Matt. 21:4 "all" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*olon* (all)," in the words, "All (*olon*) this was done" (AV), are supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.).   It is also supported by Latin, "*totum* (all)," in Latin Vulgate Codices E (*Codex Egertonensis*, 8th / 9th century, London, UK), R (*Codex Rushworthianus*, 8th / 9th century, Oxford, England), and W (*Codex Willelmi*, 1245 A.D., London, England), as well as old Latin Version q (6th / 7th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is further supported by the early mediaeval church writer, Pseudo-Chrysostom in a Latin work (6th century).

However, a variant omits Greek, "*olon* (all)," and so reads simply, "This was done," (or if the "*de*" is translated, "Now this was done").   It is further found in about 2½ dozen Latin Vulgate Codices (itemized in Merk's *Novum Testamentum*), as well as old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text reading which is therefore correct.   The origins of the variant are conjectural.

Was this an accidental omission?   Was "*olon* (all)" lost in an undetected paper fade?   Or did the rapid eye movement of a negligently sloppy scribe simply pass over so short a word?

Was this a deliberate omission?   The probable origins of the variant with Origen enhances the likelihood of this.   Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, consider the inclusion of "*olon*" here was "too verbose"?   Did he then prune away this "unnecessary wordage"?

A deliberate or accidental change?   We cannot be sure.   But we can be sure that this was a change to the *Textus Receptus* here preserved for us in the hundreds and thousands of Byzantine texts underpinning the representative Byzantine text.

As the majority Byzantine Greek reading, the TR's reading here has strong support in the Greek from ancient times, together with some minority support in the Latin textual tradition.   By contrast, as the majority Latin reading the variant has strong support in the Latin dating from ancient times, but fairly weak support in the Greek.   In

considering these factors, and bearing in mind the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 21:4 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 21:4, "all," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); at the hand of a third "corrector scribe" of (the mixed text type) Codex C 04; and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions, and a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; Armenian Version (5th century); Anglo-Saxon Version (8th to 10th centuries); and as Latin, "*totum* (all)," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the incorrect reading that omits, "all," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found as the original reading of (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type). It is also found in Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect variant entered the NU Text *et al*. Notwithstanding footnotes referring to the TR's reading in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) (although this is a normative element of Tischendorf's very useful textual apparatus), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993), the unanimity among neo-Alexandrian texts here at Matt. 21:4 thus acts to exhibit the Neo-Alexandrian School's circular general maxim, "The shorter reading is the better reading."

This incorrect and pruned reading is thus found at Matt. 21:4 in the American Standard Version (translating the "*de*" as "Now") as, "Now this is come to pass" (ASV); or in the New American Standard Bible (not translating the "*de*") as, "This took place"

(NASB 3rd ed. 1995). This incorrect reading is also found in the NASB (1st ed. & 2nd ed.), RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

Matt. 21:5b "and a colt" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Remarks.

One of the wider literary stylistic features of Matthean Greek relates to Old Testament quotations. St. Matthew will sometimes make a parenthetical reference to another Scripture in between his introductory words and his ultimate OT Scripture citation (e.g., see commentary at Matt. 13:35 on Matt. 27:8-10). This is relevant here at Matt. 21:5b since St. Matthew first uses the introductory words, "All this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying" (Matt. 21:4), where "the prophet" is Zechariah. But in typical Matthean Greek wider stylistic form, he first makes a parenthetical OT quote from the Septuagint rendering of Isaiah 62:11, "*Eipate* (Tell ye) *te* (the) *thugatri* (daughter) *Sion* (Sion)" (Matt. 21:5, 1st part of verse); and this is then followed by the awaited OT quote, in this instance, a Septuagint influenced but non-Septuagint Greek quote from Zech. 9:9, in completion of his introductory words (Matt. 21:4), "Behold, thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass" (Matt. 21:5, 2nd part of verse) (AV).

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 21:5b, the TR's Greek, "*kai* (and) *polon* (a colt)," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53, Washington, D.C., USA), and the magnificently illuminated purple parchment, Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century, Rossano, Italy); as well as the two Sydney University Lectionaries written in brown ink with colourful bright red illumination of key letters and section markers, to wit, Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). It is also supported as Latin, "*et* (and) *pullum* ('a young animal' or 'a colt')," in the *Versio Vulgata Hieronymi* (Jerome's Vulgate Version, 4th / 5th centuries), and *Codex Vercellensis* (old Latin Version a, 4th century), *Codex Palatinus* (old Latin Version e, 4th / 5th century), *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis* (old Latin Version d, 5th century), *Codex Corbeiensis* (old Latin Version ff2, 5th century), *Codex Claromontanus* (old Latin Version h, 5th century), *Codex Brixianus* (old Latin Version f, 6th century), *Codex Monacensis* (old Latin Version q, 6th / 7th century), *Codex Aureus* (old Latin Version aur, 7th century), *Codex Rehdigeranus* (old Latin Version 1, 7th / 8th century), *Codex Sangermanensis* (old Latin Version g1, 8th / 9th century), and *Codex Colbertinus* (old Latin Version c, 12th / 13th century); as well *Codex Ardmachanus* (Book of Armagh, 812 A.D.). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the *Vulgata Clementina* (Clementine Vulgate, 1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

However, a variant adding, Greek, "*epi* (upon)," and so reading, "*kai* (and) *epi* (upon) *polon* (a colt)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex N 022 (6th

century).   It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text here, which at the point of these words from Zech. 9:9 (though not at other points of this OT verse,) has the same reading as the Greek Septuagint.   The origins of the variant are speculative.   Both readings were known to Origen who is the probable originator of this variant.

Was this an accidental addition?   Did Origen, thinking through in his mind the words, "*kai* (and) *epibebekos* (sitting upon) *epi* (upon) *onon* (an ass), *kai* (and) *polon* (a colt)," as he wrote them down after remembering them momentarily from his original manuscript, get this multiple use of "*kai*" and "*epi*" mixed up in his head and so write down, "*kai* (and) *epibebekos* (sitting upon) *epi* (upon) *onon* (an ass), *kai* (and) *epi* (upon) *polon* (a colt)," without realizing he had thus made a copyist's error?   Did Origen just "get a little bit dizzy in the head" when he was copying this out?

Was this a deliberate addition?   Did Origen deliberately add "*epi* (upon)" before "*polon* (a colt)," as some kind of "innovative stylistic balance" to having "*epi* (upon)" before "*onon* (an ass)"?   Did Origen "pat himself on the back" for this "brilliant idea"?

A dizzy-headed Origen?   Or an Origen who patted himself on the back?   We just do not know.   But as with so many of these variants that appear to have originated with Origen, we are left to exclaim, "*Oh Origen!   Not again!!*"

The TR's reading has impressive support as the majority Greek reading dating from ancient times, and the majority Latin reading dating from ancient times.   By contrast, the variant is a fairly slim minority Greek reading with no support in the Latin. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 21:5b an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 21:5b, "and a colt," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century).   It is further found in what the neo-Alexandrians call their "queen of minuscules," Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type, National Library, Paris, France); as well as Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), 579 (13th century, mixed text).   It is also found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.   It is further found in

the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century, classified by some, mainly in former times, as "Caesarean" Text); and as Latin, "*et* (and) *pullo* ('a young animal' or 'a colt')," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the incorrect reading which conflates this reading by adding, "upon" and thus reading, "and riding upon a colt," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent); and the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) and Pesitto Versions; and found enclosed by critical signs indicating that it is not the representative text, in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; as well as the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) Version; and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

At Matt. 21:5b, the scribes of the ancient Alexandrian School, like their successors in the textual critics of the modern Neo-Alexandrian School, were attracted to Origen's variant like flies to a dunghill. They were joined by other "flies" such as those of Dillmann's Ethiopic Version. Thus the variant entered the NU Text *et al.*

The erroneous reading is found "flying around" Matt. 21:5b in the ASV as, "And upon a colt." This incorrect reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV. The "smell of Origen's dunghill" attracted "still more flies," for the reading is also to be found in NEB, REB, TCNT; and "of course," the Moffatt Bible, which here reads, "and on a colt."

Matt. 21:6 "commanded" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Remarks.

Manuscript W 032 is a paper codex held at the Freer Gallery of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., USA, that I was privileged and excited to see (but not touch) in March 2009. It is clear from my photocopy of a Facsimile (Sydney University copy), that at the right-hand bottom of the page containing Matt. 20:30-21:6, the paper had some round marking on it that the scribe either could not, or did not want to, write over. Thus only about three-quarters (or *c.* 75%) of the second last line is written on, and this contains the letters, "ΠΡΟCΕ" (*prose*), and then the last line starts with the letters "TAZEN" (with a line on top of the "Z" = *x*) (*taxen*); so that the TR's "*prosetaxen* (commanded)" is written over two lines.

We live in an age when such a piece of marked paper with e.g., a coffee-cup or tea-cup stain on it would be thrown out and another one printed off, rather than mailed to someone. We have an accessibility to paper unknown in ancient times (even though nowadays increasingly more of the written page is done electronically with emails,

computer discs, and the internet). We Protestants who believe in the universal priesthood of all believers (I Peter 2:9; Rev. 5:10) under our "great high priest," "Jesus the Son of God" (Heb. 4:14); have as part of that tremendous privilege and blessing, individual custody of our copies of the Bible.

