

**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

KING JAMES BIBLE

also known as the

AUTHORIZED (KING JAMES) VERSION

also known as the

SAINT JAMES VERSION

Textual Commentary, Volume: 3

**St. Matthew's Gospel
Chapters 21-25.**

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 3 (Matthew 21-25), 2011.*

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

Published & Printed in Sydney, New South Wales.

Copyright © 2011 (Volume 3) by Gavin Basil McGrath.

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

Volume 3 Dedication Sermon, preached at Mangrove Mountain Union Church,
Mangrove Mountain, N.S.W., 2250, Australia, on Thursday 9 June, 2011.

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

This copy of Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) incorporates corrigenda changes from 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, 2011.

Dedicated to Almighty God on Royal Oak Day, 2011, in the 360th anniversary year of Charles II's preservation (1651-2011), also known as e.g., Nativity & Return of Charles II's Day or The King's Restoration Day or Oak Apple Day; being the day remembering the Nativity in 1630 and Restoration in 1660 of King Charles II. The Restoration Caroline 1662 Prayer Book made the King James Version of 1611 the Authorized Version, stating in its Preface, "portions of holy Scripture ... are now ordered to be read according to the last Translation;" and 2011 is also the 400th anniversary of the King James Version (1611-2011). By one tradition, Royal Oak Day is celebrated on 29 May, e.g., in England at Salisbury, Worcester, Membury (near Axminster), and Marsh Gibbon (in Oxfordshire). By another tradition, in harmony with the wider contemporary practice in England and eastern Australia of officially remembering a monarch's birthday in June; on the first or second Thursday in June; & nowadays so remembered at the London Oak Apple Day Parade held at the old soldiers' home, Royal Chelsea Hospital, founded by Royal Warrant of Charles II in 1681. A Royal Family member was sometimes Reviewing Officer at the London Oak Apple Day Military Parade before 1977, and has generally been so since 1977, e.g., King Edward VII in 1909, King George V in 1912, King George VI in 1942, Queen Elizabeth II in 1962, 1975, 1982, & 2006, & Prince Charles in 1977, 1983, 1992, 1999, & 2005. In harmony with the Royal patronage of this Caroline old soldiers' home in general, and the London Oak Apple Day Parade in particular, this Textual Commentary Volume 3 is Dedicated to Almighty God on the day so officially designated for 2011, Royal Oak Day, Thursday, 9th of June, 2011.

"O God, who by thy Divine Providence and goodness didst this day
first bring into the world, and ... also ... restore to us, ... King Charles;
... establish his throne, we beseech thee ... through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Office for the King's Birth and Return (29 May),
Anglican Book of Common Prayer (1662-1664).

"O Almighty God, who art a strong tower of defence unto thy servants against the face of
their enemies; we yield thee praise and thanksgiving for the wonderful deliverance ...
from THE GREAT REBELLION, and all the miseries and oppressions consequent
thereupon O Lord God ... who ... by thy miraculous providence didst deliver us ...
by restoring ... King Charles the Second, notwithstanding all power and malice of his
enemies Strengthen the hands of our gracious Sovereign ... to cut off all such workers
of iniquity, as turn religion into rebellion, ... that they may never again prevail against us
... . So we ... give thee thanks ... through Jesus Christ our only Saviour and Redeemer,
to whom, with thee, O Father, and the Holy Ghost, be all glory in the Church throughout
all ages, world without end. Amen."

Office for the Restoration of the Royal Family (29 May),
Anglican Book of Common Prayer (1662, revised Office of 1664-1859).

Cranmer's prayer book was attacked by Papists because of its Protestantism, and then revised and restored under Elizabeth I as a symbol of Protestantism in 1559:
“The Book of Common Prayer ... of ... King Edward the Sixth, ... was repealed, and taken away by ... Queen Mary [in 1553], to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ's religion ... therefore ... the said repeal ... shall be void and of none effect”

1559 Act *Primo Elizabethae* traditionally printed at the front of the 1662 prayer book.

Cranmer's prayer book was attacked by Puritans because of its Anglicanism, and then revised and restored under Charles II as a symbol of Anglican Protestantism in 1662:
“By what undue means, and for what mischievous purposes the use of the liturgy [made “illegal” from 1645 under revolutionary Puritan republic Ordinances,] ... came, during the late unhappy confusions, to be discontinued, is ... well known But upon His Majesty's happy Restoration, it seemed ... the use of the liturgy would also return ... : whereunto His Majesty [Charles II] ... did graciously condescend.”

The Preface, Caroline *Book of Common Prayer* (1662); Act of Uniformity (14 Caroli II).

O Lord, our heavenly Father, who ... by thy gracious providence didst miraculously preserve the undoubted heir ... King, Charles the Second, from his bloody enemies, hiding him under the shadow of thy wings, until their tyranny was overpast; and didst bring him back, in thy good appointed time, to sit upon the throne of his father; and together with the Royal Family didst restore to us our ancient Government in Church and State. For these thy great ... mercies we render to thee our most humble ... thanks; ... through Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour. *Amen.*”

COLLECT for *King Charles the Martyr's Day*, Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662-1859. (Charles II's *Accession Day* was 30 January, 1649; and beyond its primary focus on Charles I's martyrdom in 1649, the secondary focus of *King Charles I's Day* is the interregnum, Charles II, and Restoration in 1660.)

Though Royal Oak Day or Oak Apple Day may be celebrated on Saturday 28 May when 29 May falls on a Sunday; or nowadays at the London Oak Apple Day Parade on the first / second Thursday in June as Founder's Day of the Royal Chelsea Hospital in London which was founded by Charles II; it has always been MOST COMMONLY CELEBRATED on 29 May irrespective of what day of the week 29 May falls on.

In this broader context:

By tradition the merry month of May begins with May Day (1 May) and ends with reference to the merry monarch on Royal Oak Day (29 May).

Historically, a May Pole might be decorated with flowers, and dancing around the May Pole occur on 1 May, and after the Restoration, also on 29 May.

“I was walking down the street one day,
in the very merry month of May,
 I was taken by surprise,
 by the girl with lovely eyes,
in the very merry month of May.”

A song that celebrates the traditional idea of the merry month of May.

***KING JAMES BIBLE**
400th anniversary 1611-2011
Queen's Message.

In her Christmas Message of 25 December 2010, given at the Chapel Royal of Hampton Court Palace in London, Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, said:

“Over 400 years ago King James the Sixth of Scotland inherited the throne of England at a time when the Christian Church was deeply divided. Here at Hampton Court in 1604 he convened a Conference of churchmen of all shades of opinion to discuss the future of Christianity in this country. The king agreed to commission a new translation of the Bible that was acceptable to all parties. This was to become the King James or Authorized Bible which next year will be exactly four centuries old. Acknowledged as a masterpiece of English prose and the most vivid translation of the Scriptures, the glorious language of this Bible has survived the turbulence of history, and given many of us the most widely recognized and beautiful descriptions of the birth of Jesus Christ we celebrate today.” ... “The King James Bible was a major co-operative endeavor that required the efforts of dozens of the day’s leading scholars. The whole enterprise was guided by an interest in reaching agreement for the wider benefit of the Christian Church and to bring harmony to the Kingdoms of England and Scotland.” “From the Scriptures in the Bible which bears” “King James” “name,” ““Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.’ [Matt. 7:12] I wish you and all those whom you love and care for, a very happy Christmas.”

Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, by the grace of God, *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Defender of the Faith*; Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; Queen of Australia, and elsewhere.

Excerpts from the Queen's Christmas Message of Saturday 25 December 2010.

“Now ... we have on the one side avoided the scrupulosity of the Puritans, who leave the Ecclesiastical words, ... as when they put ‘washing’ for ‘baptism,’ and ‘congregation’ instead of ‘church:’ and also on the other side we have shunned the obscurity of the Papists, in their ‘azymes,’ ... ‘praepuce,’ ‘pasche,’ and ... such like, whereof their late [Douay-Rheims] translation is full ... to darken the sense”

“The Translators to the Reader,” King James Version of 1611.

THIS COMMENTARY (VOLUME 3) HAS BEEN DEDICATED TO ALMIGHTY GOD ON ROYAL OAK DAY, THURSDAY 9 JUNE 2011, IN THE 360TH ANNIVERSARY YEAR OF 1651, IN HARMONY WITH THE DATE USED FOR THE OAK APPLE DAY PARADE ANNUALLY HELD ON FOUNDER'S DAY AT THE ROYAL CHELSEA HOSPITAL IN LONDON. This Oak Apple Day Parade was reviewed by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II in 1962, 1975, 1982, and 2006. THIS IS IN THIS 400TH ANNIVERSARY YEAR OF THE KING JAMES BIBLE (1611-2011), AND THE ROYAL CHELSEA HOSPITAL INCLUDES COLLEGE COURT, BEING THE PLACE FORMERLY KNOWN AS CHELSEA COLLEGE, WHICH IS WHERE THE KING JAMES BIBLE TRANSLATOR AND HOLY CONFESSOR, DANIEL FEATLEY, DIED IN 1645 AGED 63. DANIEL FEATLEY WAS VERY ILL & LET OUT ON BAIL FOLLOWING AN 18 MONTH IMPRISONMENT BY THE PURITAN REGIME BECAUSE OF HIS ANGLICANISM & BIBLICAL PROTESTANT COMMITMENT TO “HONOUR THE KING” (I Peter 2:17).

Table of Contents (indicates important reading before using commentary)*

PREFACE

Title pages.

***King James Bible 400th anniversary 1611-2011 Queen's Message.**

Table of Contents pages.

*** Common Abbreviations.**

*** The Articles of the Creed.**

*** The Ten Commandments or Holy Decalogue.**

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

Selections potentially relevant to Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25) from

Sydney University Greek Lectionaries 2378 & 1968.

Scripture Citations of Bishop Gregory the Great in Matt. 21-25.

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

***"I'm an Evangelical – I hope you are too!"**

Perseverance Pays.

Book of the Chronicles of Neo-Byzantine Defence of the Received Text.

Antisupernaturalist "objections" to e.g., Divine Preservation, not "modern."

Sydney University Lectionaries.

Codex Alexandrinus's Byzantine Text Gospels:

"The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church."

Citations of the Writings of Caesarius.

What ever happened to von Soden's papers?

Greek & Latin: Contrast & Comparison.

The Latin Vulgate and the Authorized Version: Quotations format.

The Book of Armagh – A special Latin treat.

The Today's English Version.

Impact of Oliver Cromwell on American Revolution & more widely the secular state.

Dedication: The Anglican Calendar.

1) *Charles I's Day (30 Jan.).*

2) *The nexus between Charles I's Day and Charles II's Day.*

a) *General;*

b) *Some sites I have visited of interest to Charles I, Charles II, James II, & William III.*

c) *Traditional Diocese of Sydney Low Church Evangelicalism, NOT Puritan and semi-Puritan trends from 1970s.*

3) *The "Father" Huddleston Saga.*

4) *The Test Acts and 1689 Religious Toleration to English & Irish Puritans.*

5) *The Restoration in the Scottish Context of the Williamite Settlement.*

6) *The Battle of Vinegar Hill (1798 Ireland & 1804 NSW):*

"Rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft" (I Sam. 15:23).

- 7) *Charles II's Day (29 May).*
- a) *My Baptist Grandmother.*
 - b) *St. Helier.*
 - c) *A General Introduction to Royal Oak Day.*
 - d) *Royal Oak Hotels.*
 - e) *Royal Oak Streets and other place names.*
 - f) *Royal Oak Naval Ships of the Fleet.*
 - g) *Royal Oak Day Sermons.*
 - h) *Royal Oak Day Celebrations.*
 - i) *The London Oak Apple Day Parade.*
 - a) *Preamble on "the Shaver's" repentance;*
 - b) *General on London Oak Apple Day;*
 - c) *KJV translators Daniel Featley et al.*
 - j) *Charles II lands at Dover ☺.*
 - k) *The Restoration Prayer Book of 1662: its language a fruit of the AV.*
 - l) *The Cross as a symbol of Christianity & some stingy Puritans get their bottoms "pinched" on Oak Apple Day.*
 - *m) *Royal Oak Day Dedication.***

TEXTUAL COMMENTARY Matt. 21-25.

Appendix 1: A Table of some instances where Scrivener's Text does not represent the properly composed Received Text. Appendix 2: Minor variants between Scrivener's Text and the Majority Byzantine Text (MBT) [or another possible reading], including references to the neo-Alexandrian Text in those instances where the neo-Alexandrian Texts agree with the MBT in such an alternative reading to Scrivener's Text; where such alternative readings do not affect, or do not necessarily affect, the English translation, so we cannot be certain which reading the AV translators followed. Appendix 3: Minor variants between the NU Text or MBT and Textus Receptus (or another relevant text and the TR) not affecting, or not necessarily affecting, the English translation (some more notable variants in Matt. 21-25). Appendix 4: Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E (Matt. 21-25). Appendix 5: Dedication Sermon for Volume 3 (2nd Thurs. in June - 9 June 2011). Appendix 6: Corrigenda to Former Volumes 1 & 2. Appendix 7: Queen's Message on KJV: Queen Elizabeth II Flyer. Appendix 8: A Sermons' Bonus.

* *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 (pronounced, “New 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 Textual Commentaries 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 Textual Commentaries 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 For Textual Commentaries Vol. 1 & Vol. 2:
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. (This edition used in Volumes 1 & 2 of textual commentaries.)
- TEV For Textual Commentaries Vol. 3 onwards:
Today's English Version or Good News Bible or Good News Translation. Scripture quotations are from the Good News Translation Revised Edition – © American Bible Society 1966, 1971, 1976, 1992. (2nd edition 1992, Australian usage text – revised edition of 1994.)
- 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.

*** *The Articles of the Creed.***

The Apostles' Creed (named after, not written by, the apostles), is found in e.g., Luther's (Lutheran) *Short Catechism* (1529); the *Catechism* (largely written by Cranmer) in the (Anglican) *Book of Common Prayer* (1662); and the Westminster (Presbyterian) *Shorter Catechism* (*Church of Scotland*, 1648). The 12 Articles, one for each of the apostles, are as follows.

- (1) I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth;
 - (2) and in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord,
 - (3) who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary,
 - (4) suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried,
he descended into hell;
 - (5) the third day he rose again from the dead,
 - (6) he ascended into heaven,
 - (7) and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty;
 - (8) from thence he shall come to judge the quick (living) and the dead.
 - (9) I believe in the Holy Ghost;
 - (10) the holy catholic (universal) church;
the communion (fellowship) of saints (believers);
 - (11) the forgiveness of sins;
 - (12) the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting.
- Amen.

