairly evenly divided inside this same type of range, then textual analysis will be required to determine the better Byzantine reading.

“halls of learning,” have not, at least to date, felt the impetus to undertake the further detailed collation that would be of interest to we neo-Byzantines, though certainly not essential or required by us. I.e., though it would be of some interest to them (and us), it is not regarded as an essential or pressing matter by them (the neo-Alexandrians) or us (the neo-Byzantines). E.g., Aland says of more than 1,100 “Byzantine type minuscules,” that citation of them has “been omitted” precisely because they show “a developed Byzantine text” i.e., one that confirms with the representative Byzantine text determined from several hundred Byzantine manuscripts. “All of these minuscules,” he says, “exhibit a purely or predominately Byzantine text. And this is not a peculiarity of the minuscules, but a characteristic they share with a considerable number of unicals,” as seen by reference to the Byzantine unical codices cited above with respect to von Soden’s text. Hence the disgruntled Aland mutters, “They are all irrelevant” *precisely because they so clearly conform to the representative Byzantine text as seen in von Soden’s c. 1900-2000 Byzantine manuscripts*<sup>473</sup>. I.e., this is the same basic argument that the neo-Alexandrians use against the c. 2,300 Greek Lectionaries, *supra*. Therefore these findings point to the fact, that the representative Byzantine text based on a smaller number of manuscripts numbering less than 50, such as used by e.g., Erasmus, Stephanus, or Beza; is in practice the same as the representative Byzantine text based a larger number of manuscripts such as the c. 900 used by Robinson & Pierpont as found in von Soden’s K group.

Therefore, as I have discussed in Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), the representative Byzantine text may be composed from a reasonable sample of texts. As I say in Volume 1, “For example, Stephanus’s 1550 Paris edition showed Erasmus’s Greek NT with variants from over a dozen manuscripts. None of these were earlier than the 12th century A.D., yet this in no way impaired the basic technique of first determining the representative Byzantine text, and then only moving away from it if there is a good textual reason to do so, with support inside the Byzantine Greek textual tradition, Latin textual tradition, or ancient church writers” (or as is less commonly the case, mediaeval church writers, especially, early mediaeval church writers) (“Displaying Some Byzantine Text Diamonds,” Commentary Volume 1.) For even though we cannot be sure as to the full range of manuscripts used by neo-Byzantines, most especially with respect to their usage of the relatively common Greek Lectionaries, we know this broad conclusion to be correct from *the result* of the neo-Byzantine texts and translations that we have.

Hence I say in Volume 1, “*Whether one uses a representative sample of Byzantine manuscripts e.g., Stephanus’s mid sixteenth century Greek NT, or a twentieth century majority Byzantine Text, makes no real difference. In either instance one may compose the representative Byzantine Text. ...* Indeed, since in practice the Burgonites’ majority Text generally equates the representative or majority Byzantine text (although where a two or more way split exists in the Byzantine text, they represent a sizeable Byzantine reading), it follows that the Burgonites’ texts such as Robinson & Pierpont, or Hodges & Farstad, or Jay Green’s Majority Text textual apparatus, ..., are generally of some value to we neo-Byzantines for determining the initial representative Byzantine text. Thus ...

---

<sup>473</sup> Aland, K., *et unum*, *The Text of the NT* (1989), *op. cit.*, pp. 138,142.

we neo-Byzantines ... find some common ground with the Burgonites” (Preface, Commentary Volume 1)<sup>474</sup>.

In this context, I note that the eight gospel manuscripts specifically referred to in Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) would certainly not have constituted the full range of texts he consulted. He would e.g., have also considered Latin texts, most especially St. Jerome’s Vulgate, together with ancient and mediaeval - especially early mediaeval, church writers. In all likelihood, he probably also considered some Greek Orthodox Lectionaries. He would surely have consulted Stephanus’s 1550 edition which contained a textual apparatus that included the readings of Erasmus’s Greek NT (1516, 2nd edition 1519), and variants from 15 manuscripts.

Thus the problem we have in all such instances, starting with Erasmus and ending with Elzevir, is that we simply do not know the full range of manuscripts that they consulted. In particular, Greek Lectionaries which were relatively accessible, but upon purchase may have been then kept in private libraries, could with relative ease be subsequently lost to us. Such factors mean that one cannot e.g., safely use just the eight gospel manuscripts Elzevir specifically refers to in this Textual Apparatus to understand Elzevir’s thinking behind his text. (The same is also true e.g., for Stephanus’s 1550 edition.) It is nevertheless notable that even these eight special selections found in Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624), frequently (e.g., Matt. 17:9a; 17:14b; John 21:3; discussed in Appendix 1), though not always (e.g., Matt. 16:28b, discussed in Appendices 2 & 3), follow the representative Byzantine text reading.