In carrying around our King James Bibles we exhibit our status as priests, for the Pentateuch written by Holy Moses was kept in the Ark of Covenant i.e., the priest's possession (Exod. 25:16; Deut. 31:26). Of course, all of Israel were in one sense "a kingdom of priests" (Exod. 19:6), and so Jews in a more general sense were able to get copies of the OT (Rom. 3:2). But do we greater number of Christians of Gentile race, together with that smaller number of Christians of Jewish race, always remember to thank God for this wonderful fact? Are we as grateful as we should be for the fact that we priests have care and custody of our very own copy of the Oracles of God in our printed Bibles? (Of course, only the original languages are inspired, nevertheless, the King James Version, though not a perfect translation, is clearly the best available English translation). W 032 here reminds us that the paper quality and accessibility we have today, plus the benefits of the printing press with affordable copies of the Bible, were not always present. *Let us thank God for his great blessings to us-ward, most especially, for our King James Bibles!*

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter: Greek. In Lectionary 2378 the TR's "*prosetaxen* (commanded)" is written over two lines. The "*pros*" is clearly visible on one line, and after a letter space gap at the start of the next line, there follows "*taxen*". On the basis of my positive and negative microfilm photocopies of this Lectionary, it looked to me like a paper fade of the "*e*" (epsilon) may have occurred at the start of the second line.

Upon checking the original Lectionary 2378 at Sydney University I found that there was indeed a faint and faded epsilon (ε), BUT at the end of the first line, followed by a stylistic blank letter space at the start of the second line. Thus while my conjecture of a faded "ε" was correct, my working theory as to its location required modification. Unless, of course, there was an original complete fade at the start of line 2, and a subsequent "corrector" scribe then added in an "ε" at the end of the first line in a lower quality ink. But I lack the scientific equipment to investigate such possibilities. Either way, it is clear that this Lectionary here reads, "*prosetaxen* (he commanded)" (TR) not "*sunetaxen* (he appointed)" (variant).

The Second Matter: Latin. None of the textual apparatuses that refer to this reading, Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), von Soden (1913), nor Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993), make any reference to the Latin. The TR's Greek *prosetaxen* from *prostasso*[1], means "he commanded," whereas the variant's *sunetaxen* from *suntasso*[2],

---

[1] Indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *prostasso*.

[2] Indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *suntasso*.

means "he appointed" or "he directed" or "he instructed." The Latin Vulgate and old Latin Versions (other than d[3]), manifested in the Clementine, read, "*praecepit* (indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *praecepio*)," and while the root Latin word, *praecepio*, can mean "command" (Stelten's *Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Latin*, 1995) and thus equate the root Greek word of the TR, *prostass<u>o</u>*; *praecepio* can also mean "to direct" (Woodhouse's *Latin Dictionary*, 1913), and thus equate the root Greek word of the variant, *suntass<u>o</u>*.

This appears to explain the absence of reference to the Latin at Matt. 21:6 in the textual apparatuses, *supra*. But is this the best view? Looking at the wider NT usage of the Greek "*prosetaxen* (or without the optional "*n*" *prosetaxe*, 'he commanded' = 'commanded,' AV, indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *prostass<u>o</u>*)," we find that it is rendered by the Latin, "*praecepit*," in the Vulgate and old Latin Versions, and manifested in the Clementine, at Matt. 1:24 (other than ff1[4]); 8:4 (other than aur[5]); Mark 1:44; Luke 5:14; and by the Latin, "*iussit* ('he commanded,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *iussit*)," at Acts 10:48 (other than d & e[6]) where it is manifested in the Clementine as "*jussit*". By contrast, we find that the Greek, "*sunetaxen* (or without the optional "*n*" *sunetaxe*, 'he appointed' or 'he directed' or 'he instructed,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *suntass<u>o</u>*)," is rendered by the Latin, "*constituit* ('he appointed,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *constituo*)," in the Vulgate and most old Latin Versions, and manifested in the Clementine at Matt. 26:19 (other than a, b, f, & h[7]); 27:10 (other than f & a[8]).

On the one hand, the type of concerns evident in the silence with regard to the Latin at Matt. 21:6 found in the textual apparatuses of Tischendorf, von Soden, and

---

[3] Old Latin d still has the same root Latin word, reading, "*praeceperat* (indicative active pluperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *praecepio*)."

[4] Old Latin ff1 still has the same root Latin word, reading, "*praeceperat* (indicative active pluperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *praecepio*)."

[5] Old Latin aur still has the same root Latin word, reading, "*praecipit* (indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *praecepio*)."

[6] Old Latin d and e (not to be confused with the Gospels e, *Codex Palatinus*, 4th / 5th century, Trent, Dublin, Rome, & London), this is old Latin e, *Codex Laudianus* (Bodleian Library, Oxford, 6th century), read "*praecepit* (indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *praecepio*)."

[7] Old Latin a reads, "*praeceperat* (indicative active pluperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *praecepio*);" whereas old Latin h, f, & h read, "*praecepit* (indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *praecepio*)."

[8] Old Latin f reads, "*praecepit* (indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *praecepio*)."

Nestle-Aland, *supra*, may be argued with regard to the pliability of the Latin *praecepio* evident in its usage for both the Greek *prostasso* and *suntasso* in e.g., old Latin versions a, b, f, and h.   Moreover, showing the further pliability of the Latin *praecepio*, we find in Mark 11:6 that Greek, "*eneteilato* ('he had commanded' = 'had commanded,' AV, indicative middle aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *entello* or some list the middle voice as *entellomai*)," is rendered in the Vulgate as, "*praeceperat* (indicative active pluperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *praecepio*)."   (But the contrast in form between the Vulgate's "*praecepit*" at Matt. 21:6 and "*praeceperat*" at Mark 11:6, means I consider the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is following Matt. 21:6, *infra*.)   But on the other hand, it is notable that the Latin Vulgate and most old Latin Versions, as manifested in the Clementine, make a stylistic distinction in which the Greek "*prosetaxen* (he commanded)" is rendered by the Latin, "*praecepit* (he commanded)," whereas the Greek "*sunetaxen* (he appointed)" is rendered by the Latin, "*constituit* (he appointed)."

Therefore it seems to me that on the balance of probabilities, one can fairly say the Latin textual tradition here supports the reading of the Greek Received Text at Matt. 21:6, *infra*.   And what of the fact that Tischendorf, von Soden, and Nestle-Aland, were evidently not of this same opinion?   In the first place I say of their textual apparatuses, *Caveat lector!*[9]   And in the second place, and final analysis with regard to these scholastic differences of opinion as to how, in broad overview, we consider this or that Latin scribe is rendering the Greek into the Latin here at Matt. 21:6, I recognize diversity of opinion, saying, *Ad libitum!* [10]

The Third Matter: Arabic from a Latin translation.   The Arabic Diatessaron's 12th-14th centuries Arabic for Matt. 21:6 is rendered by Ciasca's 19th century Latin as, "*mandavit* ('he commanded,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *mando*)."   But as to what Ciasca was rendering this from in the underpinning Arabic, and what in turn the Arabic might be said to be best rendering from the Greek, I do not know.   Therefore no reference will be made to Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.   Of course, the matter is of no serious consequence for determining the text, since the Arabic Diatessaron is outside the closed class of sources.   Hence like other manuscripts outside the closed class of sources, examination of them is purely optional, and at best of only passing interest to we neo-Byzantines.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 21:6 the TR's Greek, "*prosetaxen* (commanded)," in the wider words, "and did as Jesus commanded them," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.).   It is also supported as Latin, "*praecepit* (commanded)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century for earliest Vulgate Codices in the Gospels), and old Latin Versions

---

[9]   A Latin saying meaning, "Let the reader beware!"

[10]   A Latin saying meaning for someone to do, "As you wish!"

a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.) and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Eusebius (d. 339).

However, a variant reading, "*sunetaxen* ('appointed' or 'directed' or 'instructed')," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 1604 (13th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is thus correct. The origins of the variant are conjectural.

Was this an accidental alteration? Following a partial paper fade / loss, did the original "προσεταξεν" (*prosetaxen*) come to look something like, "::℧:εταξεν"? Was this "reconstructed" by a scribe as "συνεταξεν" (*sunetaxen*)? If so, was this done with some reference to the "*sunetaxen*" of Matt. 26:19; 27:10?

Was this a deliberate alteration? Did a religiously liberal scribe, considering the statement that "Jesus commanded (*prosetaxen*) them" at Matt. 21:5 to "sound too authoritarian," consider that to say Christ "appointed (*sunetaxen*)" them was "more in harmony with" this scribe's weakly and sickly perverted conception of "a loving Christ"? If so, did this scribe "trim down the Biblical Jesus" in favour of his "less authoritarian Jesus," with some reference to the terminology of "he appointed (*sunetaxen*)" at Matt. 26:19; 27:10?

A deliberate or accidental alteration? The answer to that question is lost to us in a historical dark age of unrecorded textual transmission history. But the fact of this alteration is not lost to us, and that is the most important thing.