* *The Ten Commandments* or *Holy Decalogue* of Exodus 20:1-17 and Deut. 5:6-21 are sometimes used in this work in summary forms of its precepts. This is in harmony with New Testament custom and practice, which sometimes cites the fuller form (Eph. 6:2,3; citing Deut. 5:16), and sometimes cites a summary form (e.g., Matt. 19:18,19; Rom. 7:7; 13:9). When the summary form is followed, it is that found in the following Table. Concerning the 3rd commandment, since NT times “the Lord’s name” includes for the Christian that of “the Lord Jesus Christ” (II Cor. 13:14). With regard to the 4th commandment, in the Greek the word, “*sabbaton*” has a contextual double meaning for both “week” and “sabbaths,” so the words that Christ rose on “the first of the week (*sabbaton*)” simultaneously mean, “the first of the sabbaths (*sabbaton*),” thus making Easter Sunday the first of subsequent Christian Sunday Sabbaths (John 20:1,19,26; Acts 2:1; 20:7; I Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10 cf. Ps. 118:22-24 & Acts 4:10,11). Our Lord also reintroduced the earlier antediluvian ban on polygamy (Gen. 2:21-24; 4:19; 7:13; Matt. 19:9; I Cor. 7:2; I Tim. 3:1), and so the 7th commandment requires Christian monogamy.

The Ten Commandments of Exodus 20 in their full form.	The Ten Commandments of Exodus 20 in their summary form.
<p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <p>And God spake all these words, saying, I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">II</p> <p>Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">III</p> <p>Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <p>I am the Lord thy God, Thou shalt have no other gods before me.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">II</p> <p>Thou shalt not make, bow down to, nor serve, any graven image.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">III</p> <p>Thou shalt not take the Lord’s name in vain.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">IV</p> <p>Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <p>Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">VI</p> <p>Thou shalt not kill.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">VII</p> <p>Thou shalt not commit adultery.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">VIII</p> <p>Thou shalt not steal.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">IX</p> <p>Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p>Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbour's.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">IV</p> <p>Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Remember to keep the Lord's day holy.</p> <p>[Latter form from, "Remember ... to keep ... holy ... the ... day ... of the Lord," cf. "Lord's day" in application to Sunday, Ps. 118:22-24 in John 12:13 ("Hosanna" = "Save now," on Palm Sunday, John 12:1,12; Luke 19:38 // Ps. 118:26 in Luke 19:28-48 Evensong Lesson of 1662 BCP;) & Acts 4:10,11; Rev. 1:10]</p> <p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <p>Honour thy father and mother.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">VI</p> <p>Thou shalt not kill.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">VII</p> <p>Thou shalt not commit adultery.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">VIII</p> <p>Thou shalt not steal.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">IX</p> <p>Thou shalt not bear false witness.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p>Thou shalt not covet.</p>
--	--

Since the Fall of man (Gen. 3), due to our fallen sinful nature (Ps. 51:5), no man, the sinless (II Cor. 5:21; I Peter 1:19) Christ except (Heb. 4:15), has ever been able to perfectly keep the Ten Commandments (Rom. 7:7-25). But they are nevertheless used to isolate sin for the purposes of repentance in the context of salvation (Luke 18:18-27; Acts 3:19; I Tim. 1:8-10), and also for the purposes of sanctification or holiness of living in the justified believer's life (Rom. 7:7). Anglican, Lutheran, and Presbyterian Protestants have historically believed in the Establishment Principle (Ps. 2:10-12; Isa. 49:22,23), i.e., a specifically Protestant Christian State, and considered that under this the Decalogue also has a function as a broad legal basis upon which the legal system should be based (Rom. 13:1-9) (e.g., Sir William Blackstone's *Laws of England & Articles 7 & 37 of the Anglican 39 Articles*).

** 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. 3 (Matt. 21- 25) 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>		
21	1-11,15-17 Partial: 18-24, 28-32, 43 33-42	63a-63b 64a-64b 36a-36b	22	2-14 ("Mark" <i>sic</i>): 15-22 35-46	37a-37b 36a 38a-38b
22& 24	22:15-33 (text broken at 23-24) & 24:1-2	66a-67a	23	1-12	36b-37a
24	1-13 3-35 34-37,42-44 42-47	37b-38a 65a 38b 100b-101a	24-26	24:36-26:2	67a-69b
25	1-13 14-29 + Lectionary bridge words + words from either Matt. 11:15 / 13:9 / 13:43 ("Luke" <i>sic</i>): 31-46 32-39	39b-40a 38b-39b 55a-55b 32a			

GREEK LECTIONARY 1968
(1544 A.D., Sidneiensiis 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>
21	1-11,15-17 18-43 28-32 33-42	22	2-14 15-22 35-46
	137a-138a 141a-143a 325a 63b-64b		66a-67a 62b-63a 69a-69b
22-23	22:15-48; 23:1-39	23	1-12 29-39
	145a-149a		64b-65b 218a-219a
24	1-13 3-35 34-44 42-47	24-26	24:36-26:2
	67b-68b 143a-144b 70a-70b 237a-237b		149a-153a
25	1-13 14-30 + Lectionary bridge words + words from either Matt. 11:15 / 13:9 / 13:43 31-46 32-39		73(1)a-73(2)a 71b-72b 116a-117a 53b-54a

Scripture Citations of Bishop Gregory the Great in Matt. 21-25.

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). Thus e.g., “The Preface” in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) continues this type of tradition in referring to Anglicans in the Kingdom of England, which comprised of both England and her dominions such as Wales, as the “Sons of the *Church of England*.”

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 its 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 cf. John 13:26,27; 17:12). 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 in these textual commentaries 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. 22:7	76:1282
Matt. 22:10b	76:1282
Matt. 22:13b	76:334,885,1282; 79:117,416
Matt. 22:30b	76:958; 79:76,1419
Matt. 23:3a	76:570,593
Matt. 23:3b	76:570,593; 79:118,224,417
Matt. 23:5a	75:1083
Matt. 23:5b	75:1083
Matt. 23:23b	76:1050
Matt. 23:23c	76:1050
Matt. 23:38	79:153
Matt. 24:27	76:802; 79:1167
Matt. 24:28	76:416,479; 79:1243
Matt. 24:31	79:674
Matt. 24:48a	76:54; 77:37
Matt. 24:48b	76:54; 77:37
Matt. 24:49a	77:37
Matt. 24:49b	77:37
Matt. 25:1c	76:1118
Matt. 25:2	76:1118
Matt. 25:3a	76:1118
Matt. 25:4a	76:1118
Matt. 25:6a	76:1118
Matt. 25:6b	76:1118
Matt. 25:13	76:1118
Matt. 25:16a	76:1105
Matt. 25:16c	76:1105
Matt. 25:16d	76:1105
Matt. 25:17a	76:1105
Matt. 25:17b	76:1105
Matt. 25:20	76:1105
Matt. 25:21	76:1105
Matt. 25:22b	76:1105
Matt. 25:22c	76:1105,1106
Matt. 25:31	79:1170

***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 often not used, 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 4: *Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E*. In Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25), all of the TR's readings have been found to be in the A to C range. Therefore the *Textus Receptus* of the King James Version (1611) requires no changes in Matt. 21-25. 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.

****“I’m an Evangelical – I hope you are too!”***

The Evangelical movement started in the 18th and 19th centuries. It was and is an inter-denominational movement amongst religiously conservative Protestants seeking to get back to, and maintain, the central truths of the Reformation. It sought in the first instance to safeguard the broad-Protestant truths of the Reformation, and in the second instance, had and still has, a particular emphasis or focus on the Gospel message and hence the name “Evangelical,” from the Greek word for “gospel” which is “*evangelion*.” I.e., there is an emphasis and continuing return in Evangelical churches from the pulpit and elsewhere to the basic gospel fact that man is lost in his sins (Rom. 3:23) as most clearly seen in his violations of the Ten Commandments (Rom. 7:7; 13:9; cf. Exod. 20:1-17), and so cut off from God. But God the Father sent God the Son into the world (John 3:16), to die in our place and for our sins (Rom. 5:8; 6:23). Thus we must repent of our sins and turn to Christ in saving faith as our Saviour and Lord, who rose again from the dead (Rom. 10:4-13), is now interceding for us at God’s right hand (Heb. 7:25; 8:1), as man’s only mediator (I Tim. 2:5; Heb. 12:24) and Saviour from sin; and is returning at the Second Advent (Matt. 24 & 25). And our authority for saying this is the Bible (II Tim. 3:16), which on this issue and more generally Evangelicals strongly encourage the reading and study of among believers (Acts 17:11; II Tim. 2:15).

Only if one understands this Evangelical or Gospel focus, can one understand the Evangelical heart, soul, and mind. We Low Church Evangelical Anglicans do not have a more simple liturgical service simply because it somehow appeals to our senses on the basis of some “fleshly wisdom” (II Cor. 1:12), but because we put the focus on the Gospel, in a Bible centered and Gospel centered service; which is thus fundamentally different to a Puseyite or semi-Puseyite service which is often described as “a Eucharistic centered service.” The same is true more generally of Evangelicals, even though in the broad sweep, the Evangelical Lutheran and Evangelical Anglican usage of liturgy is greater than one finds in Evangelical Puritan derived Churches, these issues touching upon historic denominational differences among religiously conservative Protestants.

Likewise, it is because of this Evangelical or Gospel focus that we are not “ecumenical” towards e.g., Roman Catholics or Eastern Orthodox. That is because, for instance, the Roman Catholics do not proclaim repentance from such sin as “idolatry,” with respect to e.g., their Mariolatry (Gal. 5:19-21); and nor do they proclaim the central gospel message of “grace” (Gal. 1:6; 5:4) that “no man is justified by the law in the sight of God,” “for, The just shall live by faith” (Gal. 3:11) in Christ, who by his atoning sacrifice “hath redeemed us” (Gal. 3:13); for he “gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us” (Gal. 1:4), before he was “raised” “from the dead” (Gal. 1:1) on the third day. In teaching the deadly sin of “idolatry” (Gal. 5:19-21) and works’ righteousness (Gal. 2:16; 3:11), the Roman Church thus strikes down the gospel, and renders it ineffective in their midst. Thus our opposition to, e.g., Popery, stems not, as it is sometimes alleged, from “a narrow minded bigotry,” but rather, from a broad-minded recognition of the central importance of this Evangelical or Gospel focus.

So likewise, this Evangelical or Gospel focus has always produced a spin-off

focus on evangelism, both of those inside the church who though attending church, still need to understand and accept this Gospel message, and also those outside the church. Hence the Evangelical Movement gave birth to the *Great Protestant Missionary Movement* of the later 18th and early 19th centuries, which is still ongoing. But our missionary work is not like that of e.g., the Roman Catholics historic work in South America, or that of the Mormon Church (one of the four major cults of our day¹), which simply looks to increase its numbers; for that, to be sure, is “putting the cart before the horse.” Rather, Evangelical evangelism puts the focus on the Gospel, and a person understanding and by God’s grace responding to that Gospel message, and so “the horse is put before the cart;” for our evangelism is *an outgrowth of* our Evangelical or Gospel focus.

And so too, it is this Evangelical or Gospel focus that leads us to uphold the absolute authority of the Divinely Inspired (II Tim. 3:16) and Divinely Preserved (I Peter 1:25), Word of God. Hence e.g., the Latin Motto of the Lutheran Reformation was that of I Peter 1:25, “*Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum!*” “The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever”!

Thus it is because of our belief in the authority of Scripture and need to repent of sin, that we do not condone such sins as that prohibited by the Tenth Commandment, “Thou shalt not covet” (Exod. 20:17), for St. Paul says, “What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt no covet” (Rom. 7:7). And so, e.g., we oppose such lusts as those of the sex role perverts, commonly called feminists, with, for instance, the lust of certain women to become Ministers in churches, contrary to the teaching of Biblical patriarchy (I Tim. 2:8-3:12); or those seeking to condone pornography or other sexual sins, such as fornication, adultery, or sodomy (I Cor. 6:9,10). *These morals are outgrowths* of our Evangelical or Gospel focus, for “we put the horse” of the gospel, “before the cart” of the consequences, which flow from it.

But a sad thing has happened among professedly Evangelical Churches. For in the same way that the Evangelical Movement arose among Protestants Churches as an inter-denominational Protestant movement as it was needed to bring so many Protestants back to the Reformation focus on the gospel as evident in, for example, Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer, because that was lost; so too, many professedly Evangelical Churches have now lost sight of that Evangelical or Gospel focus, and have “rusted into position” as so called “Evangelical Churches.” This has had many bad outgrowths, not the least of which is the embrace by many professed Evangelicals of the “ecumenical” compromise, a sad commentary on the fact that they DO NOT have this Evangelical or Gospel focus, since if they did, they could not, e.g., condone “another gospel” (Gal. 1:6) such as that of Popery, for this Evangelical or Gospel focus means we teach and proclaim, “that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ” (Gal. 2:16), and that it is “Christ” who “hath redeemed us” (Gal. 3:13), not as the Papists falsely allege, merely “co-redeemed” us, in their blasphemous claim that “Mary” is “co-redeemer.”

¹ See Anthony Hoekema’s *The Four Major Cults*, Eerdmans, Michigan, 1963.

And so in looking for a church to attend, an Evangelical believer must now start with those churches that profess or call themselves “religiously conservative Protestant” or “Evangelical” Churches. But amongst such churches that be in various Protestant traditions, e.g., (Low Church Evangelical) Anglicans, Presbyterians, and Baptists, one finds that the *prima facie* Evangelical Church “field” is a mix of “wheat” and “tares” (Matt. 13:24-30; 36-43). And so while looking to professedly “Evangelical” or professedly “religiously conservative Protestant” Churches, *is a starting point, this should not be one’s finishing point*, since one must test out these claims, and one will sometimes find these claims to be false, and sometimes to be true. Thus the good Christian must humbly submit himself to God’s good guidance and direction. But in looking around for the better churches, be warned, good Christian reader, that only Christ and the Bible are perfect, no church is ever perfect; and (though I do NOT like having to say this,) in some geographical areas, *providing by God’ grace one’s faith is strong enough to withstand the PAINFUL rigors of it*, one might simply have to look around for “the best of a bad lot” of churches (in some professions, such as the army, one might not have a choice, but be simply posted to an area for a certain time period; but for those who can choose - WARNING: a mistake people sometimes make when moving to a new area, is not to FIRST find out if there are any broadly sound Protestant Churches they can access from there). I.e., in the same way in a world of sin we must by God’s grace, learn how to get the best out of a bad situation as we “choose the good” and “refuse the evil” (Isa. 7:15); so likewise in church settings, we may have to by God’s grace, learn how to get the best out of a bad situation as we “choose the good” and “refuse the evil” (Isa. 7:16). But in doing so, the good Christian should also remember this, “your adversary the Devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour” (II Peter 5:8).