We know from Scripture (Gen. 1:1) that “God created” everything in “the heavens” (ASV) i.e., the three heavens (II Cor. 12:2) of the atmosphere (cf. “heaven” in Gen. 1:20), outer space (cf. “heaven” in Gen. 1:15), and Paradise (Job 1:6; 38:7; II Cor. 12:4), and on “the earth” (cf. “the earth ... and the fulness thereof,” Ps. 24:1). Since “the Lord” “made heaven and earth” (Pss. 121:2; 124:8; 134:3); it follows that species were created, they did not “evolve”; and we also know the same from a reasonable study of nature, which clearly points to the hand of a Creator (Ps. 19:1; Rom. 20). When God created various creatures, the Creator put in various species a capacity to heal within certain limits. Thus animals bitten or injured by other animals, may recover so long as the injury is within certain bounds. The Lord made various creatures in a succession of “worlds” (AV) or “ages<sup>475</sup>” (Heb. 1:2, 11:3) that existed in “the generations” (Gen. 2:4) of time between the first two verses of Genesis (Gen. 1:1); before he flooded the local (regional) area that was to become Eden with a pre-Adamite (local) flood (Gen. 1:2), and created the (local) “heaven” (cf. Deut. 2:25; Col. 1:23) and (local) “earth” (cf. Gen. 41:56; Matt. 12:42) in the (local) world (cf. Ps. 77:18; Lam. 4:12; Luke 2:1; Rom. 1:8) of

---

<sup>474</sup> Preface “1) Textual Commentary Principles,” section “b) The Received Text (Latin, Textus Receptus),” sub-section, “ii) New Testament.”

<sup>475</sup> Greek *aiōn*.

Eden in six literal 24 hour days (Gen. 1:2-2:2:3; Exod. 20:8-11; 31:16,17)<sup>476</sup>. One of the creatures he so created in a later world, that existed before, outside of, and contemporaneously with Eden, was the gecko (gekko).

Man only learnt about the gecko that existed before and outside of Eden (Gen. 2:8,10-13), after he was permitted to leave the segregated world of the Edenic region, following the Fall and Flood, when due to Adam's sin (Rom. 5:12) the human "creature was made subject to vanity" (AV), so "every" human "creature groaneth" "and travaileth in pain" (Tyndale) (Rom. 8:20,22)<sup>477</sup>. The gecko is a fascinating creature that came forth from the hand of a mighty God. I thank the Lord for his great generosity in allowing fallen man to go forth after the anthropologically universal but geographically local Noachic flood in the general region of Eden (which following the end of the last Ice Age is now under the waters of the Persian Gulf), into what had hitherto been the Lord's playground (e.g., Job 41:1,5) and out-of-bounds to man i.e., into this wider world on the globe (Gen. 9 & 10). This wider world containing the gecko and many other amazing creatures, was not designed for man in his unfallen state, but man could, by the grace of God, adapt to and inhabit it in his fallen state<sup>478</sup>. The gecko has a tail equaling about half

---

<sup>476</sup> Concerning the fact that after the dark fog clouds of the first day were lifted on the second day, but still covering the Edenic site till on the fourth day he "made ... lights" and "stars," cf. Job 9:7,9.

<sup>477</sup> The Greek of Rom. 8:22, "*pasa* ('every' / 'whole,' feminine singular nominative, adjective from *pas*) *ē* ('-, ' untranslated 'the,' feminine singular nominative definite article, from *ē*) *ktisis* ('creature' / 'creation,' feminine singular nominative noun, from *ktisis*)" can be reasonably rendered as either "the whole creation" (AV of 1611) or "every creature" (Tyndale's NT of 1526). It is also rendered as the latter in the AV at Mark 16:15 and Col. 1:23 for "*pase* ('to every,' feminine singular dative, adjective from *pas*) *te* ('-, ' untranslated 'the,' feminine singular dative definite article, from *ē*) *ktisei* ('creature,' feminine singular dative noun, from *ktisis*)." In my opinion, the contextual focus on the human "creature" in Rom. 8:20,21, related as it is to Rom. 5:12, followed by the statement, "we are saved by hope" (AV) or "in hope" (ASV) in Rom. 8:24, means the focus is on man, and so the meaning at Rom. 8:22 is "the whole" *human* "creation" (AV) or "every" *human* "creature" (Tyndale). The usage of the adjective *pas* for "every" (Mark 16:15, AV; Rom. 8:22, Tyndale; Col. 1:23, AV) or "whole" (Rom. 8:22, AV), also carries with it the connotation of "kinds or types" i.e., "every" *kind of human* "creature" or "the whole" *kind of* "creation," so that the passages look to such *kinds* as Jews and Gentiles (Rom. 2:9; Col. 3:11), males and females (Gal. 3:28), parents and children (Col. 3:20,21), or masters and servants (Col. 3:22).

<sup>478</sup> To the question, "Will the *new heaven and the new earth* (Isa. 66:22; Rev. 21:1) be a local world or a global world?," I am neither sure nor dogmatic. On the one hand, it must be the entire globe that "shall melt with fervent heat" on "the day of the Lord" (II Peter 3:10), because whereas "the heavens" "and the earth" of "the world that then was" (II Peter 3:6) were the human inhabited local world of the Edenic region; by contrast, "the heavens and the earth, which are now" after the Flood (II Peter 3:7), had expansion first to the three continents of Europe, Asia, and Africa (Gen. 9 & 10) in the

his overall length (a gecko can generally be up to 6 inches or 15 cm long). In at least some gecko species, the tail appears to act as a storehouse for reserving nutriment, that the gecko can draw upon if required to in harder times. But more than this, the gecko can also lose its tail if grabbed by a predator, and later grow back another one.