The TR's reading has strong support in the Greek. While I consider it also has strong support in the Latin because on the balance of probabilities I consider the Latin "*praecepit* (commanded)" is being used to here render the Greek, "*prosetaxen* (commanded);" I also recognize that this is a matter where there are scholastic differences of opinion, and others may consider "the matters are too line-ball to call it." But either way, even if we take the issue of Latin support out of the equation, the comparison between the TR's reading which has majority Byzantine Greek text support dating from ancient times, compared with the variant's very weak support in the Greek, is the comparison in Greek manuscript support between "the mighty elephant" of the *Textus Receptus* and "the ant" of the variant. With no good textual argument against the majority Byzantine text reading, it is thus a case of, *The elephant tramples the ant.* On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 21:6 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 21:6, "commanded," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.

However, the variant, "appointed," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 700 (11th century, independent).

How was the split at Matt. 21:6 between the two leading Alexandrian texts to be resolved by the neo-Alexandrians? What were they to do? For Tischendorf the answer was easy. He would, as per normal, follow his favoured Alexandrian text of Codex Sinaiticus, and thus for the wrong reasons, he adopted the right reading in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72). For Westcott & Hort the answer was also easy. They would, as per normal, follow their favoured Alexandrian text of Codex Vaticanus, and thus they adopted the variant reading in Westcott & Hort (1881). For Nestle's 21st edition (1952) and their successors in Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) the answer was not quite as simple, but was resolved along their normative lines of placing one in the main text and one as a footnote alternative. But which one would go in the main text? On this occasion they chose the variant. For the UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) the matter was now straightforward. Their policy was to have the same main text in both Nestle-Aland and the UBS i.e., the NU Text; so that the same NU Text Committee in fact produced the same neo-Alexandrian Greek text in two different formats, the main difference being that UBS footnotes are fairly few and far between, although when they appear, they are generally much better with the information they give than are the Nestle-Aland ones, which though more plentiful, contain less information.

And so it was, that notwithstanding "a bit of argey-bargey" between Tischendorf and Westcott & Hort as to which was "the better" of the two main Alexandrian texts; in the end, the majority of neo-Alexandrian texts came to adopt the variant at Matt. 21:6[11].

---

[11] The rhyming, "argey-bargey" is an Australian colloquialism, localized in usage to some parts of Australia only. It is derived from the word, "barge," and refers to one or more persons barging into someone or something (in this instance, Tischendorf

The incorrect variant is found in the American Standard Version at Matt. 21:6 as "appointed" in, "and did even as Jesus appointed them" (ASV). It was likewise adopted by the New American Standard Bible (1995) as "instructed" (NASB, 3rd ed.), also found in the NIV; or by the English Standard Version as "directed" (ESV), also found in the NASB (1st ed. & 2nd ed.), RSV, and NRSV. Reminding us that for loose'n'liberal translations the niceties of distinguishing between the different nuances of Greek words may become "redundant," as they just "ride over the Greek roughshod" with their "dynamic equivalents;" the religiously liberal Moffatt reads "told" from "*prosetaxen*" (von Soden's text), in "and did as Jesus told them" (Moffatt Bible); and from "*sunetaxen*" the same rendering is found in the religiously liberal TEV, and Popish JB and NJB.

Matt. 21:7c "they set [him]" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter: Greek. In using von Soden's textual apparatus, sometimes one must combine data under various headings since he does not always use a separate heading for each reading.

E.g., here at Matt. 21:7c, von Soden's δ2 in his "H" group is Codex Sinaiticus (Alexandrian Text, 4th century), and his ε 449 in his "Iβb" group is Minuscule 16 (otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden's system, 14th century). In his main text, von Soden selects the reading, "επεκαθισεν" (*epekathisen* = 'he sat upon'). His apparatus says a) "εκαθ- I επεκαθ-" i.e., (from reference to his main text,) rather than "επεκαθισεν" the reading "εκαθισεν," and in his following symbols he says this includes δ2 and his Iβ group. But then in his next reading he says, b) "-καθισαν" i.e., the "αν" suffix (they enseated upon) rather than his main text's reading with the "εν" suffix (he sat upon), and in his following symbols he says this includes δ2 and ε 449 in his "Iβb" group. Since δ2 and ε 449 appears under both headings, this means the reading of both δ2 (Codex Sinaiticus) and ε 449 (Minuscule 16) is "εκαθισαν" (*ekathisan*, 'they enseated,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *kathizo*) (*Reading 1b*). Thus one must look under both of these headings to find any matching symbols in order to know which manuscripts read "εκαθισαν" (*ekathisan*) i.e., the reading "*ekathisan*" *is NOT given by von Soden under its own separate heading*.

In the context of Matt. 21:7c, where this word is followed by "*epano* (upon)," the meaning of Reading 1a, "*epekathisan* ('they enseated upon,' from *epikathizo* = *epi* / 'upon' + *kathizo* / 'to seat') *epano* (upon) *auton* (them)," i.e., "they set [him] thereon," is going to be the same as that of Reading 1b *ekathisan* ('they enseated,' from *kathizo*) *epano* (upon) *auton* (them)," i.e., "they set [him] thereon."

---

and Westcott & Hort barging into each other). It carries a connotation of aggressively knocking the other(s) out of the way; and it may also carry a connotation of undue energy and / or rudeness.

Given that Codex Sinaiticus is outside the closed class of sources, and Minuscule 16 is unclassified outside of von Soden's system, we cannot be sure of its text type, and so I would refer to neither of these manuscripts in the closed class of sources, *infra*. But what if Minuscule 16 (National Library, Paris, France) is one day classified beyond von Soden's system, and it is found to be Byzantine Text? Or for that matter, if some other manuscripts, e.g., a Greek Byzantine Text Lectionary is found to have this reading? Would I then say the TR's reading is "*epekathisan*" (*Reading 1a*) or "*ekathisan*" (*Reading 1b*)?

My answer to this would remain as "*epekathisan*" (*Reading 1a*). That is because we neo-Byzantines follow the representative Byzantine reading unless there is a good textual argument against it. While the majority Byzantine reading here is the variant, "*epekathisen* (he sat upon)" (*Reading 2a*), rather than the TR's "*epekathisan* (they enseated upon)" (*Reading 1a*), the dispute is not with the prefix i.e., there is no reason to doubt the root word is *epikathiz͟o* (*epi* / 'upon' + *kathiz͟o* / 'to seat'), since the dispute is to do with the declension of this root word. Thus even if one or more manuscripts were to be found to be Byzantine Text in which "*ekathisan*" from the root word *kathiz͟o* (to seat) were to be documented, i.e., thus showing "*ekathisan*" (*Reading 1b*) to be another minority Byzantine reading, I would still maintain that the TR's reading is the minority Byzantine reading, "*epekathisan*" (*Reading 1a*).

As to the origins of *Reading 1b*. Was it an accidental change brought about due to an undetected paper fade of the "*ep*" of "*epekathisan*" (*Reading 1a*)? Or was it a deliberate change, brought about by a desire to "standardize" terminology in St. Matthew's Gospel, and thus "standardize" it with the "*ekathisan* ('they sit,' = 'sit,' AV)" at Matt. 23:2?

The Second Matter: Latin. The relevant reading of the Latin Vulgate *et al* is, "*sedere* ('they enseated,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *sedeo*) *fecerunt* ('they made,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *facio*)," i.e., "they made sit."

Taken in isolation from all other factors, it would be *prima facie* possible to argue that for the purposes of textual analysis here at Matt. 21:7c, the relevant underpinning Greek that could be reconstructed from the Latin might be either "*epekathisan* ('they enseated upon,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *epikathiz͟o*) (*Reading 1a*) or "*ekathisan* ('they enseated,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *kathiz͟o*) (*Reading 1b*), *supra*. But bearing in mind the wider matters discussed at "The First Matter: Greek," *supra*, I shall show the Latin supporting the Greek reading, "*epekathisan*," *infra*. And even if, unlike myself, someone wanted to argue for a reconstruction of the underpinning Greek as "*ekathisan*" rather than "*epekathisan*," it would of course make no difference to English translation.

The Third Matter: Church Writers. Study of Scripture citations for Matt. 21:7c reminds us that where there are "parallel" accounts in the Gospels, it is not always clear what Gospel a church writer is referring to. E.g., in his Tract 124 on The Gospel

According to St. John, the ancient church Latin father and doctor, St. Augustine (d. 430), discusses the general account of Matt. 21:1-16; Mark 11:1-11; Luke 19:29-48. He twice says Latin, "*et* (and) *sedit* (he sat) *super* (upon) *eum* (him)[12]." These are the exact words found at Mark 11:7 in St. Jerome's Vulgate, and this is the Gospel I think St. Augustine is quoting from. But throughout this discourse, St. Austin nowhere specifically says what information he is taking from what Gospel account. This highlights for us a broader issue, to wit, where there are diverse readings, it may not be easy, or it may not be possible, to cite a church writer due to this uncertainty. The reader will note that a similar problem sometimes occurs with Diatessaron formatting issues.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 21:7c, the TR's Greek, "*epekathisan* ('they enseated upon' = 'they set [him],' AV, indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *epikathizo*) *epano* (upon) *auton* (them)" (*Reading 1a*), i.e., (retaining the AV's italics,) "they set *him* thereon" (AV), is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscules 245 (12th century, Moscow, Russia) and 291 (13th century, Paris, France). It is further supported as Latin, "*sedere* ('they enseated,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *sedeo*) *fecerunt* ('they made,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *facio*)," i.e., "they made sit," by Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), and g1 (8th / 9th century); as well as the Latin Lectionary, *Liber Comicus* (7th to 9th centuries, Iberian Peninsula, Western Europe[13]), the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.), and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is rendered from the Latin as, "made him sit," by Wycliffe (1380). It is also manifested in the Greek *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of Erasmus (1522), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633); and rendered from the Greek as, "set him," in Tyndale (1526 & 1534), Cranmer (1539), and the Geneva Bible (1557 & 1560).