But in all our “journeyings” and “perils” (II Cor. 11:26), let us never forget the central truths of the Reformation, summarized in the Latin Motto of the Reformation: “*sola fide, sola gratia, sola Scriptura*” (Latin, “faith alone, grace alone, Scripture alone”). Let us ever be mindful that while there are secondary issues that Evangelicals may divide upon, that as religiously conservative Protestants, as Evangelicals, by the grace of God, we uphold and maintain an Evangelical or Gospel focus. But in these days of so much sad apostasy in so many Protestant Churches, let us also be mindful that those of the Jewish race “were broken off” for their apostasy, that we of the Gentile race “might be grafted in.” It was “because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear: for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee” (Rom. 11:19-21). “For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith” (Rom. 1:16,17).

Perseverance Pays.

We live in an age where all too many people lack perseverance. They quit all too easily on a whole lot of things. E.g., this is why divorce rates are so high. They lack

stamina. They just want to have their fleshly lusts pandered to. Biblical teachings, for instance, in favour of “temperance” and against “lust” (Rom. 7:7; citing Exod. 20:17) e.g., “drunkenness” (Gal. 5:21,23) or gluttony (Prov. 23:21), are certainly not popular. Yet with specific reference to our faith, we should, by the grace of God, most especially show “perseverance” (Eph. 6:18).

Back in my earlier College days (1978 to early 1980)², I remember how we students studying Greek had some mixed feelings about the subject. On the up side, we all agreed that it was a worthwhile endeavor to better understand the Bible, and it was great to learn how various Greek words connect into the etymological origins of certain English words. E.g., I recall how *topos* meaning “place” and *grapho* meaning “I write,” connects into “topography,” which refers to a form of *writing* on a map about a certain *place* i.e., mapping. But on the down side, we generally all found the greater work required for the Greek subject *hard going* relative to the lesser work required for any other subject. To make things “worse,” there was also a weekly or fortnightly Greek exam that used to be held in Dr. Young’s Greek classes (it was actually good for us, as it made sure we did not get too far behind), and this was worth a final percentage of the overall grade (although the final grade was primarily assessed by annual examination).

In 1979 a Billy Graham Crusade was held in Sydney, and I went and saw Billy Graham. I later came to share the type of concerns voiced about the Billy Graham Crusades by the Evangelical, Martyn Lloyd-Jones (1899-1981), who said in 1971 that he saw a “danger” “to” “Evangelical Christians,” in a “false, vague, nebulous, ecumenical type of thinking;” such as that found in “the Billy Graham campaigns.” Thus I now agree with Martyn Lloyd-Jones that the type of thing Billy Graham does with the giving of converts to e.g., Roman Catholics and other non-Evangelicals, means “the Graham” “campaigns have had” the bad “influence” of “shaking people’s convictions as to what “it means to be Evangelical³.” Hence I support and endorse the stand of Martin Lloyd-Jones who refused to appear on the platform with Graham in his 1954 Harringay Crusade in London because of the Billy Graham Campaign’s association with non-Evangelical Churches.

But back in 1979 my theology was not as well developed as it later came to be; and when I was a young man in my late teens and early twenties, I was simply not aware of these types of issues with respect to the Billy Graham Crusades⁴. Thus in 1979 when

² See Commentary Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), “Background Story to Commentary,” section on myself at “15-20 years old.”

³ Lloyd-Jones, D.M., *Knowing The Times*, Addresses Delivered on Various Occasions 1942-1977, Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, & Pennsylvania, USA, 1989, chapter 16, “What is an Evangelical?,” pp. 299-355, at p. 310.

⁴ I did not know a lot about Billy Graham at the time, even though as a boy, my mother had taken me to the 1968 Billy Graham Crusade in Sydney, from which I kept as a memento the *Billy Graham Crusade Songs* Booklet, compiled by Cliff Barrows (Published for the Billy Graham Crusade Committees, by Chancel Publishing, Sydney,

the Billy Graham Crusade was held in Sydney, myself and a number of other College students went to see Billy Graham on some of the Crusades' nights. I only went on one of the nights; though others I knew went on multiple nights. I remember how a story from this Billy Graham Crusade circulated around College. On one occasion, Billy Graham made a comment referring to his old College days. He said something like, "I still sometimes wake up at night in a cold sweat, thinking I've got a Greek exam in the morning." In a very definite empathy, this statement circulated amongst a number of us Greek students at College, since it was something whose sentiment we could identify with, even if neither I nor anyone I knew of at College, ever went so far as to *literally* wake up in a cold sweat over a Greek exam.

But without perseverance in difficult matters, there can never be any success. God calls us to do various things and by his grace he enables us. But we must be willing to "enter ... in at the strait gate Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it" (Matt. 7:13,14).

Book of the Chronicles of Neo-Byzantine Defence of the Received Text

Reference is sometimes made in these commentaries to various "sword fights" or "battles" (e.g., Matt. 8:13 in Vol. 1, Appendix 3). E.g., "the *Book of the Chronicles of Neo-Byzantine Defence of the Received Text*" (e.g., Matt. 21:7c or Matt. 22:13b). Of course, such references, including the existence of any such "book" or "chronicles" are written in an allegorical or metaphoric literary *genre*.

Antisupernaturalist "objections" to e.g., Divine Preservation, not "modern."

While the neo-Alexandrian anti-supernaturalists do not accept the neo-Byzantine supernaturalist preservation of the Biblical text paradigm, since it is "a religious belief" (as if that somehow intrinsically made it "wrong" or "contrary to reason"), the reality is that both neo-Alexandrians and neo-Byzantine operate their respective NT textual schools on religious beliefs. *The neo-Byzantines operate on the religious belief that God preserved the New Testament Received Text in a closed class of Greek and Latin sources; whereas the neo-Alexandrians operate on the religious belief that God did not preserve the New Testament Received Text in such a closed class of Greek and Latin sources.* Thus the Neo-Byzantine School has a religious belief that God did preserve the text; whereas the Neo-Alexandrian School has a religious belief that God did not preserve the text. But BOTH ARE RELIGIOUS BELIEFS about how God has or has not acted.

Australia, 1968). But upon further study, I later came to form the opinion that the man was a religious apostate, who e.g., gave converts from his Crusades to Roman Catholic churches and religiously liberal apostate Protestant churches. See my comments on Billy Graham in my work, *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist* (2006, 2nd edition 2010), With a Foreword by the Reverend Sam McKay, Secretary of the Protestant Truth Society (1996-2004) (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>), at "Prefatory Remarks and Principles," "The Dedication," section, "General Religious Views."

We live in an age in which religious liberals like to thing of their anti-supernaturalist “objections” as some kind of “modern” thinking. We have “oppositions of science falsely so called” (I Tim. 6:20). Their attack on Divine Inspiration and Divine Preservation of Scripture are just two examples of this, but they are more widely opposed to Biblical truths. E.g., some deny the virgin birth of Christ (contrary to Article 3, *Apostles’ Creed*), or bodily resurrection of Christ (contrary to Articles 4 & 5, *Apostles’ Creed*), or Second Coming of Christ (contrary to Article 8, *Apostles’ Creed*). Some think they are “very modern indeed,” since they deny the very existence of God, being far gone in atheism (contrary to Articles, 1, 2, & 9 of the *Apostles’ Creed*).

Such persons are ignorant and incorrect. The so called “modernists” are not really as “modern” as they think. In fact, they propagate some very old errors indeed. In OT times we are twice told of atheists, “The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God” (Pss. 14:1; 53:1). In the NT, Pharisees and Sadducees divided over such issues, “For the” anti-supernaturalist “Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit: but the” supernaturalist believing “Pharisees confess both” (Acts 23:8). Moreover, the resurrection of Christ was objected to on the anti-supernaturalist basis that no-one could really rise from the dead (Matt. 28:13-15; Acts 17:31,32; I Cor. 1:23).

For example, when the Apostle Paul spoke of the fact “that Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead,” the Procurator of Judea, Porcius Festus, burst out “with a loud voice, Paul thou art ... mad” (Acts 26:23,24). Also listening at the time, Herod Agrippa II (son of Herod Agrippa I, Acts 12:1; and great-grandson of Herod the Great, Matt. 2:1), went so far as to say “unto Paul, Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian” (Acts 26:28).

Let us not be like Agrippa who could only say, “*Almost* thou persuadest me to be a Christian” (Acts 26:28). Let us make the full commitment. That includes the profession of faith, “I believe in the Holy Ghost” (Article 9, *Apostles’ Creed*), and with it, both a belief in the Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture (II Tim. 3:16), and the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture (I Peter 1:25).

For as our Lord himself said to the anti-supernaturalist “Sadducees” (Matt. 22:23) in Matt. 22:29,31b, “Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.” “Have ye not read *that which was spoken unto you by God,*” and he then quotes the Pentateuch (Matt. 22:32; quoting Exod. 3:6). Christ says that the words of Moses were “spoken unto you” some one and a half millennia after they were written. Why? Because in the first place Scripture is given to us for *all times*, not just when the specific words were written; and in the second place our Lord here clearly requires a belief that this Divine revelation had been Divinely preserved, else how could the Sadducees or anyone else know it to be the Word of God some one and a half millennia after it was written by God’s pen man?

Sydney University Lectionaries.

It is clear from Matt. 1-25 that in broad terms both Lectionaries 2378 and 1968 fit the general picture of Greek Lectionaries following the representative Byzantine Greek Text. Nevertheless, the issue of a textual apparatus in a Lectionary occurs with a reading from Lectionary 2378 showing variant spellings at Matt. 25:19b (see Appendix 3, footnote); and with Lectionary 1968 showing variant readings at Matt. 26:15 (see Appendix 3).

In Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20) I refer to the presence of a textual apparatus in Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.) at Matt. 19:21c, in which two readings are given⁵. This exciting work continues in Volume 3, with regard to the textual apparatus of Lectionary 1968 at Matt. 21:2a, discussed in Appendix 3.

Furthermore, I also state in Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20) that, "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 tradition⁶." Here in Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) we have some further evidence of this type of thing. E.g., at Matt. 25:3 the Received Text and majority Byzantine text reads, "*oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples)," whereas a known minority Byzantine reading, "*oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples) *autou* (of him)" is found in e.g., Codices U 030, Gamma 036, and old Latin Versions h and c. But this variant has also appeared in Lectionary 2378 (p. 38a). (Cf. my Matt. 25:22c, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," "The Second Matter.")

Once again, these facts highlight the desirability of getting *more work on the c. 2,000 uncollated Greek Byzantine Lectionaries done!*

THE MYSTERY OF THE MISSING TEXT. I find that I can undertake most of my work on these two Sydney University Lectionaries from photocopies of microfilm forms I have. But sometimes I must consult the originals at Sydney University. For example, at pp. 66a-67a of Byzantine Lectionary 2378, in my photocopies the reading of Matt. 22:15-44; 24:1-2 is interrupted at Matt. 22:23 by a paper space of about 2 lines. Is this e.g., a paper fade of the original? I.e., is Matt. 22:23 like at pp. 15-16, where p. 15a is followed by p. 16b, so that we know a page is missing, and so we can say that the manuscript has likewise suffered at Matt. 22:23 in transmission history, albeit in this instance, with a paper fade? Or e.g., is this a replication by the scribe of an underpinning problem in the manuscript he was copying from? I.e., is Matt. 22:23 like at pp. 9a-9b where there is a break after John 4:54 midway in a word, and resumption at John 15:19b after some selections, indicating probable damage in the scribe's underpinning

⁵ Textual Commentary Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, "Byzantine Text Bonus for Commentary: Two Sydney University Greek Lectionaries!" section "D) Some general matters with respect to the two Sydney University Lectionaries," referring to Matt. 19:21c in Appendix 3 of Volume 2.

⁶ Textual Commentary Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, "*Determining the representative Byzantine Text."

manuscript?

Upon consulting the original in the Rare Books section of Fisher Library at Sydney University⁷, I was able to detect enough of these two lines to see that this was a fade in – fade out paper fade of Matt. 22:23. Thus supplying reconstructed letters not readable in square brackets, and the AV’s translation in circular brackets, the Lectionary which starts with the “OI” in red ink, thereafter followed by the rest of the reading in brown ink, is something like: “**OI** (*oi* = ‘which’) [λεγ]οντες (*legontes* = ‘say’) [MH] (*me* = ‘no’) ει[ΝΑΙ]⁸ (*einai* = ‘[that] there is’) ΑΝ[Α]σ[τ]ασις⁹ (*anastasin* = ‘resurrection’) και (*kai* = ‘and’) Ε[π]ηρ” with a “τ” in the air¹⁰, this is an abbreviation, possibly with some other letters lost in this fade in - fade out section, for “Ε[π]ηρωτησαν (*eperotesan* = ‘asked’),” in the wider words of Matt. 22:23, “The same day came to him the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection, and asked him” etc. . There is then a resumption of a more visible text which corruptly reads at the end of verse 23, “αυτo (auto = ‘him,’ masculine singular dative, personal pronoun from *autos-e-o*)¹¹” for “*auton* (‘him,’ masculine singular accusative, personal pronoun from *autos-e-o*),” and after verse 24’s “*legontes* (saying),” it is also a broken text which omits with no missing paper space, “*Didaskale* (Master), *Moses* (Moses) *eipen* (said);” before resuming with the rest of verse 24.

Thus much of the mystery has been solved by consultation of the original. However, the question of exactly what is missing from the “Ε[π]ηρωτησαν (*eperotesan* = ‘asked’)” abbreviation of verse 23 remains. In our scientific age it might be possible to determine the fuller extent of what has happened at Matt. 22:23 with the right equipment and permission from the university. I.e., scientific equipment might be able tell us of the exact nature of what was lost in the paper fade of “*eperotesan* (asked).” But since this type of scientific equipment is not accessible to me, this fuller element of the matter must remain, at least for the foreseeable future, a mystery to us.

Codex Alexandrinus’s Byzantine Text Gospels:

“The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church.”

⁷ Call Number RB Add. Ms. No 40.

⁸ About the first half of the “N” is visible, and about half of it is a reconstruction.

⁹ Only the top bar of the “τ” (tau) is missing, which thus looks like an “ι” (iota); and the “α” four letters from the ends looks more like a sloping backwards English “d.”

¹⁰ About the first half of the “π” (pi) is visible, and about half of it is a reconstruction.

¹¹ As seen by this “αυτo,” Lectionary 2378 uses a closed top omega that looks something like a sideways “8” i.e., “∞”, rather than the open topped omega, “ω” of standard seminary Greek. There are also a number of other differences between the letters of this Lectionary’s continuous script and the letters of standard seminary Greek.