Notably then, when the Creator designed the principles of Received Text preservation, he ensured that minor injuries here and there to the Byzantine text, could be healed. This is done in the first instance by consulting the representative Byzantine text over some aberrant one. This is done in the second instance, through textual analysis of any clear and obvious problem in the representative Byzantine text, reconstructing the Received Text from a closed class of Greek and Latin New Testament manuscript sources. In the third instance, the Creator ensured that through the existence of over 4,200 Byzantine manuscripts (together with other Latin manuscripts and copies of ancient and mediaeval church writers, if so, especially ancient church writers, as well as those used by Hoskier - a more detailed discussion of which I leave to a future volume,) there was “*a mighty long gecko tail.*” That “gecko tail” is so long for Matthew to Jude, that the nutrients of the 2,300 Greek Lectionaries have never yet been tapped in any great

---

Mediterranean region, and thereafter the globe. But on the other hand, having purified the globe by fire, it seems to me that the *new heaven and the new earth* that we live on after the Second Advent may well be in a local world. For St. John says it will have “no more sea” (Rev. 21:1); whereas Ezekiel talks about “rivers” that run into “the sea” (Ezek. 47:6-12), which would therefore seemingly be in an out-of-bounds area to man, even though certain “rivers” coming from it would not be. Furthermore, as typed by the OT Jews keeping the “new moon” and “sabbath,” “all flesh” “shall come to worship” “the Lord,” i.e., on the Christian Sabbath (Sunday) and seemingly at other times also. But for a weekly sabbath to work tends to imply a local world inside the same general time zone. (I do not say identical time-zone. E.g., by a speedy Sunday public transport system, people might be able to arrive in Jerusalem for a simultaneous act of worship at what, for one group, would be 9 am in their time-zone, what for another group, would be 10 am in their time-zone, and what for yet another group would be 11 am in their time zone; before all then returning to three different time zones.) If this is the case, then if, outside of the New Edenic region in the area which is out-of-bounds to man, Jehovah wishes to “play” with the “Leviathan” crocodile (Job 41:1,5), or any other carnivores and fabulous beasts that he creates, then *that is entirely God’s business*. I for one, will be grateful that having been redeemed by the blood of the Lamb through the grace of God, I am living in an Edenic world of “the new heavens and the new earth” (Isa. 66:22), in which like the first Eden (Gen. 1:30), the animals are gentle vegetarian creatures posing no harm to man (Isa. 11:7-9). Is it possible that in this depiction of a local *new heaven and the new earth*, I have in some way misunderstood elements of Isa. 66:22-24; Ezek. 47:6-12; Rev. 21:1; and that *new heaven and the new earth* will in fact be global? Given that in the OT passage of Isa. 66:22-24, and possibly also Ezek. 47:6-12, there is some interplay between prophetic types and the greater fulfilment, and given that “sea” in Rev. 21:1 might have a symbolic apocalyptic meaning of “the wicked” (Isa. 57:20); and the city is constantly illuminated by the light of God’s glory (Rev. 21:23), I am neither sure nor dogmatic about the matter. TIME WILL TELL.

detail for the purposes of composing the *Textus Receptus*, just as most of it had not been tapped into to compose a representative Byzantine Text till the latter part of the 20th century after the earlier 20th century works of von Soden on Matthew to Jude and Hoskier on Revelation made this possible. Thus this “*mighty long gecko tail*” acts as a storehouse for information, and a safety mechanism in the event of loss. For one could, and I hesitate to state so wicked and horrible an idea, but one could, in fact, destroy a large percentage of Byzantine texts, (*condemned and frustrated in their evil designs by God be any evil-doer who should attempt so shocking a thing.*) and one could still compose the starting point of the representative Byzantine text! Of course, this same feature has another advantage. It also graciously recognizes the need for man to be able to limit data to a manageable size.

This technique of a man considering all known Byzantine texts reasonably accessible to him, or a reasonable sample of such a larger number of them, in order to determine the representative Byzantine text, has only ever proven to be defective for the incidental and secondary issue of optional letters; or unraveling continuous script manuscripts for variant spellings (e.g., “*Dad*” goes to “*Dabid*” or “*Dauid*”); or unraveling continuous script manuscripts where something is either *one* compound word, or two words formed from its constituent parts. But none of these matters in any way affects English (or other language) translation. E.g., at Matt. 17:12, Scrivener’s Text has, *outo* (“Likewise,” AV), and while Hodges & Farstad have the same reading, Robinson & Pierpont have the optional “s” (sigma) of *outos* (“Likewise”). Or at Matt. 17:25, Scrivener’s Text has, *lambanousi* (“take,” AV, or “they take”), and while once again, this same reading is found in Hodges & Farstad; once again, Robinson & Pierpont prefer the optional letter, and so add the “n” (nu) of *lambanousin*. This matter has been resolved in e.g., Scrivener’s Text, by applying a later rule of stylistic grammar not found in the NT Greek, but nevertheless not contrary to the Greek, which I discuss in the Appendix of this second volume (Appendix 2, “Consideration of Optional Letters in Scrivener’s Text of St. Matthew’s Gospel”).