However, a variant Greek, "*epekathisen* ('he sat upon,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *epikathizo* = *epi* / 'upon' + *kathizo* / 'to seat') *epano* (upon) *auton* (them)" (*Reading 2a*), i.e., "he sat thereon," is the majority Byzantine reading e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is so manifested in the Greek NT of Stephanus (1550). Or with the same contextual meaning, "*ekathisen*" ('he sat,' AV, indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *kathizo*) *epano* (upon)

---

[12]   Sancti Aurelii Augustini, *In Iohannis Evangelium*, *Tractatus CXXIV*, Typographi Brepols Editores Pontificii, Turnholti [Turnholt, Brepols, Belgium], 1954 A.D., *Corpus Christianorum*, *Series Latina*, XXXVI, *Aurelii Augustini Opera*, *Pars VIII*, Tract. LI, 4-6 (John 12:14-16), p. 441.

[13]   Morin, D.G. (Editor), *Liber Comicus*, Maredsoli in Monasterio S. Benedicti, 1893, p. 7 (Matthew 21:1-9).

aut<u>on</u> (them)" (*Reading 2b*), i.e., "he sat thereon," it is found as another minority Byzantine reading in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) and N 022 (6th century). This is further supported by Latin, "*sedebat* ('he was sitting' = 'he sat,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *sedo*)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); and Latin, "*sedit* ('he sat,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *sedo*)," in old Latin Versions h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and ancient Latin writer, Cyprian (d. 258)[14].

However, there is a textual problem with the representative Byzantine reading (*Reading 2a*). But before considering Matt. 21:7c, let us first consider the interplay of Greek "*kai*" and "*de*" in Matthean Greek. Both of these words are quite elastic conjunctions, potentially meaning, "and," "but," "now," etc. . St. Matthew sometimes uses "*de*" as an independent conjunction to start a thought / section (Matt. 3:1; 4:18; 6:7; 8:1; 16:6; 22:34; 23:13; 26:6; 26:57; 26:69; 27:50; 28:1)[15]. Moreover, he sometimes uses "*kai*" following a multiple antecedent usage of "*kai*," to start a thought / section, where context means this is clear e.g., "And (*Kai*) it came to pass" (Matt. 11:1; 13:53), "And (*Kai*) straightway Jesus constrained his disciples" etc. (Matt. 14:22), or "And (*Kai*) Jesus departed from thence" (Matt. 15:29); and other such instances (Matt. 4:23; 7:28; 8:14; 8:23; 8:28; 9:1; 9:9; 9:27; 9:35; 13:10; 14:13[16]; 14:22; 15:21; 15:29; 16:1; 16:5; 17:10; 17:14; 19:1; 19:16; 20:17; 20:23a[17]; 21:1; 21:12; 12:14; 21:23; 22:1; 24:1; & 26:1).

---

[14]   Hans Freiherr von Soden's *Das Lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur zeit Cyprians*, in Harnack, A, & Schmidt, C., *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur*, J.C. Hinrich's sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig, Germany, 1909, pp. 366-588, at p. 410 (Latin, "*sedebat*").

[15]   At Matt. 23:4, the TR's conjunction, "*gar* (for)," flows naturally in the words, "For (*gar*), they bind heaven burdens" etc., i.e., following on naturally from the antecedent words, "for they say, and do not" (Matt. 23:3). By contrast, the stronger stylistic break of the NU Text's "*de*," based on Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, clearly jars as not being Matthean Greek, since it here creates *too strong* a stylistic conjunction breaker for the subtleties St. Matthew's nuances.

[16]   The context here shows a clear break, thus making *kai* entirely appropriate for Matthean Greek; and so the stronger break of "*de*" at Matt. 14:13 in Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, found in the NU Text, is clearly an unwarranted intrusion.

[17]   Context suffices for "*kai*" at Matt. 20:23, since we first read, "*Legousin* (They say) *aut<u>o</u>* (unto him)," etc., and then immediately thereafter we read the matching response, "*Kai* (And) *legei* (he saith) *autois* (unto them)," etc. . Hence the stronger stylistic break of "*de*" introduced into the Alexandrian School's Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, and thereafter adopted into the Neo-Alexandrian School's NU Text, is a contextual stylistic "overkill" in the context of Matthean Greek.

However, where St. Matthew uses "*kai*" multiple times, and a listener / reader could all too easily becomes at least momentarily confused by a new thought / contrast / section starting with "*kai*," he less commonly starts the new thought / contrast / section with the stronger stylistic breaker of "*tote* ('then,' etc.)" (Matt. 2:16,17; 3:16,17; 16:19,20; 24:8,9; 24:10-13; 24:38-40; 24:49-25:1; 25:35-37; 25:42-44; & 27:1-3), or more commonly starts the new thought / contrast / section with the stronger stylistic breaker of "*de*." There are numerous examples of this (Matt.1:23,24; 1:24,25; 2:4,5; 3:2-4; 4:8-10; 4:13-17; 4:23-25; 5:29-31; 6:5-7; 6:19,20; 8:4,5; 8:9,10; 9:7,8; 9:11,12; 9:14-16; 9:30,31; 9:33,34; 10:1,2; 10:16-19; 11:1,2; 11:4-7; 11:12-16; 12:9-11; 12:13,14; 12:23,24; 13:4,5; 13:6,7; 13:7,8; 13:15,16; 13:25,26; 13:55-57; 14:22,23; 14:30,31; 14:31-33; 15:4,5; 15:31,32; 16:6,7; 16:12,13; 17:3,4; 17:15-17; 17:21,22; 17:23,24; 19:21,22; 20:5,6; 20:12,13; 21:17,18; 21:33,34; 22:10,11; 25:9-12; 25:29-31; 26:19,20; 26:47,48; 26:75-27:1; 27:30-32; 27:48,49; 27:51-54; 27:56,57; & 28:1-5).

But for our purposes, let us consider just a small sample of four passages, containing eight such examples of using "*kai*" multiple times followed by a stronger stylistic breaker of "*de*." The three passages are: Matt. 6:19,20 ("*de*" once); Matt. 14:22,23 ("*de*" once); Matt. 13:4-8 ("*de*" thrice translated, once redundant in English translation); and Matt. 1:23-2:1 ("*de*" twice).

Matt. 6:19,20 reads, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and (*kai*) rust doth corrupt, and (*kai*) where theives break through and (*kai*) steal. But (*de*) lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven" etc. . Here the stronger stylistic breaker of "*de*," alerts us to a contextual switch in focus by way of contrast.

Matt. 14:22,23 reads, "And (*Kai*) straightway Jesus constrained his disciples to get into a ship, and (*kai*) to go before him unto the other side, while he sent the multitudes away. And (*Kai*) when he had sent the multitudes away, he went up into a mountain to pray: and (*de*) when the evening was come, he was there alone." Here the stronger stylistic breaker of "*de*," alerts us to a contextual switch in focus.

Matt. 13:4-8 reads, "And (*Kai*) when he sowed, some seeds fell by the way side, and (*kai*) the fowls came and (*kai*) devoured them up: (*de*, redundant in English translation) some fell upon stony places, where they had not much earth: and (*kai*) forthwith they sprung up, because they had no deepness of earth: and (*de*) when the sun was up, they were scorched; and (*kai*) because they had no root, they withered away. And (*de*) some fell among thorns; and (*kai*) the thorns sprang up, and (*kai*) choked them: But (*de*) other fell into good ground, and (*kai*) brought forth fruit, some an hundredfold, some sixtyfold, some thirtyfold." Here the stronger stylistic breaker of "*de*," alerts us to a contextual switch in focus by way of a series of contrasts.

Matt. 1:23-2:1 reads, "Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and (*kai*) shall bring forth a son, and (*kai*) they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us. Then (*de*) Joseph being raised from sleep, did as the angel of the Lord had bidden (*prosetaxen*) him, and (*kai*) took unto him his wife: and (*kai*) knew her not till she

had brought forth her firstborn son: and (*kai*) he called his name JESUS. Now (*de*) when Jesus was born in Bethlehem" etc. . Here the stronger stylistic breaker of "*de*," alerts us to a contextual switch in focus. And the usage here of "*prosetaxen* (he had bidden)," acts to create a further stylistic similarity with the passage we now turn to, Matt. 21:6-8.