Good Christian reader, we have previously said, “Bonjour” (French, “Hi” / “Goodbye [Australian colloquialism = ‘Good day’],”) to e.g., a special Latin treat with citations from the church doctor, St. Gregory; and a special Greek treat with the two Sydney University Lectionaries¹².

But now, good Christian reader, in this Volume 3, I introduce another very special Greek treat. For starting in this volume, from Matt. 25:6b, we now say, “Bonjour” to *Codex Alexandrinus*. This special Greek treat sees the start of Gospel citations from *Codex Alexandrinus*. Codex A 02 (*Codex Alexandrinus*, 5th century) is missing a number of folios but is Byzantine text in its incomplete Gospels which cover St. Matthew 25:6-28:20, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25. I thank God that I have been privileged to see the original of this manuscript in a glass cabinet at the British Library in London, UK, on a number of occasions. My working photocopy of a facsimile of *Codex Alexandrinus* comes from Flinders University in Adelaide, South Australia (*Facsimile of the Codex Alexandrinus*, With an Introduction by E. Maunde Thompson, British Museum [now British Library], London, UK, 1879).

Codex Alexandrinus is significant for, among other things, the fact that it reminds us that while Alexandria had an unorthodox school of scribes who gave rise to the prunist Alexandrian Text, this ancient city of North Africa also had a broadly orthodox school of scribes who maintained the general textual traditions of the Byzantine Text. In 1628, the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople, Cyril Lucar, presented *Codex Alexandrinus* to His Majesty, King Charles I. Cyril Lucar had converted to Protestantism, and was given comfort and succour in his embrace of the truthfulness of Protestantism from the *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland*, King Charles the First, in his ultimately unsuccessful attempt to sow the seeds of the Protestant Reformation in the Greek Orthodox Church¹³. Sadly the Eastern Orthodox equivalent to the Roman Catholic *Council of Trent* (1545-63), to wit, the *Synod of Jerusalem* (1672), specifically rejected the Reformation and thus the Protestant teachings of Cyril Lucar.

Both Cyril Lucar and Charles I would ultimately die as Protestant Christian martyrs, Cyril Lucar being martyred in 1638, and King Charles the Martyr being martyred in 1649. This manuscript thus comes to us through the hands of two holy martyrs of the Christian faith. The ancient church Latin writer, Tertullian (d. after 220), coined the now well known saying, “The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church” (Apologeticus, chapter 50). I pray God that the blood of these two noble martyrs,

¹² See Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, “Byzantine Text Bonus for Commentary: Two Sydney University Greek Lectionaries!,” “* C) ‘Bonjour’ to the Two Greek Lectionaries kept at Sydney University;” cf. “Scripture Citations of Bishop Gregory the Great in Matt. 15-20.”

¹³ See Textual Commentary Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” “2) The Monastic legacy.”

through whose hands passed this *Codex Alexandrinus*, may not be spilt in vain; but that among other things, God might bless to the hearts and minds of all good Christian readers, the wonderful treasures that this manuscript has in its Byzantine text Gospels.

Citations of the Writings of Caesarius.

The textual apparatus of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) sometimes refers to "Caes" meaning, "Caesario Nazianzeno" i.e., Caesarius Nazianzus (d. 368/9), brother of Gregory Nazianzus (d. 390), as found in Migne (Greek) Volume 38:851-1190. So too my copy of the *United Bible Societies'* 3rd edition (1975) which I have kept in near pristine condition as a memento from my College days, being at the time a standard gift in Australia from UBS to all students studying NT Greek; like the subsequent UBS 3rd corrected (1983) edition which I later purchased and then threw out my old working copy of UBS 3rd edition (that I had purchased while at College so as not to spoil my gift copy,) both show "Caesarius-Nazianzus" of "369" in their section on church writers.

But it is now generally considered that this identification is incorrect due to the work's content¹⁴. The better view seems to be that the name "Caesarius" "was not an uncommon one," and so these Greek writings in Migne "*may be safely ascribed to some Caesarius,*" but not Caesarius of Nazianzus as "attributed" by e.g., Tischendorf & UBS 3rd & 3rd corrected editions, since he died in "368 or 369" and "the book refers to Maximus, who lived subsequently¹⁵."

Therefore, in these commentaries I shall refer to "the ancient church Greek writer, Caesarius (5th century)," at for instance, Matt. 24:18 and Matt. 24:40. However I am prepared to revise this designation, or any relevant particulars of it, if I receive any better information on these Greek writings.

What ever happened to von Soden's papers?

Hodges & Farstad refer to "approximately 5,000 complete or partial manuscripts¹⁶." On the one hand, I would agree with that as a *rounded approximate* number. But on the other hand, the placement of this statistic at the beginning of their "Introduction" requires qualifications, such as the fact that many of these manuscripts are

¹⁴ "Caesarius of Nazianzus," (April 2010) *Wikipedia* (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Caesarius_of_Nazianzus); & "St. Caesarius of Nazianzus," [*Roman*] *Catholic Encyclopedia* of 1913 (<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/03138a.htm>).

¹⁵ Caesarius of Nazianus, in *Dictionary of Christian Biography* (http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Dictionary_of_Christian_Biography_and_Literature_to_the_Sixth_Century/Dictionary/C/Caesarius_of_Nazianzus).

¹⁶ Hodges & Farstad (1985), p. ix.

very fragmentary, and most only contain selected portions of the Greek New Testament. Moreover, in their majority text of 1985, Hodges & Farstad only use about 1,500 of these manuscripts (from von Soden's I & K groups), and Robinson & Pierpont's majority Text of 2005 uses about 1,000 of them (from von Soden's K group). Certainly this is more than enough to constitute a reasonable sample from which one can fairly base a majority text, which in practice will be a majority Byzantine text; although neither Hodges and Farstad nor Robinson & Pierpont plainly make these kind of statements, even though they evidently believe them. Of course, in addition to *c.* 2500 manuscripts looked at by von Soden with the help of his *c.* 40 research assistance over *c.* 15 years, which encompasses basically all the Codices and Minuscules; it needs to further be plainly said that there are also about another *c.* 2,300 to 2,400 Lectionaries, of which only 100 to 200 have ever been looked at in greater detail.

The financial and organization difficulties of replicating von Soden's work with his *c.* 40 research assistance over *c.* 15 years, looking at basically all the Greek Codices and Minuscules i.e., *c.* 2500 Greek manuscripts, means that at least to date his work has never been repeated; and similar issues of financial and organization difficulties also exist for any detailed collation work on the *c.* 2,300 to 2,400 Lectionaries. But this leads me to raise a question with regard to von Soden's work, to wit, *What ever happened to von Soden's papers?* That is because if his raw data could be retrieved, something *even better* than von Soden's *very useful* textual apparatus could surely emerge from it.

In the "Preliminary Textual Discussion," at "The First Matter" of Matt. 24:49b with regard to the manuscript strength of *Variant 1*, I say, "von Soden's generalist group figures mean that an unlisted variant like this might e.g., have *c.* 10% support, or *c.* 5% support, or less than 1% support. We simply do not know. But we do know that it is a minority reading with less than *c.* 10% support."

It is issues such as this that have sometimes led me to ponder, "What ever happened to von Soden's papers?" If we could locate this data he says in *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (1913) was sent to him by some 40 research assistants over some 15 years, with the generous funding of his wealthy patroness, the lady, Elise King; then we could no doubt use it to compile a much better textual apparatus than von Soden did.

So "What ever happened to von Soden's papers?" Were they all thrown into a rubbish bin after he died in 1914? Were they placed in an archive and destroyed during World War Two Allied military bombings of Germany? Or are they still in some archive in Germany, waiting to have their data rediscovered and reused in a new and improved textual apparatus?

Greek & Latin: Contrast & Comparison.

The white Caucasian or Aryan peoples descended from Noah's son, Japheth (Gen. 10:1-5), were given languages in both the Aryan or Japhetic Linguistic family and the Caucasian Linguistic Family. Due to the sad lack of chastity morals of certain Iranian tribes, for which sin in antediluvian times "the Lord said, My Spirit shall not always

strive with man” (Gen. 6:3); we find that contrary to God’s law (Gen. 6:1-3,9; Ezra 9 & 10; Dan. 2:43,44; Matt. 24:37-39), these West Asians engaged in miscegenation with certain Central Asian Dravidian speaking Australoid descendants of Shem’s son, Elam (Gen. 10:22), so that an admixed Dravidian-Caucasian group was formed in northern India which has retained the Aryan tongue of Sanskrit. So too, various sadly admixed Aryan groups in southern Europe retain the Aryan tongue, though they bear in their mixed race frame the evidence of the dirty sin of miscegenation¹⁷. Like “Esau” “who “afterward” “found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears” (Heb. 12:16,17); such mixed race persons find that “they cannot wash the tar brush from themselves,” so that even if inwardly their souls are washed clean and saved, yet outwardly they must still continue to bear the horrible legacy of this sin in their very frame (cf. Deut. 23:2-8). God does not remove the effects of such racial sin from saved persons, just like he does not remove the effects of such former sins as the “worldly lusts” (Titus 2:12) of e.g., tattoo “prints” (Lev. 19:28), brains damaged by illegal drugs, ears partially deafened by loud Big Beat Popular music, or herpes contracted from fornication. *Oh the ugliness of sin!*

The great Japhetic tongues of Greek and Latin are the classic languages of learning; and were greatly honoured by the Holy Ghost who selected them for the Divine Preservation of the New Testament *Received Text*. We thank the Lord, who is the Spirit (II Cor. 3:17 & *Nicene Creed*), for his inspiration (II Tim. 3:16) of the New Testament Oracles in the Greek tongue, and his preservation (I Peter 1:25) of the New Testament Oracles in the Greek and Latin tongues. Their grammatical similarity means that the Latin is an excellent choice for preserving the Greek. But amidst the similarity, one ought not to forget the diversity of these two great Aryan tongues of Greek and Latin.

Continuing issues found before Volume 3 (see Volume 2, at Matt. 17:2, “The Fourth Matter”), the reader will note some interesting contrasts and comparisons between the Greek and Latin in this volume. See Volume 3, “Preliminary Textual Discussion,” at Matt. 21:30b, “The Second Matter;” Matt. 21:38, “The Second Matter - Latin;” Matt. 22:40; Matt. 22:37a, “The Second Matter: Latin;” and Matt. 23:23b, “The First Matter: A comparison and contrast of the Greek and Latin grammar.”

I also remind the reader of the importance to be placed on distinguishing between the Western Greek of D 05 (outside the closed class of sources), and old Latin d (inside the closed class of sources), both of which may be found in the same Greek-Latin diglot, *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis*. See Textual Commentary at Matt. 23:21, “Preliminary Textual Discussion,” “The Second Matter: Greek and Latin in D 05 & old Latin d.”

The Latin Vulgate and the Authorized Version: Quotations format.

At e.g., Matt. 23:23b I say of the Received text’s reading that, “It also has strong support as the majority Latin reading, where it dates from ancient times in St. Jerome’s

¹⁷ Cf. McGrath, G.B. (myself), “Sons of God,” *British Church Newspaper*, 12 Feb. 2010, p. 9.

Vulgate” etc . . . Though referring to the Vulgate as a document from “ancient times” is undoubtedly correct, it should also be understood that the Latin Vulgate Codices used in Wordsworth & White’s *Novum Testamentum Latine* (1911)¹⁸ date from the 6th to 9th / 10th centuries; and those for the NT of Weber & Gryson’s *Biblia Sacra Vulgata* (2007) date from the 6th to 14th centuries (OT from 5th century to 10th centuries)¹⁹. (The Vulgate Codices of Merk’s *Novum Testamentum* (1964) revision of the Clementine Vulgate date from the 6th to 13th centuries²⁰.)

While the Vulgate of preference I use for the NT is Wordsworth & White’s (1911) edition of St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate; I also sometimes consult Weber-Gryson’s (2007) fifth edition of St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate which contains a textual apparatus of some value. The Latin of St. Jerome’s Vulgate is generally straightforward. If one can put something into Latin in a relatively simple and direct way, St. Jerome generally did so, and hence the name “Vulgate,” i.e., the “vulgar” or common type of Latin which was understandably “popular” historically among Latin readers. The reality is that for most of church history, Latin has always been something other than a person’s mother tongue, i.e., a second or third or fourth language etc., and so St. Jerome’s translation principles of using a “Keep It Simple Sonny-Jim” or “KISS” Latin, historically underpinned the Vulgate’s wide acclaim among Latin readers. By contrast, manuscripts like old Latin *d* appear to have been written by Latin scribes looking to a more “advanced” Latin reader, and so while extremely valuable and useful in its own right, it has never had the same popular appeal of the Vulgate to a larger number of Latin readers.

Latin was historically important to Anglican Protestants, a fact reflected in e.g., the fact that the 39 Articles were produced in both English and Latin. It is also seen in a number of useful Latin works I have seen at the British Library in London, where the *Church of England* (though now more generally in sad apostasy,) has been the Established Church for centuries. And in fairness to the Roman Catholics, on a number of occasions I have found Latin works kept in their libraries to also be very useful indeed.

When visiting North America in March 2009, at the USA capital city of Washington D.C., I was interested to visit the [Roman] Catholic University of America, where I enjoyed an excellent meal in their canteen (dining hall). My *raison d’être* for visiting this university was multi-faceted.

¹⁸ John Wordsworth and Henry White’s *Nouum Testamentum Latine, Secundum Editionem Sancti Hieronymi*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, England, UK, 1911, pp. vi-ix.

¹⁹ Robert Weber & Roger Gryson, *Biblia Sacra, Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, 1969, 5th edition, 2007, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft / German Bible Society (in the United Bible Societies), Stuttgart, Germany (ISBN 978-3-438-05303-9), pp. xliii-xlvi.

²⁰ Augustine Merk’s *Novum Testamentum, Graece et Latine*, 1933, Sumptibus Pontificii Instituti Biblici, Rome, 9th edition, 1964, pp. 42*-43*. In the NT, the readings of the Sixtinam (1590) and Clementine (1592) Vulgates may be found in the textual apparatus of Wordsworth & White’s *Nouum Testamentum Latine, op. cit.*, (1911).

In some ways I view the Roman Church something like I view Judaism i.e., with some ambivalence. On the down side, the Jews became entangled in works' righteousness in opposition to the gospel of justification by faith (Gal. 2:16; 3:11); as indeed did the Roman Church, and this was a key factor necessitating the Reformation sparked by Martin Luther in 1517. And on a range of key issues the Jews came to elevate "tradition" above the authority of Scripture, e.g., by their tradition they set aside the fifth commandment (Exod. 20:12; Mark 7:9-13); just like Roman Catholics, by their tradition, set aside the second commandment (Exod. 20:4-6).