Contrary to the claims of the Dean Burgon Society and their derivatives that the 16th and 17th century composers of the Received Text must have engaged in some kind of mammoth majority text count, or indeed ever counted anything more than *c.* 1% of the *c.* 4,200-4,300 Byzantine manuscripts, or anything more than *c.* 5% of *c.* 900 Byzantine manuscripts in von Soden’s “K” group (used by Robinson & Pierpont); Erasmus could determine his starting point of a representative Byzantine text from a relatively small number of manuscripts. His 1516 Greek NT consisted of e.g., two twelfth century Byzantine manuscripts, one of the Gospels and one of the Epistles (Acts to Jude), and one of Revelation. He used high quality techniques of textual analysis, comparing these with a small number of other textual sources, including St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate. *Therefore for my purposes, I shall simply say that for any given text Erasmus used less than a dozen textual sources.* The exact number of all sources / manuscripts used by Erasmus for any given reading is not definitively known, though on the available evidence it seems to have been less than a dozen, and in at least some instances, *possibly* less than half a dozen. I include in this count references made to ancient or mediaeval writers church writers citing a given Scripture, if the latter, especially early mediaeval writers, e.g., St.

Gregory (d. 604). How many Greek Lectionaries might Erasmus have been able to consult which were then subsequently lost to us? To conjecture the possibility of at least one or two is surely very reasonable.

The King James Version translators primarily used Stephanus's editions of 1550 and 1551 and Beza's edition of 1598. However, they produced their own NT Greek Text. We cannot be sure as to the full number of Greek manuscripts they consulted, even though it would have been a relatively small number. E.g., we know that at the time of the Puritan Revolution in 1640-60 (with its Puritan republic from 1642-60,) that Archbishop Laud had a number of Greek Lectionaries connected with Greek liturgies in his private library, since this matter was raised at his trial. So too, therefore, various King James translators may have had some Greek Lectionaries or even the odd Minuscule in their private library, and if so, these sources may then have become lost to us. But even if e.g., one King James translator had a couple of Greek Lectionaries and a Minuscule, and another had one Greek Lectionary, and another had three such Greek Lectionaries, and they are now all lost to us, the number of overall Greek manuscripts would still have been relatively small.

Therefore, the reality is, that if e.g., Erasmus of Rotterdam (1469-1536) could use less than a dozen manuscripts / sources to determine his starting point of the representative Byzantine Text; and if e.g., Stephanus of Geneva (1503-1559) could use between one and two dozen manuscripts to determine his starting point of the representative Byzantine Text; and no neo-Byzantines of the 16th or 17th centuries ever used more than c. 1% of the just over c. 4,000 Byzantine manuscripts, or c. 5% of c. 900 Byzantine manuscripts in von Soden's "K" group; then these numbers are so dwarfed by e.g., the c. 900 Byzantine manuscripts in von Soden's K group used by Robinson & Pierpont (2005), that we can certainly use this work to compose our starting point of a representative Byzantine Text, and in this context, also consult *with some caution* the Majority Text of Hodges & Farstad (1985) based on c. 1,500 manuscripts from von Soden's "I" and "K" groups, or factoring in an error bar of up to 10% for von Soden's generalist groups, c. 1,350 manuscripts for Hodges & Farstad's text; and Green's Textual Apparatus (1986). For we neo-Byzantines, this is *the starting point*, not the finishing point of the Received Text. For we are prepared to move away from this representative Byzantine Text, if compelled to do so by some evident textual problem. Furthermore, where there is a fairly even division between the Byzantine texts, we also consider textual factors. (Cf. e.g., commentary at Matt. 19:5b.)

Whether frequently consulting von Soden's work indirectly on a second-hand basis through reference to the majority texts of Robinson & Pierpont (1991 & 2005) and Hodges & Farstad (1982 & 1985), or Green's majority text Textual Apparatus (1986); or infrequently consulting von Soden's work directly on a first-hand basis such as I did e.g., for Matt. 19:19, *supra*; I am grateful to Hermann von Soden for the excellent work he did in his textual apparatus, and also to the generous lady whose finances facilitated this project, his wealthy patroness, Elise King. I thus thank God for the textual apparatus of the German, Baron von Soden (d. 1914), and under God, give the memory of the Baron and his patroness, all due respect and honour for this wonderful work.

God has given us a mechanism in the representative Byzantine text to act as the starting point for the neo-Byzantine *Textus Receptus*. A wise God and good God, has ensured that we can determine this starting point of a representative Byzantine Text on the count of either a relatively small number of Byzantine Texts (Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, & Elzevir), or a relatively large number of Byzantine Texts (Robinson & Pierpont, or myself). We follow this representative Byzantine text, which has been providentially preserved over time, unless there is a clear and obvious textual problem with it. If so, through textual analysis, we consider other readings in the closed class of sources that God has providentially protected over time, in the Latin textual tradition or Latin and Greek church writers, whether the ancient church writers, or mediaeval church writers, if the latter, especially early mediaeval writers e.g., the iconolater (icon idolater) who wickedly opposed the policy of the godly Byzantine Emperors of *The First Iconoclasm* (730-787) when they tried to stamp out this evil, to wit, John of Damascus (d. before 754) e.g., Commentary at Matt. 18:21; 18:26a; 18:34b; 19:10. These Greek and Latin sources had a general and reasonable accessibility over the ages, (or their basic text type did, in the case of manuscripts later found that conform to their Greek or Latin type), and so the Received Text may have been so composed at any time, by one with the God given gift of teaching (Rom. 12:6,7; I Cor. 12:28), with specific reference to textual analysis. Now God gives different types of “teachers,” e.g., pastoral “teachers” in charge of churches, Sunday School “teachers,” or teachers of the Biblical languages of Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, and Latin, (for though Latin is not a Biblical language at the point of Divine Inspiration, it is a Biblical language at the point of Divine Preservation,) or “teachers” of the *Textus Receptus*. These and other God given teachers, are not like secular or non-church teachers, for such “teachers” are given by God “for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ” (Eph. 4:11,12).