Matt. 21:6-8 reads in the TR, but using the majority Byzantine reading at Matt. 21:7c, "And (*de*) the disciples went, and (*kai*) did as Jesus commanded (*prosetaxen*) them, and (-, added in English translation) brought ('they brought,' *egagon*, indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *ag<u>o</u>*) the ass, and (*kai*) the colt, and (*kai*) put on ('they put on,' *epeth<u>e</u>kan*, indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *epitith<u>e</u>mi*) them their clothes, and (*kai*) he sat (*epekathisen*) thereon. And (*de*) a very great multitude spread their garments in the way" etc. .

A textual problem is now clearly evident with the words of Matt. 21:7c, "*kai* (and) *epekathisen* (he sat upon) *epano* (upon) *aut<u>on</u>* (them)," i.e., "and he sat thereon." There is a clear contextual switch in focus by way of contrast from what "they" did in fulfilling what "he commanded (*prosetaxen*)," found in the double use of 3rd person <u>plural</u> verbs (*egagon* = 'they brought' & *epeth<u>e</u>kan* = 'they put on'), to the 3rd person <u>singular</u> verb of what "he" did when "he sat (indicative active aorist, 3rd person <u>singular</u> verb, from *epikathiz<u>o</u>*) thereon." Such a switch is stylistically incongruous for Matthean Greek after a "*kai* (and)" following a multiple antecedent usage of "*kai* (and)" for connected matters. This is evident in the immediately following usage of "*de*" in "And (*de*) a very great multitude" etc. . Therefore in terms of Matthean Greek, either the "*kai* (and)" is wrong, or the "*epekathisen* (he sat upon)" is wrong at Matt. 21:7c.

Is there a variant reading "*de*" before the "*epekathisen* (he sat upon)"? The "*kai* (and)" is the majority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022; Lectionaries 2378 and 1968), and there is no Greek variant of "*de*." (It is found in the Latin as, "*et*" / "and.") Is there a variant which continues the double usage of the indicative active aorist 3rd person <u>plural</u> verbs (*egagon* = 'they brought' & *epeth<u>e</u>kan* = 'they put on'), so as to form a contextually linked triple usage of indicative active aorist 3rd person <u>plural</u> verbs? Such a reading is found in the minority Byzantine reading, "*epekathisan* ('they enseated upon,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *epikathiz<u>o</u>*)" (*Reading 1a*). Therefore this minority Byzantine reading must be the correct reading. (Cf. commentary at Matt. 22:7; 22:39; 23:23b.)

The origins of the variant are speculative.

Was this an accidental alteration? I here raise three possibilities. The first two are more uncertain than usual since I do not know the prior history of the cursive script relevant to matters I raise in connection with the Greek cursive scripts of Lectionaries 2378 and 1968. Hence I then complement these two conjectures with a third speculation that will stand up irrespective of the Greek script being used.

In Lectionary 2378, "*epekathisen*" is written over two lines, and ends with an unjoined iota (ι) followed by an epsilon that looks something like our number "6"

inverted to the right i.e., like as in the following box:

౨

and this is then joined to the nu (written as "μ" not "ν" but without the protrusion to the right of what would be a "μ" / mu) and in between these two letters in the space between the two lines, the sigma ("c").   Because I am familiar with Lectionary 2378, I know that it may write epsilon (e) as "E" (e.g., Matt. 21:1), "ε" (e.g., Matt. 21:6), something like a "G" (with the right bar going down further, e.g., Matt. 27:57[18]), or "6" (e.g., Matt. 14:14). While the alpha of this Lectionary's script may also be written as a closed circle, and may or may not be joined in running writing to the next letter, there will always be a protrusion from a right-hand bar, near the top of this enclosed circle for it to be an alpha, whether an ever so slight protrusion or a larger protrusion.   Hence I know this is an epsilon and not an alpha here at Matt. 21:7c.   Did a manuscript with some kind of similar letters, undergo a paper fade of the slight protrusion on the top of an alpha, with the consequence that the alpha was taken to be an epsilon of this kind?

Alternatively, in Lectionary 1968, the epsilon can look like a "c" as it does here (e.g., "*ekeinos*" / "that [one]" = "He" in "He answered," AV, in John 9:36, and is written with a "c" for epsilon at the start, and then has a "c" for sigma at the end[19]), and is joined in running writing to the nu written as "μ" not "ν" but without the protrusion to the right of what would be a "μ" / mu.   Did a scribe looking at a manuscript with an alpha, "α" in closer than normal proximity to such an adjoining nu, and who was familiar with epsilons looking like a "c", wrongly take this to be a "c" (epsilon) running into a nu ("μ" without the protrusion to the right), and so copy this as an "εν" (epsilon, nu) suffix rather than an "αν" (alpha, nu) suffix?

But with respect to these first two conjectures, it must be said that I am not familiar with the fuller history of the Greek cursive script in general, and its variant localized forms in particular.   Therefore, it is possible that these variant forms of epsilon found in the localized cursive scripts of one or both of these Lectionaries, in fact originated *too late in time* for such speculations to account for the rise of the majority Byzantine text variant.   Therefore, alternatively, was there a paper fade / loss of an entire "regular" looking alpha (A / α)?   Did a scribe, probably Origen, then "reconstruct" this as an epsilon (E / ε)?   If so, did Origen do so with some reference to the similar "*ekathisen*" of Mark 11:7?

Was this a deliberate alteration?   The variant's probable origins with Origen, who is notorious as one of the "many which corrupt the Word of God" (II Cor. 2:17), greatly enhances the likelihood of this possibility.   Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, deliberately seek to produce "a gospel harmony" that "gave the same contextual meaning" but which "still retained a difference due to diverse authors," by part-assimilating the Received Text's "*epekathisan* (they enseated upon) *epano* (upon)," to the

---

[18]   Lectionary 2378, p. 96a.

[19]   Lectionary 1968, p. 25b.

"*ekathisen* (he sat) *ep* ('upon' / 'thereon')" of Mark 11:7 and / or John 12:14 by making it "*epekathisen* (he sat upon) *epano* (upon)"?

      If so, this was a lot of fuming and fiddling by Origen that failed to also consider Luke 19:35 and understand the basic issues of legitimate diversity here.   For while it is true that from one perspective Jesus was here "enseated" in kingly fashion by the disciples, a notion harmonious with the kingly emphasis of St. Matthew's Gospel (Matt. 21:7c); and also evident in Luke 19:35 ("*epebibasan*," 'they set upon' = 'they set,' AV, indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *epibibazo*);" it is simultaneously true that having down so, Jesus himself then "sat ("*ekathisen*," 'he sat,' same word as Matt. 21:7c, *Reading 2b*)" upon the colt (Mark 11:7; John 12:14).

      A deliberate or accidental alteration?   We cannot be sure, but we can be sure that the majority Byzantine text variant is here an alteration to the Received Text.   To the question, "Where was the reading of the *Textus Receptus* at Matt. 21:7c over time and through time?," I reply, "It was first and foremost in St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate.   For which reason, the Morning Star of the Reformation, John Wycliffe, rendered it, 'made him sit' in 1380.   *Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum!*; which is, being interpreted from I Peter 1:25 in the Vulgate, 'The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever!!'"

      In the first place, the reading of the representative Byzantine Greek text screeches out like a screech owl, screeching out for a remedy here at Matt. 21:7c.   Hence sometime after his first edition of 1516, the learnèd Erasmus grew weary with "putting his fingers in his ears to stop hearing the noise of this screech owl," and so he adopted the TR's reading by the time of his 1522 edition.   And so too, when Stephanus, perhaps suffering under the fatigue of his arduous labours, due to the weakness of his human frailties made a sad mistake amidst his generally very good work, by letting the representative Byzantine reading at Matt. 21:7c back into his text (1550); there followed again the loud noise of this screech owl.   And so great was the consequent hubbub of this screeching owl, that the neo-Byzantines, Beza (1598) and Elzevir (1633) took it to be an alarm bell that sent them running to quickly quieten down this screeching noise.   (Cf. my comments on Stephanus at Matt. 23:13,14, "Preliminary Remarks.")

      Given its poor attestation in Greek manuscripts, it is not at all inconceivable that by the time of his 1522 edition, that past master of the Neo-Byzantine School, Erasmus, had reconstructed this Greek reading of the TR after comparing the representative Byzantine text with that of the Latin Vulgate.   If so, because his textual analysis was *on the Greek text*, it follows that this would be an example of the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, dutifully bowing low, as well it should, to the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*.   And if so, the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, here showed itself to be a most worthy and profitable assistant and helper to the Greek.