But on the upside, the Jews, even in their apostasy, have done a great service to God's truth because "unto them were committed the oracles of God" (Rom. 3:2). Thus both the Hebrew and Aramaic text of the OT, and other Hebrew or Aramaic works containing OT citations, were faithfully preserved by them over time, and when the Roman Catholic Complutensians (whose work was closed down by the Council of Trent) and Protestants came to work on the OT text, they found that these works preserved by the Jews were inside the God preserved closed class of OT sources used for composing the OT text. So likewise, the Roman Catholics, even in their apostasy, have done a great service to God's truth because of their work in preserving Latin texts and citations of the OT and NT, seen *par excellence*, in their work of copying out and preserving St. Jerome's Vulgate. Thus when the Roman Catholic Complutensians of the 16th century and Protestants of the 16th and 17th centuries came to work on the NT text, they found that these Latin works preserved by the Roman Church were inside the God preserved closed class of NT sources used for composing the NT text.

This then leads to the following paradox. On the one hand, we religiously conservative Protestants condemn the errors of both Judaism and Roman Catholicism, and do what we can to be the instruments of God both in calling men out of these false systems of religion, and simultaneously protecting religiously conservative Protestant Christians from their harmful theological influences. But on the other hand, we view both with some ambivalence, since we recognize a debt of gratitude to both for their respective work in preserving manuscripts inside the OT and NT closed class of sources used for composing the OT or NT Received Text. We thus think positively of them in some ways, and recognize that notwithstanding their dangerous theological errors which put them in most serious apostasy, they both still retain some amazingly wonderful truths about the God who revealed himself in the Holy Bible. It's a case of, *Truth is sometimes stranger than fiction!*

With such qualifications in mind, I draw the reader's attention to two useful works on Ecclesiastical Latin that I have in my library. Both of these are published by the Roman Catholic University of America in Washington D.C., USA. These are John Collin's *A Primer of Ecclesiastical Latin* (1985), and the associated work of John Dunlap's *An Answer Key to A Primer of Ecclesiastical Latin* (2006)²¹. Collins'

²¹ Collins, J.F., *A Primer of Ecclesiastical Latin*, [Roman] Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C., USA, 1985; & Dunlap, J.R., *An Answer Key to A*

Ecclesiastical Latin is largely that of the church fathers and doctors, St. Jerome (d. 420) and St. Ambrose (d. 397). This nexus with e.g., the Vulgate, makes Collins' work of value to Protestants such as myself.

The Protestant *Authorized King James Version* of 1611 is gratefully indebted to much in St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate. E.g., by the standard convention, quotations in the Vulgate are not placed in quotation marks, rather, capitalization of the first word indicates the beginning of a quotation²². This same stylistic feature is found in the AV. What then are we to make of modern translations like the *New King James Version* which jettison this tradition and use quotation marks? Well ... let's just say that if their NT Burgonite Majority Text theory lacks recognition of the bigger thing, to wit, God's preservation in a closed class of three sources used for composing the NT text, the Byzantine Greek and Latin texts, together with NT citations from Greek and Latin church writers; then it should not surprise us if more subtle elements of the Latin Vulgate's presence in the King James Version are also lost on, and not appreciated by them.

Book of Armagh – A special Latin treat.

Starting from Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25), the *Book of Armagh* (9th century, Latin Codex D), or Latin, *Liber Ardmachanus*, or *Codex Armachanus*, is a special feature of these textual commentaries. I acquired a photocopy of this from Sydney University, and it contains Matt. 1-14:33; is then missing a number of folio pages, and then recommences at Matt. 21:4b with the rest of the New Testament, although it places the Book of Acts at the end, after the Book of Revelation.

Referred to by both Wordsworth & White (1911) and Merk (1964) as Latin Vulgate Codex D, it is referred to by UBS (1993) as old Latin Version ar. While I may use either designation, I shall more commonly identify it by its long title. Its presence in Wordsworth & White and Merk emanates from its general designation as a Latin Vulgate Codex. Why then do UBS classify it as an old Latin Version? The answer lies in the fact that its designation as a Vulgate Codex should not be understood in absolute terms, e.g., it contains numerous old Latin readings in Acts and the Pauline Epistles²³; or in the Gospels (e.g., see commentary at Matt. 21:31a; 21:38). In thus has some similarities with the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron, which though a Latin Vulgate Codex, may sometimes follow a divergent old Latin Version reading (see e.g., commentary at the *Form 2*, component 3 reading of Matt. 21:29,30c,31b).

Primer of Ecclesiastical Latin, A Supplement to the Text by John F. Collins, [Roman] Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C., USA, 2006.

²² Collins's *A Primer of Ecclesiastical Latin*, *op. cit.*, pp. v & 90.

²³ "The Book of Armagh," *Wikipedia* (1 Jan. 2010) (http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Book_of_Armagh), citing, Metzger, B.M., *The Early Versions of the NT*, Oxford University Press, England, UK, 1977, pp 305 & 341.

While it is generally agreed that this is a manuscript from the first half of the 9th century, some variation of view exists on its exact date. The scribe Ferdomnach of Armagh (known to have been assisted by two other scribes,) is generally regarded to have written the first part in *c.* 807, and he died *c.* 845. Thus the Book of Armagh is generally dated to the first half of the ninth century. While I shall use Wordsworth & White's *Novum Testamentum Latine* (1911) date of "A.D. 812" throughout, it should therefore be understood that this is an approximation falling within a wider range of possible dates inside the first half of the 9th century.

My copy is that of Editor John Gwynn's *Liber Ardmachanus THE BOOK OF ARMAGH*, published for the Royal Irish Academy, at Dublin by Hodges Figgis & Company, and in London by Williams & Norgate in 1913. It is copy 67 of 400 copies made. John Gwynn (1827-1917) (referred to in the *Dictionary of Ulster Biography*,) was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he became a Fellow (1853-64), and among other positions he held he was Warden of St. Columba's College, Rathfarnham. He became the Regius Professor of Divinity at Dublin University from 1888, and a Member of the Royal Irish Academy.

Comparison of Plate II, B, (page ciii) which reproduces the writing in the actual Book of Armagh; and Folio 53 (p. 100) of Gwynn's printed edition, show how he uses letters added in italics in his printed form not present in the original. Thus e.g., while he adds "*autem* ('and' / 'but')" in italics at Matt. 21:24a (p. 85), I show the Book of Armagh as omitting this in the commentary at Matt. 21:24a. Similar dynamics operate in this commentary with e.g., "*et* (also)" at Matt. 22:27. By contrast, at Matt. 21:30c, underlining the letters Gwynn adds in italics, the Book of Armagh reads, Latin, "Eo (I go) Domine (Sir), et (and) non (not) ivit (he went)." But since Gwynn is here merely supplying the standard letters of these pre-existing manuscript words, at Matt. 21:30c I simply show the Book of Armagh following this reading (even though it uses the added "*et*" / "and," this is not in dispute; cf. where it is in dispute at Matt. 22:20, *infra*); although I reserve the right to sometimes look at the matter in more detail (e.g., see commentary at Matt. 22:37a).

Gwynn might sometimes be criticized as blurring the line between interpretation and presentation of this manuscript with such additions as the "*et* ('and,' word 1)" at Matt. 22:20, which I classify in this commentary as a minor variation to the reading without "*et* ('and,' word 1)." But in the end any such criticism must be qualified by the fact that because Gwynn had the good sense to use italics, he has shown the reader what the manuscript actually reads, and so any necessary corrections, such as occurs in this commentary at Matt. 22:20, may be undertaken. *Like the Authorized Version, Gwynn thus wisely recognizes the need for italics to distinguish between what is added.*

While various persons who are neither Anglican, Lutheran, nor Roman Catholic, may be interested in Latin Biblical manuscripts, in the English speaking world, there seems to be a *tendency*, though not an absolute one, for those so interested to be either Anglican or Roman Catholic, and beyond the Anglophone world, some Lutherans e.g., von Soden in his textual apparatus. The divergent *tendency* which considers "only the

Greek matters for New Testament studies,” is to some extent reflected in the presuppositions of something like Hodges & Farstad’s (1985) or Robinson & Pierpont’s (2005) Burgonite majority texts. Similar attitudes have also been very largely cross-applied by the neo-Alexandrians with their focus on two very corrupt Alexandrian text *Greek manuscripts*. In its most extreme form this was found in the Latin-phobia of civil war Roundheads who in 1643 smashed in pieces at number of chairs at the Anglican Cathedral of Peterborough because they had on them Latin distich inscriptions (a couple of lines of Latin poetry) which referred to certain Bible stories. They then proceeded to break into the Cathedral’s Chapter House where because some legal documents contained Latin writing, the Roundheads denounced them as Popish and started to destroy them²⁴.

Of course, there have also been Puritan derived Protestants who were great students and scholars of the Latin tongue, and who hold no sympathy for these barbarian Roundheads. For example, from 1691 title pages in Acts of the *General Assembly of the Church of Scotland* bore the Latin words, “*nec (not) tamen (yet) consumebatur* (it was being consumed²⁵),” meaning, “Yet it was not consumed,” from the Biblical story of the Burning Bush in Exod. 3:2. (This became the motto first of the *Church of Scotland*, and then of the *Free Church of Scotland*.) Among the New Testament Greek and Latin textual traditions regarding great neo-Byzantines of the 16th and 17th century who were Protestants, Puritan derived Protestants of the Reformed faith would, for example, look with favour on such non-Anglicans as Theodore Beza; *and certainly there is no reason whatsoever why orthodox Protestants of various religious traditions might not support the Neo-Byzantine School of the Received Text*. But for all that, at least to date, *the tendency* in the English world has been for interest in the Latin Biblical manuscripts to be taken up by either Anglicans or Roman Catholics. In this broader context, Dean Gwynn is very much an Anglican figure.

Dean Gwynn is commonly identified by being referred to as the “Dean of Raphoe” (e.g., in the British Library catalogue)²⁶. In 1834 the *Church of Ireland* Dioceses of Londonderry (since 1922 in Northern Ireland) and Raphoe (since 1922 in the Republic of Ireland) united, with the Cathedral Church in Londonderry being St. Columb’s, and the Cathedral Church in Raphoe where John Gwynn was Dean being St. Eunan’s²⁷. *Raphoe Castle* was formerly the Bishop’s Palace. Built in the 1630s its

²⁴ Textual Commentary Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), Preface, “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” “(b) William Laud,” subsection, “Some instances of ‘Laud’s Popery’ as Puritan folly;” citing *Hierurgia Anglicana* (1848), pp. 275-81.

²⁵ Indicative passive imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *consumo* (from which comes our English word, ‘consume,’ although our English word also partly derives through ‘consumer’ from the Latin language of French).

²⁶ See e.g., *The Church of Ireland & her Censors*, by John Gwynn, Dean of Raphoe; Hodges, Foster, & Co., Dublin, 1874.

²⁷ Eunan died as a Septuagenarian in 704 A.D., being Abbot of Iona, Scotland (679-704). A cousin of Columba (after whom the Cathedral at Londonderry is named),

remains are still visible. It was disliked and attacked by Papists as a symbol of Protestantism in the *Irish Massacre* of 1641; who during the Primacy of the Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland, His Grace, James Ussher, also targeted as a Protestant symbol, and burnt, the Anglican St. Patrick's Cathedral Armagh, since Armagh in Northern Ireland is the Primatial See of the *Church of Ireland*. (*Irish Massacre Day*, the 23rd of October, was a red-letter day in the *Church of Ireland* from 1663-1859, and it had its own Office in the 1666 *Church of Ireland's* Caroline prayer book from 1666 to 1800.) *Raphoe Castle* was also disliked as a symbol of Anglican Royalism by English and Irish revolutionary republican Puritans, and taken by Cromwell's republican Roundhead troops in 1650. It was then further disliked and damaged as a symbol of Protestantism by anti-Williamite Jacobites in 1689.

Thus from the perspective of Royalist Anglican Protestants such as myself, *Raphoe Castle* is a 17th century symbol of what we believe in, for we are neither Papist nor Puritan, but *we are unapologetically Protestant*. This fact means that since the apostasy of Anglicanism into Puseyism, semi-Puseyism, and religious liberalism from the 19th century; our support for the Reformation still acts to create a gospel bond between we Evangelical Low Church Anglican Protestants and Puritan Protestants; as it did more generally before this time when the whole Anglican Church was more generally faithful to the glorious tenets of the Reformation. And this has been further intensified with the Evangelical movement that started in the 18th and 19th centuries (see "*I'm an Evangelical – I hope you are too!*", *supra*). And we Royalist Anglican Protestants also recognize that under the Establishment Principle the monarch is Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church in England, and in the 17th century also in Ireland.

Thus the *Church of Ireland* Bishop's Palace of *Raphoe Castle* was attacked by Papists in 1641 because it was a symbol of *Protestantism*; then attacked by revolutionary English and Irish *republican Puritans* in 1650 because it was a symbol of *Royalist Anglicanism*; and then attacked again by Papists in 1689 because it was a symbol of *Protestantism*.

Remember the Bishop's Castle of Raphoe,
Both Papist and Puritan dealt it a blow;
Anglican Protestants held on hand and toe,
Remember the Bishop's Castle of Raphoe.

The badly battered and horribly scarred remains of this once great symbol of Anglican Royalist Protestantism, are still visible today at Raphoe.

In undertaking this edition of the *Book of Armagh*, the Dean of Raphoe, Dean John Gwynn was completing the work of a *Church of Ireland* Bishop. It was started by the *Church of Ireland's* Bishop Reeves (1815-1892), the Anglican Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore (1886-1892), a bishopric which includes the City of Belfast in Northern Ireland. One of Bishop Reeves' grandfathers fought in the *Battle of Bunker's*

his *magnum opus* was *Life of Columba* (Latin, *Vita Columbae*).

Hill (1775), in which American republican revolutionaries engaged in the American War of Independence. In March 2009, I walked the full length of the red-line on the footpath (sidewalk) of *The Boston ... Trail* in Boston, Massachusetts, USA, which included near its end, *The Bunker Hill Monument* to this royalist-republican revolutionary North American battle, in which royalists ultimately held Canada, and the republicans ultimately formed the United States of America. Bishop Reeves was the last private custodian of the *Book of Armagh*, and at the time of his death was also the President of the Royal Irish Academy²⁸, of which Dean Gwynn was a member.