Those who say that they believe in the Received Text but are not prepared to recognize neo-Byzantine textual analysts, such as Beza, Elzevir, or myself, choosing instead some alleged “Majority Text count” which they claim will tally and equate “the Received Text of the King James Version,” need to recognize this reality. Whereas the Devil’s cup is sweet at the top, but when one starts to drink it becomes bitter and bad; by contrast, with necessary repentance, the Lord’s cup may seem to be “bitter” at the top, but when one starts to drink it become sweet and good. Though the existence of a neo-Byzantine textual analyst “teacher” (Rom. 12:6,7; I Cor. 12:28; Eph. 4:11) such as myself is “a bitter pill” for them to swallow, they nevertheless need “to take their medicine.”

*Recognizing* that my own work is the first main work of a neo-Byzantine textual analyst since Elzevir, (although the work of the neo-Byzantine, the Reverend Mr. John Mill, c. 1645-1707, *supra*, should not be forgotten,) i.e., *I am the first neo-Byzantine textual analyst in about 350 years if one counts from Elzevir, or about 300 years if one counts from Mill in 1707, those who accept the Biblical teaching of the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture should be supporting my work on the Received Text, even if they disagree with me in some other areas.* E.g., I doubt very much that Arminian Puritans like Moorman and Waite, or Reformed Puritans like Hembd, Khoo, and Watts, will be joining a Reformed Anglican like me in considering that there is value in such

holy days (Rom. 14:5,6) as e.g., St. John Baptist's Day (24 June), St. Matthew the Apostle's Day (21 Sept.), St. Mark's Day (25 April), St. Luke the Evangelist's Day (18 Sept.), St. John the Evangelist's Day (27 Dec.), Transfiguration Day (6 Aug.), Charles I's Day (30 Jan.), Richard Johnson's Day (3 Feb.), or St. Alban's Day (17 June); though some of them may find value in Christmas Day (25 Dec.), Good Friday and Easter Sunday; and all of them would agree with me on the importance of weekly Sunday sacredness on the basis of Christ's resurrection from the dead following his vicarious substitutional atonement (e.g., John 20:1,19,26; Acts 20:7; I Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10).

And so it was, that in the 16th and 17th centuries, that under such godly men as e.g., Stephanus of Geneva, Beza of Geneva, and the Elzevirs of Leiden, that the NT Received Text was more formally composed *as a complete document* than it had been done before. This occurred at a time just after the fall of the Greek speaking Byzantine Empire's capital, Constantinople (modern Istanbul, Turkey), to Arabic speaking Mohammedan's aggressively wielding the violent sword of Islam in 1453. It also correlated in broad time with the rise of the printing press. It was thus an important transition point from scribes copying out hand manuscripts, to printed editions of the Scriptural text, starting in the mid 15th century and ending finally at the end of the 16th century in 1599 following the publication of Beza's edition of 1598. We have the fruits of this momentous God ordained and sustained achievement in our King James Versions of 1611. It was indissolubly interconnected with the great Protestant Reformation ignited by God under Martin Luther on the Eve of All Saints' Day, 1517, at Wittenberg Castle in Germany. "For the Lord is good; his mercy is everlasting [covenant of grace]; and his truth [Divine Inspiration of Scripture] endureth to all generations [Divine Preservation of Scripture]" (Ps. 100:5).

***"Riding the great white stallion" that is "stabled" at von Soden's "Ohio ranch."***

Angels like "Gabriel" who was "caused to fly swiftly" (Dan. 9:21; cf. 8:16), flew threw the air long before the fulfilment in modern times of the Old Testament prophecy, "many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased" (Dan. 12:4), with (among other elements of the fulfilment,) "knowledge" being "increased" so that men now fly in aircraft "to and fro" over the globe. On Monday 23 March, 2009, just two days before the church remembers the coming of the angel St. Gabriel (Luke 1:26; cf. 1:19) to St. Mary on *Annunciation Day* (25 March)<sup>479</sup>, (which day was historically so important in

---

<sup>479</sup> The Annunciation recalls when "Gabriel was sent from God" to "Mary" (Luke 1:26,27), telling her she was to "conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son," "JESUS" (Luke 1:31), nine months before Christmas is celebrated (25 Dec.). In the *Book of Common Prayer* 1662, the Communion readings are Isa. 7:10-15; Luke 1:26-38; and the Collect is, "We beseech thee, O Lord, pour thy grace into our hearts; that, as we have known the incarnation of thy Son Jesus Christ by the message of an angel, so by his cross and passion we may be brought unto the glory of his resurrection; through the same Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen." This same Anglican Calendar remembers St. Gabriel on *St. Michael & All Angels Day* (29 September).