      But in the second place, the variant is the majority Byzantine text reading, dates from ancient times; and the minority Byzantine reading of the *Textus Receptus* has the

support of less than 10% of Greek manuscripts[20]. However, in the third place, the TR's reading has impressive Latin support from St. Jerome's Vulgate, which is quite probably where Erasmus got this reading from for his 1522 Greek NT. Quite autonomously from the presence of the TR's reading in other manuscripts of the Latin textual tradition, its presence in St. Jerome's Vulgate shows that the TR's reading had wide accessibility over time and through time, dating from ancient times. The testimony of the Received Text's reading in the Latin Vulgate of the church father and doctor, St. Jerome, is simply too significant to ignore or downplay. Weighing up these considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 21:7c a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 21:7c, "they set [him] upon (*epekathisan*) *epano* (upon)" (*Reading 1a*) i.e., "they set [him] upon," is found at the hand of a "corrector" of one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus; thus showing certain rivalries inside the ancient Alexandrian School of scribes, as one with a more tender conscience sort to undo the damage here done to the text by the original Alexandrian scribe of this exceedingly corrupt manuscript. It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century). Moreover, "they set [him] (*ekathisan*) *epano* (upon)" (*Reading 1b*) i.e., "they set [him] upon," is found as the original reading in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). *Reading 1* is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century).

However, the variant reading, "he sat upon (*epekathisen*) *epano* (upon)" (*Reading 2a*) i.e., "he sat upon," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is further found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), 579 (13th century, mixed text); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent).

Moreover, "he sat (*ekathisen*) *epano* (upon)" (*Reading 2b*) i.e., "he sat upon," is found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent) and 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere).

Furthermore, "he sat (*ekatheto*, 'he was sitting' = 'he sat,' indicative middle imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *kathemai*) *epano* (upon)" (*Reading 2c*[21]) i.e.,

---

[20]   Green's Textual Apparatus says the variant is followed by "95-100% of all" Greek "manuscripts."

[21]   With this middle as a deponent, and so having the same meaning as an indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb; compare this reading (outside the closed class of sources) with the Latin, "*sedebat* ('he was sitting' = 'he sat,' indicative

"he sat upon," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); as well as Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent).

Reading 2 (which for these generalist purposes I corporately unite) is further found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Thus among neo-Alexandrians from the time of Tischendorf on, who on this occasion preferred the reading of Codex Vaticanus as broadly supported by such "authorities" he refers to as Dillmann's Ethiopic Version, we find that the erroneous variant here at Matt. 21:7c appears in the main texts of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

Thus at Matt. 21:7c the erroneous variant is found in the ASV as, "and he sat thereon." So too, this incorrect reading is found in the neo-Alexandrian's NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, TEV, TCNT, NEB, REB, Moffatt Bible, JB, and NJB. They are joined in their error by the Majority Text Burgonites, for this incorrect reading is found in the main texts of Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). A footnote in the Burgonites NKJV reads here at Matt. 21:7 that the "NU-Text reads 'and He sat'," though it fails to refer to the fact that so does the Majority Text.

In the *Book of the Chronicles of Neo-Byzantine Defence of the Received Text* a most peculiar chapter is here writ with regard to Matt. 21:7c. The old Latin Papists who arose following the *Council of Trent* (1545-63), in harmony with the Clementine Vulgate at this point, correctly rendered this as, "and made him sit thereon" (Douay-Rheims). Then following the *Vatican II Council* (1962-5), the new neo-Alexandrian Papists arose, entering an alliance with the apostate Protestants of the Neo-Alexandrian School. First the neo-Alexandrian Papists said to the apostate Protestants, "We'll take care of these old Latin Papists here at Matt. 21:7c, just watch." The neo-Alexandrian Papists, coming up behind the old Latin Papists, who as fellow Papists trusted them, then thrust their daggers into the backs of the old Latin Papists, who fell down mortally wounded with the triumph among Papists of the [Roman] Catholic RSV, JB, and NJB here at Matt. 21:7c.

---

active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *sedo*)" (inside the closed class of sources). Hence for my purposes I shall designate this as *Reading 2c*. Given the diversity in the root Greek word of *Reading 2c* (*kath_emai*) relative to that of *Reading 2a* (*epikathiz_o*) & *2b* (*kathiz_o*), I would more normatively classify this as *Reading 3*. But given that a greater laxity applies to readings outside the closed class of sources, none of which are important, and all of which could, if we neo-Byzantines so wished, be totally ignored, (the main reason I spend so much space and time on them is to help the reader better understand where the trashy neo-Alexandrian texts are coming from,) on this particular occasion I shall group them altogether. And so too, I shall unite Dillmann's Ethiopic and other versions under a common *Reading 2* heading.

Then the neo-Alexandrian apostate Protestants, together with the Majority Text Burgonites, who here formed a triple alliance with neo-Alexandrian Papists, said to the Papists, "We'll take care of the neo-Byzantine Protestants here at Matt. 21:7c, just watch." Now the neo-Byzantines were located on a plateau on top of a hill. "We can see them with our binoculars," one of them exclaimed, "they're sitting down reading their King James Bibles." Another of them said, "Don't be a dill, man[22]. The founding father of the Neo-Alexandrian School, Constantine Tischendorf, says we've got the broad support of Dillmann's Ethiopic Version here at Matt. 21:7c, surely all those blacks from the Land of Cush can't be wrong!"

Thus the neo-Alexandrians, wishing to advance the interests of e.g., their NRSVs, ESVs, NIVs, and TEVs, and the Burgonites wishing to advance the interests of e.g., Hodges & Farstad's Majority Text, started to march up the backside of the mountain, intending thereby to cast daggers into the backs of the neo-Byzantine Protestants. But the neo-Byzantines, being more adroit than the old Latin Papists, and knowing than an enemy can "come from within," saw them coming from afar. Thus they slipped down into trenches and pulled concealment covers over their heads. The neo-Alexandrian Papists, having become impatient to see neo-Byzantine PROTESTANT blood, decided to march up the front side of the mountain to attack these hated neo-Byzantine Protestants, and thus advance the interests of their [Roman] Catholic RSVs, JBs and NJBs.

The neo-Alexandrian Papists coming up the mountain's front side, and the apostate Protestant neo-Alexandrians and Burgonites coming up the mountain's backside, both came to the plateau of the mountain at the same time. Not realizing that the neo-Byzantines were concealed in trenches with covers on top, they both took each other to be the hated neo-Byzantine Protestants, and so the battle was joined. It was a very bloody affair. Casualties on both side exceeded the 99% mark. As small remnants on both sides lay fatigued and often wounded from the battle, the Neo-Byzantine Protestants now sprang from their concealed trenches, and finished off their enemies from both sides. And so it was, and so it is, that the Received Text here at Matt. 21:7c was safeguarded[23].

Matt. 21:9 "that went before, and" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter: Greek (Lectionary). The TR's wider words for this reading

---

[22] "Dill" is an Australian colloquialism referring to an incompetent or foolish person.

[23] 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*

are, "*oi* ('the,' word 1) *de* ('And,' word 2) *ochloi* ('multitudes,' word 3) *oi* ('the [ones]' = 'that,' word 4) *proagontes* ('going before,' word 5), *kai* ('and,' word 6)" i.e., "And the multitudes that went before, and" etc. . However, Lectionary 1968 is missing words 2, 3, and 4. These were evidently lost by ellipsis as after writing, "*oi* ('the,' word 1)," the scribe's eye jumped from this first "*oi* ('the,' word 1)" to the next "*oi* ('the,' word 4)," which he thus wrongly took to be the first "*oi*", and he then just kept writing. But for my purposes I am concerned with the variant that adds after word 4, "*auton* ('him,' word 4b)," and hence I show Lectionary 1968 as supporting the TR's reading, *infra*.

The Second Matter: Latin (Diatessaron formatting). The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex. At Mark 11:9 the Vulgate reads, "*qui* (that) *praeibant* ('they were going before,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *praeeo*) *et* (and)" i.e., "they that went before and." This is certainly different to both the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron and reading of the Vulgate at Matt. 21:9, "*quae* (that) *praecedebant* ('they were going before,' from *praecedo*), *et* (and)" i.e., "that went before, and." Hence I show the Sangallensis Diatessaron supporting the TR's reading, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 21:9, the TR's Greek, "*oi* ('the [ones]' = 'that,' AV) *proagontes* ('going before' = 'went before,' AV, masculine plural nominative, active present participle, from *proago*), *kai* (and)," i.e., "that went before, and" in the wider words, "And the multitudes that went before, and that followed" etc. (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, "*quae* (that) *praecedebant* ('they were going before,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *praecedo*), *et* (and)," i.e., "that went before, and" in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century, '*praecebant*'[24]), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century, '*praecedebat*'[25]), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.) and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

---

[24] A syncopated form dropping the "d" and contracting the vowels.

[25] The "*quae* ('that,' nominative feminine pronoun)" can be either plural or singular. The plural form of the Vulgate *et al*, "*praecedebant* ('they were going before,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *praecedo*)," relates to an earlier, "*turbae* ('multitudes,' feminine plural nominative noun, from *turba*);" whereas the singular form of q, "*praecedebat* (indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *praecedo*)," relates to an earlier "*turba* ('multitude,' feminine singular nominative noun, from *turba*)." But for my immediate purposes here at Matt. 21:9 (though not necessarily in another context, see commentary at Vol. 1, Matt. 8:18; Vol. 2, Matt. 15:36e; Vol. 2 Appendix, Matt. 15:31b, referring to Matt. 8:18; 14:19c; 15:31a), the distinction between "multitudes" and "multitude" does not matter.