Prima facie, it would have been theoretically possible for me to have integrated much more from the Book of Armagh into the Revised Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14). However, time constraints and priorities in getting the revised Volume 1 out by the deadline of 30 Jan. 2010 made this impossible. Although to this must be made the qualification that some limited usage of it may be found in Volume 1. Thus it is cited at Matt. 8:25a, where I note that:

Armagh, in Northern Ireland is famous as the religious centre founded by St. Patrick (d. 461), and is the home of two rival Cathedrals, both claiming to be the “true” successors of St. Patrick, the national (motif) saint of Ireland, and both called “St. Patrick’s Cathedral.” (The cross of St. Patrick, a red “X” shape, is found on the Union Jack, because it represents the fact that Northern Ireland is part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, although before 1922 it represented all of Ireland.) One of these rival Cathedrals called “St. Patrick’s” is Protestant (Anglican *Church of Ireland*), and was formerly the Cathedral Church of the Anglican Archbishop and Primate of Ireland, James Ussher (Archbishop, 1625-1656); whereas the other Cathedral is Roman Catholic. I inspected both of them in 2001. However, I also visited Trinity College, Dublin, in southern Ireland, founded by the Protestant Queen Elizabeth the First in 1592, for education and “true religion;” which is where this famous manuscript ... is kept

I now further note that Gwynn’s edition of the *Book of Armagh*, being published for the Royal Irish Academy, contains on its title page the insignia of a St. Patrick’s Cross, with a Royal Crown in the middle of the St. Patrick’s Cross and above it, and the Motto, “We Will Endeavour.”

As an Australian whose national and state flags contain the Union Jack, made up of the Cross of St. George (old Kingdom of England, including the Dominion of Wales), St. Patrick (old Kingdom of Ireland, & since 1922, Northern Ireland), and St. Andrew (old Kingdom of Scotland), it would be fair to say that St. Patrick is one of the motif

²⁸ “William Reeves (Bishop),” (27 Aug. 2009), *Wikipedia* ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Reeves_\(bishop\)#cite_note-eirdata-1](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Reeves_(bishop)#cite_note-eirdata-1)); quoting Lady Ferguson, “the Rev. Dr. Bernard ... is engaged with Dr. Gwynn in completing the labours of the late Bishop Reeves on the Book of Armagh” (*Sir Samuel Ferguson in the Ireland of his day*, p. 77).

saints of Christianity in Australia (as indeed are St. George and St. Andrew, and the Reverend Richard Johnson).

Of course, the *Book of Armagh* could not be used for Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20) of my textual commentary due to its missing folios. However, from Volume 3 onwards, this *Book of Armagh* is being featured as part of a very special Latin treat. It starts at Matt. 21:4b; and therefore commences shortly after the beginning of this Volume 3. My usage of the *Book of Armagh* for Volume 3 commences in February 2010, and at this time I turned over that month's page in my *Trinitarian Bible Society* pictorial Calendar, which contains quotations from the Authorized Version and pictures from the United Kingdom for every month of the year. Notably then, February 2010 (with a reading from John 6:35,) shows some beautiful white flowers on healthy green stems, and the caption that these are flowers called, "snowdrops" from "Ardress House," in "Co[unty]. Armagh," Northern Ireland, UK²⁹.

If one goes back in the ancestry of all of us white Protestants of Western European descent, one will find first Roman Catholic ancestors, and before that, pagan ancestors, and before that a pure monotheistic worshipping ancestry of Japhethites (Gen. 10:1-5), and before that a pure monotheistic worshipping ancestry of Sethites (Gen. 5:6-32), and before that, Adam and Eve (Gen. 3:20; 4:1; 5:1-5).

As one who is of Irish descent, (I am of Irish-American ancestry from Boston, USA,) for the name, "McGrath" is Irish meaning, "Son of Grace," and a Royalist Protestant, it is with great pleasure that I now present this very special Latin treat. In doing so, I am grateful for the diligent work of Latin scribes in the Roman Church who both undertook this work, and for many centuries preserved it. This was a manifestation of God's common grace to those of the Gentile race who in some way acknowledge him, just like God's common grace to the Jews who in some way acknowledge him was manifested in their preservation of the OT Hebrew Oracles (Rom. 3:2; 11:29). Like the holy Apostle St. Paul of the Jewish race, who was separated from his religiously apostate "kinsmen according to the flesh," (Rom. 9:3), I am conscious of the fact that most of my blood-brothers of Irish descent are fast-bound in the idolatry of Popery, even as in turn our ancestors were fast-bound in the idolatry of Gentile paganism. But "when Irish eyes are smiling," like other white Caucasians, we may remember our yet earlier illustrious and noble ancestry through Noah's son, Japheth.

For all lovers of the God preserved Latin and Greek New Testament manuscripts, I therefore here present a very special Irish treat, to wit, Gwynn's edition of *The Book of Armagh* (1913). It comes to us in the form of this edition through the labours of Irish Protestant Christians. It most appropriately bears on its title page a goodly crest containing the Cross of St. Patrick. Let the good Christian reader, *ENJOY IT*.

The Today's English Version.

²⁹ The Trinitarian Bible Society supports the AV; and they call this product, "The Words of Life Calendar" (<http://www.trinitarianbiblesociety.org/>).

The *Today's English Version* received some fairly limited attention and reference in Volumes 1³⁰ and 2³¹ of these commentaries. The TEV includes such horrendously wicked perversions of God Word as rendering Isa. 7:14, “a young woman who is pregnant will have a son” (TEV) with a footnote falsely claiming, “... The use of ‘virgin’ in Mt. 1.23 reflects a Greek translation of the Old Testament made some 500 years after Isaiah” (TEV footnote). Its rendering of Dan. 9:24-27 further denies the Messianic Promise. And its “translation” of Micah 5:2 also changes the reference to the Son of God being “from everlasting” (AV), simply to one “whose family line goes back to ancient times” (TEV); something that could be said of any human being, since we all come down from Adam and Eve, and that is surely *an ancient family line!* As if all that about the TEV was not bad enough, references to the “Antichrist” (AV) in e.g., I John 2:18 are changed to “the enemy of Christ” (TEV); and the TEV is riddled with many other bad translations.

However, in this superficial and debased secularist Western World, in which far too few of those who are saved (justification by faith) live surrendered lives under the directive will of God (sanctification), it has transpired that together with the NIV the TEV has largely captured a big slice type of “market” that e.g., the NEB, REB, and Living Bible were trying to target³². Its popularity is e.g., evident in the fact that an AV using friend of mine showed me a TEV that was presented by a local City Council in Sydney to his Scottish born wife when she was naturalized in Australia. On the one hand, I rejoice that a local City Council naturalization ceremony would give out any copies of the Bible, since it to some extent bespeaks of Australia’s Christian heritage. But on the other hand, I am saddened that these were not AVs that were being given.

³⁰ Textual Commentary, Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), at Matt. 12:22 & Matt. 14:26b. Of course, when in these Volumes I refer to “Textual Commentary Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14)” without any qualification, it should be understood that it is to the Revised Volume 1 of 2010, not the original Volume 1 of 2008 that I am referring to.

³¹ Textual Commentary Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, section “7b) Gunpowder Treason Day: 5 November,” when discussing former USA President Ronald Reagan’s defence of the *St. James Version* in opposition to the TEV.

³² USA statistics show the NIV has 45% of the Bible market (Marketing Today’s New International Version” at www.bible.researcher.com>...>21stCentury>TNIV). John Kohlenbeger III says, “Since the mid 1980s, the NIV has been the best-selling English Bible;” and together the NIV and the KJV account for as much as 60 per cent of all Bible sales. ... Also in the top 10 ... are the NKJV, NRSV, and NASB.” He says these figures are “based on actual sales statistics published by Spring Arbor Distributors, the largest distributor of Christian books to the retail trade, and monthly sales statistics gathered and published by *Bookstore Journal*, the official publication of the Christian Booksellers Association” in the USA. (“The Best Study Bible” by John Kohlenbeger III, www.equip.org/articles/how-to-choose-a-study-bible.)

However, such TEV usage is “just the tip of the iceberg.” It is clear to me that e.g., in Australia quite a lot of people and churches have now been tragically taken in by the TEV deception; just like many have been taken in by the NIV deception. Thus as a consequence of the sad popularity of the TEV, I have decided that starting with this Volume 3, I shall do with it as I do for the NIV, and include reference to it in all sections in the main part of this commentary. Thus it shall be referred to together with the ASV, NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, and NIV, when considering the readings of the neo-Alexandrian versions at every main reading (i.e., this does not include the appendices).

This expanded usage of the TEV includes “updating” the older TEV that I used in Volumes 1 and 2, which was the British usage text first published as the 4th edition in 1976 (The British & Foreign Bible Society, London, UK, 1966, 1971, 4th edition, 1976). From Volume 3 onwards the TEV that I use will be the 1992 second edition (American Bible Society), with Australian usage text in the revised edition of 1994 (Bible Society in Australia Inc., Locked Bag 3, Minto, NSW, 2566). What of the question, How does one go from what the copyright page of the earlier TEV calls the “4th edition 1976,” to what the copyright page calls “Today’s English Version – Second edition © 1992” (then qualified as “Australian usage text – revised edition 1994), so that the “second edition” of 1992 comes after the “4th edition” of 1976? The 1976 edition seemingly refers to the TEV’s NT of 1966, 1967, and 1971 as the first three editions, which proceeded under Batcher as Chairman³³. Then with the added TEV’s OT, the completed edition is referred to as the “4th edition 1976.” But this completed “4th edition 1976” is then regarded by the 1992 revisers as what might be called, “the 1st edition 1976,” and hence they call their revision “Today’s English Version – Second edition © 1992.” *Does all this business about the TEV’s second edition coming after its fourth edition sound a little bit confusing? Well that is as nothing compared with the confusion of trying to work out where its loose so called “dynamic equivalents” are coming from, relative to the Greek!*

I purchased this new 1992 & 1994 edition of the TEV between the time of first publishing the Revised Volume 1 (Jan. 2010) and this Volume 3 (June 2011). But I have a much longer link with the TEV. As I discussed in Volume 1:

Back in the 1970s, not long after the *Good News Bible* or *Today’s English Version* (TEV) first came out in 1976, I learnt that one of its translators, Robert Bratcher (b. 1920), the Chairman of the TEV Committee, would be speaking at Scots Presbyterian Church, Margaret Street, in the City of Sydney (near the Harbour Bridge). I had never met a Bible translator, and so somewhat excitedly, albeit somewhat naively, I decided to go and listen to him. While I have not ridden a motor-bike for more than 25 years, in those days I used to ride a green Honda CB ... 200 motor-cycle. ... After I had ridden into the city and arrived at Scots Church, the man I had come to listen to opened his copy of the *Today’s English Version* (1976) and read Luke 1:1-4.

³³ Kubo, S., & Specht, W., *So Many Versions?* Zondervan, Michigan, USA, 1975, pp. 140-148 (TEV) at pp. 140 & 147.

He then gave a most liberal interpretation of Luke 1:1-4 that undermined and attacked the Biblical teaching of the verbal inspiration of Scripture (II Tim. 3:16) ...³⁴.

As part of the enhanced focus on the TEV from Volume 3 onwards, I have further reflected on the matter since I penned these words, and I can now date this to 1978 or 1979 because I retained from this a copy then being handed out of the bearded Robert Bratcher's Olivier Beguin Memorial Lecture of 1978. This says Bratcher's address was first delivered at the *Canberra College of Advanced Education* in May 1978, and thereafter repeated at Sydney, Melbourne, and Hobart in June 1978; and that Bratcher is an American Baptist from the USA³⁵. I also have a photo of myself with a "Good News" sticker on my motor-cycle helmet which was given out in connection with Bratcher's address that I attended. At the time I liked the name "Good News" inside a fish shape as a Christian symbol, so I cut the sticker down to just this fish shape with "GOOD NEWS" in the middle i.e., with no reference to the "Good News Bible" or Today's English Version on it, before affixing it to my helmet. Thus I modified it from its originally intended usage as a TEV promotion, to simply a Christian symbol. (I never liked the TEV which I always considered to be too non-literal and too interpretive.) This photo has stamped on the back of it a development date of August 1979. Thus Bratcher's address that I attended at Scots Presbyterian Church was sometime between June 1978 and August 1979.

Therefore my increased usage of the TEV from Volume 3 onwards comes against the backdrop of one who as a tertiary College student of 18 or 19 years of age, in either my first or second year of College in 1978 or 1979, listened to Bratcher promoting it not that long after its complete OT and NT edition was published in 1976 (with its NT going back to 1966 and 1971). Bratcher's religiously liberal attack on the verbal inspiration of Holy Scripture, was ultimately an attack on the authority of Scripture which is at the heart of the *sola Scriptura* or "Scripture alone" of the Reformation. It echoes Lucifer's words in the Garden of Eden, "hath God said?" (Gen. 3:2). It feeds into Bratcher's "dynamic equivalence" views in the TEV, that translators are free "to get the general idea" of what a Bible writer said, "and then put it in their own words;" rather than like the King James Version translators following a more literal form of Bible translation

But "we know that all things works together for good to them that love God" (Rom. 8:28); and I thank God I attended this address in 1978 or 1979, since in the longer term it helped me to better understand how religious liberals like Bratcher misuse Luke 1:1-4 in order to deny the great Protestant doctrine of the verbal inspiration of Scripture.

³⁴ Textual Commentary Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), Preface, section "9) Usage of ASV, RSV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NKJV, NIV & Moffatt Bible in this commentary."

³⁵ Bratcher, R.G., Olivier Beguin Memorial Lecture 1978, *The Authority & Relevance of the Bible in the Modern World*, Published by The Bible Society in Australia, Sydney, 1978, (National Library of Australia ISBN 0-647-19013-3) pp. ii (Bratcher is a Minister in the USA's Southern Baptist Convention) & v.

In turn, this helps me to then better isolate this issue as one that needs to be addressed. “For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you” (I Cor. 11:19).

Though I find the TEV a most painful and inaccurate translation (see e.g., my comments at Matt. 21:9; 21:28a; 21:38; 22:23; 22:32; 22:39; 23:3a; 23:3b; 23:5a; 23:5b; 23:26), I have nevertheless now formed the opinion that the tragically wide usage of the TEV in Australia and elsewhere, means that I need to give it a higher profile in these textual commentaries than I hitherto have done. The TEV is a swine of a translation! It is bad, bad, bad! *Prima facie, going through the TEV is a pest and a pain that I do not want; but then again, like all good Christians, I must do my duty.* As our sweet Lord Jesus said, “he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me” (Matt. 10:39). Thus by the grace of God, *I bear this cross*; and by his rich mercy towards me, I then come to the point where I thank God that he has led me to do so as part of my wider work on these textual commentaries. “Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven” (Matt. 6:10).

Impact of Oliver Cromwell on American Revolution & more widely the secular state.