England that before 1750 it was celebrated as New Year's Day,) I flew high in the sky over Ohio.

Hermann von Soden was born in Ohio, a mid-west state in the union of the United States of America. The capital of Ohio is Columbus, and like Columbia University in New York which I had inspected earlier that month, this reminds us of the discovery of the Americas by Christopher Columbus in 1492. The banks of the famous Ohio River (sometimes simply called, "the Ohio,") mark several state boundaries. About 2/3rds of Ohio is farmland, with e.g., ranches, large rolling wheat-fields, galloping horses, and livestock.

As a boy, I annually won Sunday School prizes at Evangelical Anglican Churches (other than in 1969 and 1970 when I was in Melbourne, and the Sunday School there had an unfortunate policy against giving out prizes). Though some are opposed to the Protestant institution of Sunday Schools and / or Sunday School prizes, I thank God for the benefits of a Sunday School background, and its assistance in nurturing me in the Bible and Christian faith. I am a supporter of both Sunday Schools and Sunday School prizes. In 1971, from St. Philip's Eastwood (Sydney), I won a book with a cover jacket picture showing a bronco rider being thrown off a bronco horse. The book told of some High School students going out to a ranch, learning to ride, and setting off on various adventures<sup>480</sup>.

Working within metaphors appropriate to his state of birth, von Soden's textual apparatus is "a great white stallion," and "the most powerful horse under stable" that we have. But those who would go to "the von Soden Ranch" in "Ohio," with its 40 farm hands, and farmhouse named after his patroness as, "Lady Elise Lodge," in order to "mount'n'ride" this "horse," should *hasten slowly* and be forewarned that von Soden's "horse" is "a feisty beast"<sup>481</sup>. On the one hand, it is nowhere near as bad as a bronco rider's horse, for if it were, one could not travel far on it. But on the other hand, with its intricate details and complications, erroneous "K" "I" "H" textual theory, and bad main text, it can be like "a roguish horse" that is "difficult to ride." It can "rear up on its hind legs," or "throw its rear side up" and "buck its rider off." If not under the tight control of a "very good horse rider" "who really knows what he's doing," this "roguish horse"

---

<sup>480</sup> Ellen Jane MacLeod's *Adventures on the Lazy 'N'*, Pickering & Inglis, London, UK, 1957, reprint 1969, this picture is repeated opposite the title page, with a reference to p. 88. The "Board of Education Diocese of Sydney" sticker in the front reads, "ST. PHILIP'S SUNDAY SCHOOL EASTWOOD. AWARDED TO GAVIN McGRATH 2ND PRIZE – 1971 MR. HUGHES' CLASS," and is then signed by the "Dept. Leader" "W.B. Wakely" and also bears the (not entirely clear) signature of the "Asst. Supt. [Assistant Superintendent]".

<sup>481</sup> Kurt Aland says, "The system of symbols designed by von Soden for New Testament manuscripts makes his edition almost impossible to use;" and "the reader needs to refer to supplementary manuals, and these are usually either incomplete or awkward to use" (Aland, K., *et unum, The Text of the NT*, 1987, *op. cit.*, p. 23).

might even “run under a tree just to try and throw its rider (reader) off.” It is not “the horse” for a man to first “cut his spurs” on.

Indeed even some experienced “horse riders,” like Jacob Geerlings of Utah, have first looked at, and then simply walked away from this mighty horse, refusing so much as to even try to mount so feisty a beast<sup>482</sup>. Others, like the American, Jack Moorman, of the Dean Burgon Society in New Jersey, have tried to mount’n’ride von Soden’s “great white stallion,” but to their chagrin, they have been “thrown off to the ground” by “the horse,” and very badly injured themselves in the process<sup>483</sup>. Even an experienced “rider” of von Soden’s great “white horse,” William Pierpont of Kansas, suffered “a minor fall” from this “bucking beast” in his composition of Green’s Textual Apparatus<sup>484</sup>.

Nevertheless, while there is a general stable which includes in it a white horse from Europe, a red horse from Asia, and a black horse from Africa, this “great white stallion” of von Soden’s is “stabled by itself,” away from “the other horses,” being in “a top class of its own.” It is, I say, “the most powerful horse under any stable” that we have. Thus before one should journey to “the von Soden Ranch,” to “go for a ride” on von Soden’s “great white stallion,” one should first gain some prior experience. If one has no knowledge of textual apparatuses, he might start by just “walking the lame red gelding” of Westcott-Hort’s very modest apparatus “by the reins,” in order to get an idea of textual variants. He might then progress to “the old grey mare” of the UBS 4th edition’s textual apparatus with its user-friendly apparatus style, though its very small number of textual apparatus readings makes it “a slow old horse” that one cannot get very

---

<sup>482</sup> Jacob Geerlings (1968), ignored it in his work, saying, “Von Soden’s apparatus is hopelessly complex and the time spent in combing through it is not commensurate with the effort” (Geerlings, J., *Family E & its Allies in Mark*, *op. cit.*, p. 101).

<sup>483</sup> As discussed, *supra*, Moorman failed to understand some key elements of the residual feature in von Soden’s textual apparatus, and this led him to seriously and fundamentally misunderstand important parts of it.