However, a variant adding "*auton* (him)," and so reading, "*oi* (that) *proagontes* (went before) *auton* (him), *kai* (and)," i.e., "that went before him, and" is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 1010 (12th century). It is further found added as Latin, "*eum* (him)," and thus reading Latin, "*quae* (that) *praecedebant* (they were going before) *eum* (him), *et* (and)," i.e., "that went before him, and" in old Latin Versions d (5th century) and ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Eusebius (d. 339).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must thus stand. The origins of the variant are speculative.

Was this an accidental alteration? In Manuscript Washington (W 032), an earlier "ΑΥΤωΝ (*auton*, 'of them')" in verse 8 (see Matt. 21:8 in Appendix 3) comes at the end of a line, and is abbreviated as something like "ΑΥΤω⸜¬"; and the "ΚΑΙ" here of verse 9, is abbreviated to something like "Κ,_,". Did the manuscript that a scribe, probably Origen, was looking at, use this or some similar abbreviation for "ΚΑΙ" which came at the end of a line? Was this then lost in a paper fade? Did Origen then "reconstruct" this either using some abbreviations himself, or working on the presupposition that some abbreviations had been originally used, which meant "*auton* (him), *kai* (and)"? Or bearing in mind that we know from *Codex Alexandrinus* (A 02) e.g., at column 2 of page 27b containing Matt. 26:46-26:73, that scribes sometimes would "squeeze in" words at the end of a line, did Origen consider that originally an "ΑΥΤωΝΚΑΙ" had been "squeezed in" i.e., looking something like, "ΑΥΤωΝΑΙ" at the end of a line?

Was this a deliberate alteration? The probability of this variant's origins with Origen, a man who when it suited his fleeting fancy, did like to "corrupt the Word of God" (II Cor. 2:17), increases this possibility. Did an arrogant and addle minded Origen consider he could here produce a "greater stylistic clarity" than "an old Jewish scallawag publican who collected taxes for the Gentile pagan Romans, like Matthew Levi, was capable of attaining to"?[26]

A deliberate or accidental change by Origen? Probably the latter, but possibly the former. However in either instance, we cannot doubt that this was a change to the reading of Holy Scripture.

The *Textus Receptus* (TR) reading here at Matt. 21:9 has strong support in the Byzantine textual tradition as the majority Greek reading from ancient times; and a corresponding strong support in the Latin textual tradition as the majority Latin reading from ancient times. This support in the Latin includes the Vulgate of the church father and doctor, St. Jerome. By contrast, the variant has no good textual argument to

---

[26] "Matthew the publican" (Matt. 10:3) was also called "Levi" (Luke 5:27-32; cf. 6:15). Cf. Matt. 22:15-22; Rom. 13:1-7.

commend it, looks very much like a "fiddling at the edges" type of "stylistic improvement" that Origen would undertake, and has weak support in both the Greek and Latin textual traditions. Under the circumstances, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 21:9 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 21:9, "that went before, and," is found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century) which is a Greek-Latin diglot with a Latin interlinear; and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels), 579 (13th century, mixed text); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent). It is further found in the Armenian Version (5th century).

However, the variant which conflates the text by adding, "him," and thus reading, "that went before him, and" is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); as well as Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 157 (12th century, independent text i.e., independent scribal corruption). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) Version; the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

From such sources, at Matt. 21:9 the erroneous variant entered the NU Text *et al.* The conflation, "him," is thus found as part of the words, "before him, and" in the ASV. This textual conflation is likewise found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, and NIV.

The Today's' English Version reads at Matt. 21:9, "Jesus" in, "walking in front of Jesus" (TEV). The implication of this "dynamic equivalent" is that the TEV translators agree with the erroneous variant, but wish to "clarify" it to "Jesus." In fairness to the TEV translators, they are simply acting as carry on and continuing later modern neo-Alexandrians "which corrupt the word of God" (II Cor. 2:17); in continuation of a similar sentiment evident in the addition of "him" by the earlier ancient Alexandrian School. It seems that these modern neo-Alexandrians are just "a chip off the old block" of the ancient Alexandrians in their desire to "corrupt the word of God" (II Cor. 2:17).

On the one hand, the pre-Vatican II Council old Latin Papists, both in the Clementine Vulgate and the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version, here have the correct reading i.e., "that went before and" (Douay-Rheims). But on the other hand, the

post-Vatican II Council new neo-Alexandrian Papists here followed the variant's conflation in both the Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles. Though the JB and NJB are based on the Alexandrian Texts, to the extent that they here concurs with the Western Greek text, there is a sense in which *the Papists "have fallen into their own trap,"* i.e., the new neo-Alexandrian Papists have here fallen headlong into an old trap spring-loaded by the Latin Church when making the bumblers and stumblers the Western Greek scribes.

It is a notable fact that here at Matt. 21:9, while the text of Scripture was kept pure by the Western Latin scribes copying out the Vulgate, by contrast, the Western Greek scribes corrupted this reading. Of course, it suited the purposes of the Western Latin Church to make their better quality scribes the Latin scribes, and their lower quality scribes the Greek scribes. While this may have been intended to give a perception that "the Latin is of more value than the Greek," in the longer term, this became a *localized* reality only i.e., *the Western Latin is of more value than the Western Greek.*

Both the scribes of the Alexandrian School and Greek Western School were among the "many which corrupt the word of God" (II Cor. 2:17). While the Alexandrian School scribes tended to prune the New Testament text, the Greek Western School scribes tended to conflate the text. But here, both schools of scribes found common cause in supporting a conflation that appealed to their vanities. Now the religiously liberal and apostate Protestant, James Moffatt (d. 1944), was a semi neo-Alexandrian who was sometimes attracted to Western Greek readings. In short, *he was exactly the type of dunderhead that the old Latin Church used to turn into a Greek scribe.* And so it was, that Moffatt was as a happy as a pig, wallowing in the mire of both the Alexandrian *and Western Greek* texts here, as he hog snorted out to add in "him" in his exceedingly corrupted Moffatt Bible, which in so many ways is a successor to the type of Greek textual standards, or lack thereof, found among the earlier Western Greek scribes.

Matt. 21:11a "Jesus the prophet" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*Iesous* ('Jesus,' word 1, masculine singular nominative noun, from *Iesou*) *o* ('the,' word 2, masculine singular nominative definite article, from *o*) *prophetes* ('prophet,' masculine singular nominative noun, from *prophetes*)," i.e., "Jesus the prophet" is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as Latin, "*Iesus* ('Jesus,' word 1) *propheta* ('the prophet,' words 2 & 3)," i.e., "Jesus the prophet," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century, spelling variant of words 2 & 3 as, "*profeta*"), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D., spelling variants as, "*Ihesus profeta*,") and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century, spelling variant of word 1 as, "*Ihesus*"). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Eusebius (d. 339), and Chrysostom (d. 407).

Variant 1, using only words 2 and 3, reads "*o* ('the,' word 2) *prophetes* (prophet)." This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscules 245 (12th century), 1198 (12th century), and 1200 (12th century). It is also found as Latin, "*propheta* ('the prophet,' words 2 & 3)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century) and aur (7th century).

Variant 2, using word order 2,3,1, reads "*o* ('the,' word 2) *prophetes* (prophet) *Iesous* (Jesus)," i.e., "the prophet Jesus." This is found as Latin, "*propheta* ('the prophet,' words 2 & 3) *Iesus* ('Jesus,' word 1)," in old Latin Version d (5th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Eusebius (d. 339). A similar minority Byzantine reading is found in Minuscule 548 (11th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which thus must stand. The origins of the variants are conjectural.

Was *Variant 1* an accidental alteration? In Manuscript Washington (W 032), and Lectionaries 2378 and 1968, "*Iesous* ('Jesus,' word 1)," is abbreviated from "*IHCOYC*" to "*IC*" with a line on top. Was such a "*IC* ('Jesus,' word 1)" lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate alteration? Did a scribe consider the "*Iesous* ('Jesus,' word 1)," at Matt. 21:11a was "unnecessary wordage" since general context and the name of "*Iesous* (Jesus)" at Matt. 21:6 "already made it clear who the prophet" of Matt. 22:11 "was"? Did he then regard it as a "stylistic improvement" to prune away the "*Iesous* ('Jesus,' word 1)," on the basis of "redundancy"?

The fact that the earliest citation for both the TR and *Variant 2* is Origen, a well known textual corrupter, means that he is the likely originator of this variant.

Was *Variant 2* an accidental alteration? In Manuscript Washington (W 032), and Lectionaries 2378 and 1968, "*Iesous* ('Jesus,' word 1)," is abbreviated from "*IHCOYC*" to "*IC*" with a line on top. We know from W 032 that sometimes a scribe might inadvertently miss a short word and then add it back in, for instance, at Matt. 24:2, the W 032 scribe first missed the word, "*ode* (here)," and then, realizing his error, wrote the word back in above the line, starting at the point where it should have been just left to the lambda ("l") of "*lithos* (stone)."

Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, first accidentally miss the "*IC* ('Jesus,' word 1)" and write "*o* ('the,' word 2) *prophetes* (prophet)"? Did he then realize his error? Not thinking the matter through with sufficient care, did he then think that there was "not any real difference of substance" between "Jesus the prophet" (TR) and "the prophet Jesus" (variant), and so did he then quickly add in "*IC* ('Jesus,' word 1)" after word 3, and keep writing?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate alteration? Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen,

consider it was some kind of "literary stylistic improvement" to say, "the prophet Jesus" (variant) rather than "Jesus the prophet" (TR)?   If so, did Origen then deliberately change the word order to 2,3,1 (variant)?