I have previously discussed the Puritan Presbyterian from the USA, Rousas Rushdoony, a Judaizer who does not recognize the Biblical distinction found in Article 7 of the Anglican *39 Articles* and chapter 19 of the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession*; and so he does not recognize that OT Mosaic law no longer binds Christians of necessity, but NT law does (Eph. 2:15; Col. 2:14). Indeed, Rushdoony openly denies these relevant sections of the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession*³⁶. Thus while Rushdoony accepts the teaching of Article 7 of the Anglican 39 Articles that, “the Law given from God by Moses, as touching upon ceremonies and rites, do not bind Christian men” (Col. 2:16; Heb. 7:12; 9:10), he does not accept that part of this Article which says, “nor ... the civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any Commonwealth.” Thus while he would *prima facie* accept that “no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called Moral” (Article 7, Anglican 39 Articles), he then tries to falsely place under heads of the Moral Law as found in the Ten Commandments, various Jewish civil laws; i.e., this Judaizer falsely claims they continue to bind Christians³⁷.

I have also previously referred to the fact that Rushdoony has “produced inaccurate anti-Caroline propaganda against both Charles I and Charles II, ...; but ... he

³⁶ Rushdoony, R.J., *The Institutes of Biblical Law*, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, USA, 1973, Vol. 1, pp. 550-1.

³⁷ See my work, *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist* (2006, 2nd edition 2010) (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>), “Part 1: Prefatory remarks and principles,” “Doctrinal principles used in this commentary (Optional Reading),” “5) Judaizers and liberals who subvert Lev. 18:16,” “a) Judaizers who subvert Lev. 18:16.”

speaks favorably of Cromwell ...³⁸.” Under Editor, Gary North, Rushdoony’s *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* of 1976 was a “Symposium on Christianity and the American Revolution.” It includes articles by numerous authors in favour of the American Revolution.

Its disrespectful and dishonoring attitude to royalty, is evident in the fact that even when King Charles I did something they like, they try to put it in the most negative terms they can. Hence on the one hand, they like the fact that Charles I guaranteed annual meetings of the Virginia legislature. But they dare not say so in a way that would “Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17). And so with a spirit of contempt and ingratitude, they say, “In 1629 ... England was on the verge of war with France, and King Charles was in desperate need of money. Consequently, he agreed to allow the assembly to reconvene in return for a monopoly of the valuable tobacco exports. In 1639, Charles issued a decree formalizing this earlier commitment and guaranteeing that the Virginia legislature would meet annually. *In essence King Charles I sold the birthright of representative government in America, and his ‘mess of pottage’ was the tobacco monopoly*³⁹.”

This last sentence typifies their unholy and unBiblical spirit of ingratitude. They cannot say, “We thank God that a wise and good King Charles gave unto us a royal decree that the Virginia legislature should meet at least annually.” Rather, they must try and depict this as a man who “sold” his “birthright” like Esau, for a “mess of pottage” (Gen. 25:19-34). What saith the Word of God, “Curse not the king, no not in thy thought” (Eccl. 10:20); but rather, “Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17). And, where “gods” in the AV is Hebrew *’elohim* it can, depending on context, refer to broadly speaking godly “rulers,” as opposed to the ungodly rulers of Psalm 82. In this context, we read in Exodus 22:28, “*Thou shalt not revile the gods.*”

Among other things, this 1976 “*Christian Reconstruction*” “Symposium on Christianity and the American Revolution,” makes the following statements. “In America, natural law teaching was largely expressed in the form of natural rights, and derived ... from the writings of the English Civil War⁴⁰.” “Bailyn sees ... that ‘The ultimate origins of this ... ideological strain [The American Revolutionaries’ philosophy] lay in the radical social and political thought of the English Civil War and of the Commonwealth period’ In short, during the ascendancy of Oliver Cromwell and the Roundheads⁴¹.” “The influence of Puritanism ... ought not to be underrated⁴².” E.g.,

³⁸ Textual Commentaries Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” at “a) Preliminary Qualifications & Remarks.”

³⁹ Murdoch, J.M., “1776: Revolution or War for Independence,” *The Journal of Christian Reconstruction*, 1976, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 74-87, at p. 83 (emphasis mine).

⁴⁰ Jones, A.P., “The Christian Roots of the War for Independence,” *The Journal of Christian Reconstruction*, 1976, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 6-51 at p. 29.

⁴¹ Robbins, J.W., “The Political Philosophy of the Founding Fathers,” *The*

“The immediate cause” of the Revolution “was the issue of taxation.” “The importance of America’s [Puritan] clergy ... as a primary factor in the coming of the Revolution and the support of it” should not be “ignored.” For “it was a Christian revolution primarily, one which had support from the grass-roots level, as well as from the ‘Deistic’ leadership⁴³.” And to the question, “Can a Christian legitimately celebrate a ‘revolution’ in the light of Romans 13?” The answer is given in the affirmative on the basis of “*an appeal to God or nature*⁴⁴.”

Yet on any other matters, Rushdoony says, “For the Bible, there is no law in nature There is no law *in* nature but a law *over* nature, God’s law⁴⁵.” Christ said, “Be not, as the hypocrites” (Matt. 6:16). Indeed, more widely, such Puritans may like to point to the so called “Regulatory Principle” in which they look for a specific Biblical statement that something should be done in a church service (although they are not entirely consistent in this,) and they criticize Anglicans who maintain that a tradition that is useful and good may be kept providing “nothing be ordained against God’s Word” (Article 34, Anglican 39 Articles). Yet on this issue of sedition against a so called “tyrant,” they do what orthodox Anglicans will not do, since they go *against God’s Word* by setting aside God’s laws against “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:20,21), and requiring we “Honour the King” (I Peter 2:17). Christ said, “Be not, as the hypocrites” (Matt. 6:16).

This type of radical inconsistency stems from their glorification of men like Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford, the latter of whom annunciated such unBiblical principles in his *Lex Rex*. I remember talking to a Presbyterian Elder in 2010 who had been inculcated with anti-Caroline values. On the one hand, he rightly criticized attempts to impose Anglicanism on Scotland, (e.g., Charles sought to do this, an error he himself later acknowledged,) but then wrongly uses this fact to whip up an anti-Caroline sentiment. Then on the other hand, he criticized Charles II for his “betrayal,” i.e., in not enacting the *Solemn League and Covenant*, calling for the “extirpation of” “Prelacy” not only in Scotland, but also England and Ireland, and so *seeking to impose Puritanism, which contextually would most probably be Presbyterianism, on England and Ireland*.

Journal of Christian Reconstruction, 1976, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 52-68 at pp. 65-6; citing Bailyn, B., *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, 1967, p. 34.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 67.

⁴³ North, G (Editor), “The Declaration of Independence as a conservative document,” *The Journal of Christian Reconstruction*, 1976, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 94-115 at pp. 97 & 101.

⁴⁴ Murdoch, J.M., *op. cit.*, pp. 74-87, at pp. 74 & 81.

⁴⁵ Rushdoony, R.J., *The Institutes of Biblical Law*, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, USA, 1973, Vol. 1, p. 10.

Such Puritans rightly criticize any attempt to impose Anglicanism on Scotland; but wrongly criticize Charles II for not imposing Puritanism on England! The Presbyterian Elder in question was emotive, tried to speak favorably of Samuel Rutherford, and walked off in bit of a huff, refusing to discuss the matter further, and refusing to acknowledge his radical inconsistency⁴⁶.

Moreover, 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 USA Congress in Washington D.C., where inside the great Dome was called, “The Temple of Liberty.” This type of thing reminds me of the words of Edward Christian in his 1809 edition of Blackstone’s *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (1 Bl. Com. 126-7), where he first commends Blackstone’s “intelligible description of liberty.” But he then further says that for some “liberty” has become an “idol of mankind. Thousands worship it, and are even ready to offer their blood as a sacrifice to it.” Such “foolish” acts of “sedition” “may inflame the passions of the vulgar for a time, when practised upon by all the artifices of designing and wicked men, and may suppress the voice of reason and sobriety.”

For me, the proposition that one can set aside e.g., Romans 13, on the basis of a so called “higher law” of “liberty” against a so called “tyrant,” which “higher law” is said to exist over the Bible, is pure religious liberalism. I addressed this issue in a debate entitled by the Editor, “Cavaliers and Roundheads,” with regard to “we modern-time Cavaliers who fight with the pen and not the sword against modern day Roundheads,” such as those who seek to justify the Puritan revolution. The appeal to such a so called higher law by one of them, was that it was “absolutism” and so contrary to “the democratical system.” What I said there, is also relevant here in reply to the claims of these Puritans seeking to endorse the American Revolution of 1775/6.

... Charles I is not beyond criticism, though my view of him is a lot higher than that of ... [modern day Roundheads]. But this is ultimately a secondary issue. Neither ... [of these modern day Roundheads] cite Scripture for setting aside the Biblical teaching that those who engage in “seditions” and “murders” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (Gal. 5:20,21 cf. Rev. 21:8). Rather, in typical Roundhead tradition, like Rutherford’s *Lex Rex*, they claim some higher “reason” overrules God’s Word. While there is a natural law (reason) consistent with God’s revelation (e.g., Ps. 19:1; Rom. 1 & 2), I cannot accept that there is a higher natural law over God’s Book. It is one thing to “obey God rather than men” (Acts 5:29); it is another thing to seditiously attack “the higher powers” and so “receive” “damnation” (Rom. 13:1,2).

Under strict scrutiny, let us apply ... [these Roundhead] views to some comparable issues. A “civil rights” campaigner says the words “abusers of

⁴⁶ See my further comments on this Presbyterian Elder at 5, “The Restoration in the Scottish Context of the Williamite Settlement,” paragraph starting, “In general I see many positive qualities in both this man and his *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland*”.

themselves with mankind” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (I Cor. 6:9,10), do not apply to sodomites who should be accepted into the church because it is a form of “absolutism,” contrary to “the democratical system” (Evans) Does ... [this] kind of argument set aside I Cor. 6:9,10 for the Protestant? Not for me!

An “inter-faith” campaigner says the idea “no ... idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ” (Eph. 5:5), does not apply to Hindu idolaters as it is a form of “absolutism,” contrary to “the democratical system”... . Does ... [this] kind of argument set aside Eph. 5:5 for the Protestant? Not for me!⁴⁷

This then raises the issue of what good Protestant Christians in the United States of America are to do, if being subject to the Word of God they do not support what happened at the time of American Revolution? The following section from Sir William Blackstone’s *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (1765-9) is instructive.

... The king ... is the king in possession, ... for it is held that a king *de facto* and not *de jure*, or in other words an usurper that hath got possession of the throne, is a king within the meaning of the statute; as there is a temporary allegiance due to him, for his administration of the government, and the temporary protection of the public: and therefore treasons committed against ... [him] were punished ... though ... usurpers And a ... writer ... carries the point of possession so far, that he holds, that a king out of possession is so far from having any right to our allegiance, ... that we are bound by the duty of our allegiance to resist him. ... But in truth, this seems to be confounding all notions of right and wrong; and the consequence would be, that when Cromwell had murdered the elder Charles, and usurped the power (though not the name) of king, the people were bound in duty to hinder the son’s Restoration: and were ... Poland or Morocco to invade this kingdom, and ... get possession of the crown, ... the subject would be bound by his allegiance to fight for his natural prince today, and by the same duty of allegiance to fight against him tomorrow.

The true distinction seems to be, that the statute of Henry the Seventh does by no means *command* any opposition to a king *de jure*; but *excuses* the obedience paid to a king *de facto*. When therefore an usurper is in possession, the subject is *excused* and *justified* in obeying and giving him assistance: otherwise under an usurpation, no man could be safe: if the lawful prince had a right to hang him for obedience to the powers in being, as the usurper would certainly do for disobedience. Nay further, as the mass of people are imperfect judges of title, the law compels no man to yield obedience to that prince, whose right is by want of possession rendered uncertain and disputable, till Providence

⁴⁷ McGrath, G.B (myself), “Cavaliers & Roundheads,” *British Church Newspaper*, No. 176, 15 Jan. 2010, p. 10; in reply to Evans, H., on “Charles I,” & Bartley, A., on “Civil War,” *British Church Newspaper*, No. 174, 4 Dec. 09, p. 10.

shall think fit to interpose in his favour ... and therefore, till he is entitled to such allegiance by possession, no treason can be committed against him⁴⁸.”

Thus as at under Cromwell’s republic, so likewise under the United States of America, we find that the Crown is not in possession. Therefore Christians in the USA are excused for their obedience to the *de facto* powers that exist under the US Constitution. Subject only to the fact that *they have no duty of allegiance to resist the Crown* should it move to repossess the USA, they are to obey the republican powers that have existed for over 200 years in the USA. They are to do so *unless and until*, by a miraculous act, exhibiting the supernatural power of God, comparable to the events of 1660, God brings about a Restoration of the monarchy in the United States of America.

Thus while Rushdoony *et al* are wrong to claim “a Christian” “can” “legitimately celebrate a ‘revolution’ in the light of Romans 13,” *supra*, they are right to require that Christians in the USA are now subject to the powers that exist under the USA Constitution, and that they do not UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES engage in any seditious or illegal acts to try and overthrow it. They are to retain their obedience to it, *unless and until*, by a miraculous act, “*Providence shall think fit to interpose in*” the monarch’s “*favour*.”

One of the controversial aspects of Samuel Rutherford and Oliver Cromwell, is that they are glorified by both those who in general are liberals, as well as some who are in general conservatives. Putting aside the fact that Rushdoony’s “Christian Reconstruction” movement in the USA adopts Judaizing beliefs on the OT Jewish civil law being still binding, and so is unorthodox with regard to its semi-Judaizing beliefs (Eph. 2:15; Col. 2:14; Article 7, Anglican 39 Articles; & Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* chapter 19); in many of its other aspirations it represents the more conservative end of those who glorify Samuel Rutherford and Oliver Cromwell. I.e., there is a group of generally conservative Puritan derived Protestants who consider the legal theory of setting aside Biblical law on the basis of “reason,” with Rutherford’s basic principle that if a Divine Law allows a “tyranny” then in an act of self-defence one may set it aside; is only applicable as a “one-off” jurisprudential principle, specifically, for the purposes of allowing sedition and murder in a political revolution against a so called “tyrant” king such as King Charles I or King George III.

But at the other end of this gradient, one finds a group of anti-Christian State secularists who glorify Samuel Rutherford and Oliver Cromwell. Hence in referring to a multiplicity of view on Charles I, I have previously referred to the “*The secular ‘democratic’ view*. This 19th century view sees Cromwell’s republic as ‘a milestone’ in ‘the growth of parliamentary democracy.’ Like Cromwell, it seeks e.g., to place all power in the House of Commons, but whereas the Puritan republican revolutionaries sought to abolish the House of Lords and monarchy, this view, at least in the UK, seeks to retain both as rubber stamps⁴⁹.”