<sup>484</sup> As discussed, *supra*, in Green’s Textual Apparatus (1986), Pierpont failed to factor in an allowance of *c.* 10% in recognition of the generalist nature of von Soden’s group symbols in his calculations; even though this does not negate the general usefulness of this textual apparatus. Hence Green’s Textual Apparatus ratings should be understood to have an error bar factor of up to 10% of the figures he gives. But whereas Pierpont ignored this *c.* 10% error bar factor, Moorman massively inflated and grossly overstated this percentage. This same basic error of not understanding the generalist nature of von Soden’s group symbols, can also emerge by those finding some references to manuscripts in one of von Soden’s groups not referred to in his apparatus. E.g., Moorman and Wisse on “the 99 checked” manuscripts, in which it was said that “76” of the “99” “were missing one or more times when they should have been cited” in von Soden’s apparatus (Moorman’s *When the KJV Departs from the ‘Majority’ Text*, *op. cit.*, p. 11; quoting Frederick Wisse’s *Profile Method*, pp. 16,17), *supra*.

far on. Thereafter, he might advance to “the dark horse” of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition, which contains a most useful textual apparatus; and if daring, he might then proceed to “the black horse” of Tischendorf’s 8th edition, which contains another very useful textual apparatus.

Yet if he should then desire to leave these lesser beasts, and ride “the great white stallion” on “von Soden’s Ohio ranch,” he ought to still *approach this “beast” with the utmost care and caution*. It is, I repeat, “the most powerful horse under any stable,” which is why it was “harnessed” by Robinson & Pierpont for their Majority Byzantine Text, Pierpont for Green’s Textual Apparatus, and also Hodges & Farstad for their Majority Text. But it is also a potentially “dangerous horse.” It is a beast that is known to have “thrown many an unwary rider off.” It can “buck its rider off” and then has the potential to “trample him underfoot” and “kick him to death.”

Ideally, there would be another “great white horse” on “another ranch” somewhere, with a better temperament than von Soden’s “horse;” one that had all the strength and power of von Soden’s “horse,” but without all the concomitant problems that come with this “feisty beast.” Alas, no such “better beast” exists on planet Earth. This is not a perfect world, and at least to date, von Soden’s “horse” is still without peer or rival for its strength and “horsepower.” Thus if one wants to “ride a horse” strong enough to cover many hundreds and indeed thousands of Byzantine manuscripts, von Soden’s “horse” is *the only one strong enough to cover the distance*.

Thus a variety of different types of “horse-riders” journey to “von Soden’s ranch” from different places. E.g., one type is the “Anglican Cavalier” type “horse rider.” Personally, I am such a modern day “cavalier<sup>485</sup>.” (I am by no means “the last of the cavaliers,” since “the king’s men” in “the king’s army” continue “to ride” another “horse” every 30 January.) Nevertheless, I only ever trek to “the von Soden Ranch” to “mount’n’ride” this “great white stallion” when I absolutely have to; for only when the element of *necessity* is present, can I generally say that it brings me more pleasure than pain to do so. The ride is always fatiguing, even when necessity makes it pleasurable. Certainly for the purposes of defending my starting point of the representative Byzantine text against the claims of the Dean Burgon Society, I have “been in the saddle” with “my feet in the stirrups” on this “powerful white stallion” much longer than normal in these

---

<sup>485</sup> The term, “cavalier,” was historically used for a “horseman,” and in the context of this metaphor, that is its first layer of meaning, although such usage is now archaic. It derives from the fact that historically, 1640s Royalist military forces of King Charles I in the Civil War were known as “Cavaliers” i.e., as opposed to the republican “Roundheads.” As a royalist Anglican, there is thus a second impressionistic sense in which I am here identifying myself with the royal military forces that fought so gallantly and bravely for King Charles. Stemming from this, the term “cavalier” also refers to a courtly or gallant gentleman, sometimes, although certainly not always, in the context of escorting a lady. The reader should be warned of modern day “Roundheads” who try to give the word “cavalier” a negative connotation, which is a nasty piece of propaganda that I for one entirely reject.

prefatory sections of Volume 2 of this textual commentary. But given the foundational nature of the representative Byzantine text as the starting point of neo-Byzantine textual analysis in composing the Received Text, this was an instance of “necessity.” My usage of the von Soden based works of Robinson & Pierpont, Hodges & Farstad, and Green’s Textual Apparatus is such, that if von Soden’s work upon which they are based is wrong, then I am wrong in the methodology I use to determine the representative Byzantine text as my starting point *for every reading in my commentary*.

Though I would caution any man wishing to “go for a horse-ride” on “the great white stallion” in von Soden’s “Ohio ranch,” if he nevertheless wishes to so “mount’n’ride” “the most powerful horse” we presently have “in any stable,” then that his choice. But let “the rider (reader)” also remember that this is “a roguish horse,” and if one approaches it from the front, and then “turns one back” it “will bite” the would be rider, i.e., one must, “Watch it fairly carefully right from the very start.” Upon “mounting the horse,” it will “buck, and kick, and try to throw its rider off.” *In many ways, this is not “a good horse to ride.” But it is also the only “horse under stable” that has enough “horsepower strength” for some journeys, and being by far “the strongest horse,” one must sometimes “ride it” from necessity if one wants to cover a verse adequately on the available data.*

Therefore, to those “American cowboy horseman types,” “Anglican Cavalier horseman types,” or any other “horseman types,” who so wish to go to the “OHIO ranch” of von Soden and “ride” this “most powerful white stallion,” I can only then say with that other white man on his white horse, (the Lone Ranger,) “HI! HO! SILVER!!!”

*Here again, Gone again, versions.*

When I visited Scotland in December and January 2001-2002, I entered the land from which came King James the First, after whom the King James Version of 1611 is named. Thus there is a sense in which the King James Version is *the glory* of Scotland, and indeed the *glory* of the three Kingdoms of England (containing England & Wales), Ireland, and Scotland that James ruled over. The memory of King James in these three Kingdoms is now preserved in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

But there is another side to Scotland’s history. When visiting Edinburgh, among other things I saw a columned structure known as, “The Disgrace of Edinburgh.” It was built on the Roman Forum model during the Crimean War (1853-6) to bury war dead, but they ran out of money and so it was never completed. The fact that it was started but not completed, gave rise to its name as “The Disgrace of Edinburgh” (cf. Luke 14:28-30). Actually, I think the even bigger “disgrace” of Scotland would be the Moffatt Bible (1913-1935) produced by the religiously liberal Presbyterian Scotsman, James Moffatt, and the religiously liberal New English Bible (1961-1970) produced at the instigation of the *Church of Scotland*. Both of these versions have ceased to have the popular followings they once had. E.g., the Moffatt Bible of 1913-1926 was *first gone* and *here*

*again* with a new revision in 1935, and then *gone again* as it faded from the more popular and spiritually damaging usage it had received for a time.

Nevertheless, elements of this wild Scotsman's type of methodology (see commentary at Matt. 9:22; 11:10 on the Moffatt Bible), which may occasionally use a non-Alexandrian text pincer arm (less so than Moffatt) in conjunction with their more commonly used Alexandrian text pincer arm, continue to infect neo-Alexandrian texts (see commentary at Matt. 10:25 on Tischendorf's Text & NU text; Matt. 13:33 on Westcott-Hort's text; Matt. 18:26a on Tischendorf's text; Matt. 19:3c on UBS 3rd & 3rd corrected editions, and NU Text) and versions (see commentary at Matt. 13:34; 15:6c on NASB; Matt. 16:5 on NIV; Matt. 16:8a on NEB & TEV; Matt. 18:19a, REB; Matt. 18:21, REB, JB & NJB; Matt. 18:28a, TCNT, TEV, NEB, REB, NIV, JB & NJB; Matt. 18:29a, NEB, REB, JB & NJB; and Matt. 19:3c on *prima facie* reading of TCNT, TEV, NEB, REB, NRSV, NIV, JB & NJB).

Indeed, I stated in Volume 1 (Preface, section 9), that "there are *so many versions*, ... that the task of keeping up with them is like *a cat chasing its tail*." E.g., my library contains a 1961 NT edition of the *New English Bible* (NEB), which I sometimes refer to in this Commentary Volume on Matt. 15-20. In its Introduction, it repeatedly claims that the language of the AV (1611) and RV (1881-5) is *archaic*, and that this warrants the NEB<sup>486</sup>. This same NEB New Testament was itself apparently deemed *archaic* just nine years later, for when in 1970 the NEB's OT and Apocrypha were published, they also revised the NEB's NT to a second edition (1970)<sup>487</sup>.

But of course, in time the NEB (1961 & 1970) itself was then deemed to be *archaic*, and replaced by the *Revised English Bible* (REB) in 1989. The NEB thus lasted among its devotees for less than 30 years from 1961 to 1989, and the complete NEB lasted less than 20 years from 1970 to 1989. The NEB of 1961 was *here again* with a second edition of its NT in 1970, and then *gone again* in 1989 with the REB. Such are the comings and goings of so many of the neo-Alexandrian versions, or earlier editions of a neo-Alexandrian version.

Another book in my library is *The Twentieth Century New Testament* (1904). My copy is the second edition, since a note in the Preface tells of how it was first issued in three parts from 1898 to 1901. It was thus a case of *here again* in 1904 with its second edition. One of its numerous bizarre features is that it rearranges the order of NT Books, so that e.g., the Book of James comes after the Book of Acts and is then followed by the First & Second Books of Thessalonians, which in turn are then followed by the Book of Galatians (and various other such changes to NT Book order as well).

---

<sup>486</sup> See Commentary Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), Preface, section 8.

<sup>487</sup> Kubo, S., & Specht, W., *So Many Versions?* Zondervan, Michigan, USA, 1975, pp.149-162 at p. 149.

*The Twentieth Century New Testament* (1904) gained popularity among some for a time, but then like its first edition (1898-1901), it was *gone again*. People had forgotten about it. It was a case of, *Good riddens to bad rubbish*. But then seemingly from nowhere, in the early 1960s a new third edition of *The Twentieth Century New Testament* (1961) was published by Moody Press, USA. It was a case of, *here again*<sup>488</sup>. But with so many other new neo-Alexandrian versions now appearing on the market, *The Twentieth Century New Testament* (1961) was unable to survive. In time, it was a case of, *gone again*.

---

<sup>488</sup> Kubo, S., & Specht, W., *op. cit.*, pp. 23-27 at p. 23.