⁴⁸ 4 Bl. Com. 77-78 (underlined emphasis mine).

⁴⁹ Textual Commentaries Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), “Dedication: The Anglican

Thus e.g., Rushdoony was one of the early members of the Rutherford Institute's Board of Directors after it was established in 1982 and named in honour of Samuel Rutherford. In general (i.e., his semi-Judaizing views aside,) Rushdoony would certainly be at the more conservative end of those who have been involved with the *Rutherford Institute*. But let us consider some at the more liberal end of the *Rutherford Institute*. This *Rutherford Institute* has published a number of editorials on its web-site in favour of the 2003 US Supreme Court case decision in *Lawrence v. Texas*, in which the USA Supreme Court struck down the anti-sodomy laws in Texas⁵⁰. Thus whereas the more conservative followers of Rutherford argue that because Rutherford himself was morally conservative on issues like sodomy, one cannot apply his jurisprudence to support the US Supreme Court in *Lawrence v. Texas*; by contrast, the more liberal followers of Rutherford may argue that Rutherford enunciated a principle of "reason" overruling Divine law, and that on application of this principle, it is a "tyranny" against homosexuals to have anti-sodomy laws. Thus having started in political revolution with the setting aside of such Scriptures as, "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these," "seditions" and "murders," for "they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. 5:20 & 21); they end in e.g., setting aside such Scriptures as, "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived, neither the "effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind" "shall inherit the kingdom of God" (I Cor. 6:9 & 10); which under the Establishment Principle (Ps. 2:10-12; Isa. 49:23) became the historic anti-sodomy laws. So that while Jewish "civil precepts" "ought" "not" "of necessity to be received in any commonwealth" (Article 7, Anglican 39 Articles), we here see with the issue of sodomy a good example of how in harmony with the NT, the basic law of Lev. 18:22 & 23 should be legislatively enacted in anti-sodomy laws against sodomy with man or beast.

Another example of this more liberal secularist end of those who glorify Samuel Rutherford and Oliver Cromwell, is found in the disgraceful statue of Oliver Cromwell that has been erected as an eye-sore next to the Westminster Parliament in London. It was erected by the Liberal Prime Minister of the UK in 1894 and 1895, Lord Rosebery⁵¹. When he was a student at Oxford University, he bought a horse, and since this was against College rules he was given a choice, to either sell the horse or leave College, and

Calendar," at "a) Preliminary Qualifications & Remarks."

⁵⁰ "Rutherford Institute," WorldLingo, http://www.worldlingo.com/ma/enwiki/en/Rutherford_Institute .

⁵¹ "Archibald Primrose, 5th Earl of Rosebery," *Wikipedia* (2011) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Archibald_Primrose,_5th_Earl_of_Rosebery); "Hannah Primrose, Countess of Rosebery," *Wikipedia* *Wikipedia* (2010/11) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hannah_Primrose,_Countess_of_Rosebery); "Francis Douglas, Viscount Drumlanrig," *Wikipedia* (2010) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Francis_Douglas,_Viscount_Drumlanrig); "The Cromwell Statue at Westminster" (<http://www.icons.org.uk/nom/nominations/cromwell>).

so he left College. He thereafter acquired a large stable of racehorses and his lusts were said to include the desire to win the Epsom Derby, a goal he accomplished in 1894 with his racing horse, "Ladas." A Presbyterian who was buried at Dalmeny *Church of Scotland* in Scotland, his wife was buried at Willesden Jewish Cemetery in London, for he had married a wealthy Ashkenazi Jewess, Hannah Mayer de Rothschild of the wealthy Jewish Rothschild family, thus entering a religiously mixed marriage with one who among things, denied the Trinity, denied the virgin birth, denied the atoning death and resurrection of Christ, and denied the forgiveness of sins through Christ's sacrificial death. In their Christian-Jewish marital home of Landsown House, their guests included the homosexual, Oscar Wilde.

As Prime Minister, Rosebery selected a prominent atheist to be his Private Secretary, Francis Douglas. As an atheist, in 1880 Douglas had been banned from serving as a representative peer in Parliament because he had refused to take a religious oath of allegiance to the monarch. Then, when he lay-a-dying in 1929, Rosebery requested that he die to the accompaniment of a gramophone recording of the Eton boating song; and when he had earlier been at Eton, he made a name for himself as one who liked to viciously attack the name of King Charles the First. This big time gambling figure; this professed Christian who married a Jewess; this 15 month Prime Minister whose Private Secretary was a prominent atheist who had refused to take a religious oath of allegiance to the monarch; this man whose dying wish was to be listening to some pathetic irreligious song from his days at Eton where he was known to be a reviler of King Charles I; this same Rosebery, when he was Prime Minister in 1894, proposed that a statue of his hero, Oliver Cromwell, be erected at Westminster. The Irish MPs strongly opposed this on the basis of Cromwell's shocking behaviour in Ireland; and the English MPs opposed this on the basis of his regicidal murder of Charles I; with the consequence that all public funds for this monstrous proposal were stopped. But then an anonymous donor, generally though to probably be Rosebery himself, paid for the statue to be made; though when this disgraceful monument was unveiled 5 years later, to avoid public protests, there was no unveiling ceremony. Those at the more conservative end of the gradient who glorify Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford, would wish to distance themselves from the secular irreligiosity of Rosebery. Yet they join him in glorifying this statue, and name of, Oliver Cromwell⁵².

⁵² See e.g., the favourable usage of this Oliver Cromwell statue in *The Spreading Flame*, "Winds of Change" episode, Produced by Ambassador-Spinnaker Productions, Northern Ireland, UK, 2002, on Digital Versatile / Video Disk (DVD), Ambassador International, Greenville, South Carolina, USA, 2006. Here as historian, Richard Doherty, is speaking about Henry VIII in "the age of absolute monarchy," an unqualified secularist democratic type usage is made of this disgraceful Oliver Cromwell statue at Westminster. Ambassador in Northern Ireland who produced this DVD, also reprinted in 1992 the anti-Anglican and pro-*Solemn League and Covenant* work by Thomas Hamilton, *History of Presbyterianism in Ireland*, 1887, discussed at "5," "The Restoration in the Scottish Context of the Williamite Settlement," *infra*.

Thus we see that among those who glorify Samuel Rutherford and Oliver Cromwell, there is a gradient between a more conservative end (e.g., Rushdoony), and a more liberal end (e.g., Rosebery in the UK; or the Rutherford Institute on *Lawrence v. Texas* in the USA). While those at the respective ends of this gradient cannot agree on where to draw the line on their principle of “reason” overruling Divine Law, nevertheless, they all see Samuel Rutherford and Oliver Cromwell as pointers in the right direction, in showing them the way to attain “freedom” from “tyranny,” by placing the so called “great brain of man” *over* the Word of God, rather than men humbly submitting themselves *to* the Word of God. Thus Rutherford may act as *the thin edge of the wedge* to introduce religious liberalism into various churches, even though the philosophy of Rutherford and Cromwell might first be so introduced to a church by someone at the more conservative end of Rutherford’s supporters.

It should also be noted that the issue of “freedom” and “tyranny” may have relativistic perceptions. For example, what the English Puritan revolutionaries called “freedom,” the Anglicans called “tyranny.” Or what those promoting the “human rights” agenda in the post World War Two era call “freedom,” has led to the most horrendous intellectual and academic tyranny against these academics’ intellectual superiors and moral betters, who have been effectively “locked out” of the so called “halls of learning” at college or university level for years, by, for example, intellectually inter-mediate and morally putrid academics using their marking systems to replicate their power structures. And similar issues exist across the board.

We thus see how in the USA republic, and in the UK following its adoption of a modified form of American secularism in the 19th century; how the subsequent growth of more and more religious liberalism can develop from this starting point of Samuel Rutherford and Oliver Cromwell.

This same fuller outgrowth was not seen as clearly in the Puritan’s revolutionary republic of the 1640s and 1650, because the thing collapsed in on itself fairly quickly; although it came out in the wash following the Restoration in 1660, that many either were, or became, Deists or a vaguely defined Theists, who are one of the groups called by St. John the Divine in Revelation 21:8, the “unbelieving” who “shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone.” English and Irish Puritan revolutionary propaganda seeks to conceal this element of the revolution. Consider, for example, the case of Edward Herbt who died in 1648 and is generally considered “*The father of English Deism.*” As early as 1624 he had argued that knowledge of God should be based on so called reason not revelation. In May 1642 he was imprisoned by the Puritan legislature for urging that a resolution against King Charles be modified, and he then decided to take no further active part in the civil war. He metaphorically cringed and whimpered in a corner of his Montgomery Castle, and in cowardly manner refused a summons by His Majesty King Charles the First. Then, when the Roundhead’s Puritan army came for him in 1644, he metaphorically “hoisted a white flag,” and “waved a yellow feather,” for he “was no hero.” Arriving in London, he kow-towed down to the republicans, and pledged his submission to this revolutionary regime, and for his treason

against the Crown he was granted a special pension. Then in 1645 he published his book, entitled, “Of the Religion of the Heathens,” in which after studying heathen religions he came up with what have become the “Five Articles” of English Deists, which it must be said, are more the beliefs of what we would now call a vaguely defined Theist, than a Deist. For try and try as he might, Herbt could never get beyond a common grace recognition of “THE UNKNOWN GOD” of Acts 17:23, whom he recognized as the Romans 1:20 type Creator. Why were so many republicans of the revolutionary 1640s and 1650s era attracted to such a “vain” “philosophy” (Col. 2:8)? Because for their rebellion against the lawful authority of the Crown, for like the later 1770s and 1780s American Revolutionaries, they “received to themselves damnation” (Rom. 13:2), and somehow, they just could not believe in Christianity anymore.

The Deism or vaguely defined Theism of so many from the 1640s and 1650s republican revolution came out in the wash more after the Restoration because it was so short-lived, there being from the time of the last organized royalist resistance with the surrender of Dunnottar Castle (near Stonehaven, Scotland,) in May 1652, till the Restoration in May 1660, just some eight years⁵³. But this outgrowth and nexus was more quickly apparent in the American Revolution of the 1770s.

Hence when I was in Boston, USA, in March 2009, I walked the red line on the ground of *The Boston ... Trail* (they call it, “the Freedom Trail”). Among other things it took me to a Puritan Church called “Old South Meeting House,” with a big sign at the door reading, “NO TAX on TEA!!” This was the place of the Boston Tea Party, a Puritan Church in which Benjamin Franklin had been baptized. And inside there were Primary School children with school teachers re-enacting elements of the Boston Tea Party and American Revolution, and students were being incited by the teacher to seditiously yell out to burn down the Governor’s House. Of course, His Excellency the Governor was the representative of the Crown. And this Boston red-line trail also took me to King’s Chapel, which was the first Anglican Church of Boston founded in 1686. But it is no longer an Anglican Church, because after the American Revolution they gave it to the virulently anti-Trinitarian, Unitarians, and it then became the first Unitarian Church in the United States of America. That is because the secularist revolutionaries first killed, or drove out of town, what today we would call the Evangelical Anglicans, because they believed the words of Scripture in I Peter 2:17, “Fear God. Honour the king.” And only once they were gone, did the USA republic grant their so called, “religious liberty.”

Indeed, to this day, “Protestant” in the USA tends to mean, or carry the connotation of *Puritan* Protestant, i.e., rather than *Anglican* or *Lutheran* Protestant; since from the time of the American Revolution there has never been a strong presence of what came to be called from the 19th century, the *Low Church Evangelical Anglican*, and

⁵³ With respect to such Deism or vaguely defined Theism and the revolutionaries, see the associated issue of “atheism” with regard to “they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation” in Rom. 13:2, in Dean Sprat’s 1684 sermon at “7g) Royal Oak Day Sermons,” *infra*.

Lutherans have also been fairly small in number. The matter is further complicated by the rise of Puseyism and religious liberalism from the 19th century, with the largest Anglican Church in the USA, ECUSA (*Episcopal Church in the USA*, or, *Protestant Episcopal Church in the USA*), now being generally Puseyite or semi-Puseyite and religiously liberal; so that many of the old Puritan anti-Anglican depictions of the Anglican “bogeyman,” are set against the backdrop of these admittedly very unProtestant Puseyite religious liberals, who do not represent anything even roughly approximating the true and historical form of pre-American Revolution Anglicanism as set forth in the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 and 39 Articles. Starting from a bad post-American Revolution base in 1801, e.g., the denial of the *Athanasian Creed* (Article 8, 39 Articles), the denial of *The Establishment Principle* (Article 37, 39 Articles), or the removal of *King Charles I’s Day* from their Calendar, ECUSA has also further greatly deteriorated in spiritual and moral standards from its compromised starting point with e.g., women priests and tolerance towards homosexuality; and while some attempts have been made to plant a *Low Church Evangelical Anglican* seed in the USA, it has never been particularly successful, in part due to the American nationalist sentiment which is generally pro-American Revolution⁵⁴. Of course, the deplorable state of Anglicanism in large sections of e.g., the *Church of England* or Anglican Church of Canada, shows that the absence of the monarch as Head of State is only one of the factors that has acted to cripple Anglicanism in historically modern times, reducing it from its glory days as the Flag Ship of the Protestant Fleet, once known as *The Bulwark of the Reformation*.

Sadly, that USA model of a secular state, with some modification, was largely mimicked in the United Kingdom in the 19th century, when to get rid of what today we would call Low Church Evangelical Anglicans, whom they perceived would because of their belief in the Bible be hostile to the secular state; they dare not, as in America, kill and drive them from town for they were the historic *Church of England* and there were then far too many of them for that. So instead, they opened up the Anglican Church to Puseyites, semi-Puseyites, and religious liberals, thus striking down the authority of the Bible inside of Anglicanism, and crippling the *Church of England’s* effectiveness; a policy which they coupled with other secularizing policies. These type of secular policies were also exported throughout the British Empire of the 19th century to e.g., Canada, New Zealand, and Australia. In time, they would e.g., cripple the UK, destroy the British Empire, and be part and parcel in the ruination of the wider Anglican Church. “The Bulwark” is broken! “Vanity of vanities, saith the Preacher, vanity of vanities; all is vanity” (Eccl. 1:2).

⁵⁴ See my comments on the *Reformed Episcopal Church in America* and the *Anglican Church in North America* in Textual Commentary Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” section “c) i) Charles the First’s Day (30 Jan), Charles the Second’s Day (or Royal Oak Day) (29 May), & Papists’ Conspiracy Day (5 Nov),” subsection, “The removal of religious liberty to Puritans from 1662 to 1689.”