Deliberate or accidental alterations?   We cannot be sure?   But either way, it is clear that the two variants are corruptions of the text.

The TR's reading has strong support in the Greek and Latin textual traditions, as well as the further support of the ancient church doctor, St. John Chrysostom of Constantinople.   By contrast, *Variant 1* has weak support in the Greek and Latin, and no good textual argument to commend it.   *Variant 2* also has weak support in the Greek and Latin, and looks very much like the type of thing Origen would do.   Thus on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 21:11a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 21:11a, "Jesus the prophet," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 1071 (12th century, independent); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*.   It is further found in all extant Syriac Versions; Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century), and a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Variant 1, "the prophet," is found in Minuscules 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels) and 579 (13th century, mixed text); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.

Variant 2, "the prophet Jesus," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent) and 157 (12th century, independent).   It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Armenian Version (5th century).

The *New International Version* uses an eclectic text.   On this occasion, perhaps impressed by its presence in such diverse text types as the Byzantine Greek and Latin, as well as the Syriac and Coptic Middle Egyptian; for partially the right reasons and partially the wrong reasons, it adopted the correct reading here.   Thus at Matt. 21:11a it reads, "This is Jesus, the prophet" etc. (NIV).

Variant 2 was adopted by the NU Text *et al*.   Hence at Matt. 21:11a, the *American Standard Version* reads, "This is the prophet, Jesus" etc. (ASV).   So likewise, the erroneous *Variant 2* is found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, and TEV.

The old Latin Papists followed the correct reading in the Clementine Vulgate, and correctly rendered this at Matt. 21:11a in the Douay-Rheims as, "This is Jesus, the prophet" etc. (Douay-Rheims).   But the new neo-Alexandrian Papists followed the incorrect reading of the NU Text *et al*, and adopted *Variant 2* in the JB and NJB.   How do they reconcile such contradictions with regard to their claim that the Roman Church is "*semper* (always) *eadum* (the same)"?   Perhaps they might say, "The guy who wrote out the Douay-Rheims was cross-eyed."

Matt. 21:12b "the temple of God" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 21:12b the three Latin words, "*in* (into) *templum* (the temple) *Dei* (of God)," are found in the *Book of Armagh* as two words, "*intemplum Dei*" (Gwynn's edition).   The underpinning grammar is that of a preposition with an accusative i.e., "*in* ('into,' preposition with <u>accusative</u>) *templum* ('the temple,' neuter singular <u>accusative</u> noun, from *templum*)."   This was evidently either a local Irish dialect Latin form, or a wider dialect Latin form, which expressed the relationship of a preposition with an accusative by turning both the preposition and noun into a compound word.   This dialect form is also found elsewhere in the *Book of Armagh* e.g., nearby at Matt. 21:17,18.   Or for instance at Matt. 21:23, the preposition and pronoun respectively, "*In* (By) *qua* (what)" of the Vulgate becomes the one compound word, "*inqua*" of the *Book of Armagh*. Hence I show the *Book of Armagh* supporting the TR, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 21:12b, the TR's Greek, "*to* (the) *ieron* (temple) *tou* (-, literally, 'of the,' redundant in English translation) *Theou* (of God)," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century).   It is also supported as Latin, "*templum* (the temple) *Dei* (of God)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.) and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine

Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Basil the Great (d. 379); and ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430).

However, a variant which omits Greek, "*tou* (-) *Theou* (of God)," and so reads simply, "*to* (the) *ieron* (temple)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 1010 (12th century). This omission is further found in old Latin Version b (5th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text which is thus correct. The origins of the variant are speculative.

Was this an accidental assimilation to "the temple" in the other Gospels? Was the "*tou* (-) *Theou* (of God)" accidentally lost in a paper fade? Did a scribal tradition, probably starting with Origen, then consider that the passage must "still be correct" on the basis of the absence of these words in Mark 11:15; Luke 19:45; John 2:14?

Was this a deliberate assimilation to "the temple" in the other Gospels? The probable origins of this variant with Origen, who cited both readings, increases this probability. Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, conclude that "Matthew's account is unnecessarily wordy;" and so to prune away "his verbose language," deliberately seek to "standardize" the Matt. 21:12b reading with the absence of these words in Mark 11:15; Luke 19:45; John 2:14?

A deliberate or accidental assimilation to Mark 11:15; Luke 19:45; John 2:14? We cannot be sure, though with Origen "sticking his dirty nose into the manuscripts," more likely the former than the latter.

The reading of the Received Text here at Matt. 21:12b has rock solid in both the Greek and Latin textual traditions from ancient times. The TR's reading is further supported by the ancient church fathers and doctors, St. Basil the Great, St. Jerome, and St. Austin. By contrast, the variant has fairly weak support as a slim minority reading in both the Greek and Latin textual traditions, looks like a typical assimilation to the other three gospels, and also looks exactly like the type of thing Origen is notorious for. Therefore, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 21:12b an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 21:12b, "the temple of God," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1243 (11th

century, independent outside of the General Epistles), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), 579 (13th century, mixed text), and 205 (15th century, independent in the Gospels & Revelation); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is further found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Georgian "A" Version (5th century); Slavic (Slavonic) Version (9th century); and as Latin, "*templum* (the temple) *Dei* (of God)," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the variant which omits "of God," and so reads simply, "the temple," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is also found in the Syriac Palestinian Version (*c.* 6th century); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian "1" & "B" Versions (5th century); Anglo-Saxon Version (8th to 10th centuries); and Ethiopic Versions (*c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

From one perspective inside the neo-Alexandrian paradigm, both the TR's early attestation with Origen (a bad reason); the fact that there is support in different text types i.e., Byzantine, Latin, Western, and the Syriac (a bad reason which fails to properly distinguish the Byzantine Greek and Latin from other text types); and the fact that this looks like a typical assimilation of Matt. 21:21b to Mark 11:15; Luke 19:45; John 2:14 (a good reason), seems to best account for the fact that the correct reading was here adopted by Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72); and the fact that it is given as a side-note alternative in Westcott-Hort (1881). But from another perspective inside the neo-Alexandrian paradigm, the fact that "the shorter reading is the better reading," it is supported in both major Alexandrian texts, and it has "external support" in the Syriac, Egyptian, and "Caesarean" text (Armenian Version), seem to best account for the fact the incorrect reading was adopted in the main texts of Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

The confusion of the neo-Alexandrian texts was greatly magnified with confusion confounded emerging among the neo-Alexandrian Versions. With both the Western Text and a number of Syriac Versions following the TR's reading, the semi neo-Alexandrian, Moffatt adopted the correct reading at Matt. 21:12b giving no footnote

alternative, as "the temple of God" (Moffatt Bible). Following Tischendorf's and the Westcott-Hort sidenote's type of logic, the correct reading at Matt. 21:12b entered the main text of the ASV as "the temple of God," although following the main text Westcott-Hort type of logic, an ASV footnote says, "Many ancient authorities omit 'of God'." This ASV format was followed the RSV. The ASV's and RSV's preference was reversed, with "the temple" in the main text, and a footnote saying, "Some manuscripts add 'of God'" in the ESV. This ESV's format is also found in the NRSV. The erroneous reading at Matt. 21:12b was adopted with no footnote alternative by the NASB, NIV, TEV, TCNT, NEB, and REB.

What of the Romanists? The pre-Vatican II old Latin Papists of the Douay-Rheims, following the Latin, correctly read, "the temple of God," as does also the Clementine. But the post Vatican II new neo-Alexandrian Papists omitted "of God" in the JB and NJB. After all, the Roman Church says she is "*semper* (always) *eadum* (the same);" and what better way to prove that *she is "always the same" in being highly inconsistent*, than by here changing her endorsed text of Scripture at Matt. 21:12b?

Matt. 21:13 "ye have made" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. The parallel reading at Mark 11:17 is Greek "*epoiesate* ('ye have made,' indicative active <u>aorist</u>, 2nd person plural verb, from *poieo*)" (TR and majority Byzantine text); but the NU Text follows Origen at Mark 11:17 in reading, Greek, "*pepoiekate* ('ye have made,' indicative active <u>perfect</u>, 2nd person plural verb, from *poieo*)." The Latin of the Vulgate and most old Latin Versions at Mark 11:17 is "*fecistis* ('ye have made,' indicative active <u>perfect</u>, 2nd person plural verb, from *facio*)." Since the Latin perfect tense is often used in translation for the Greek aorist tense, at Mark 11:17 the Latin could have been arguably rendered from either.

Here at Matt. 21:13, Origen refers to two readings, Greek, "*pepoiekate* ('ye have made,' indicative active <u>perfect</u>, 2nd person plural verb, from *poieo*)" (*Variant 1*); and Greek, "*poieite* ('ye are making' = 'ye make,' indicative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *poieo*)" (*Variant 2*). Once again, the Latin "*fecistis* (ye have made)," could have arguably been rendered from either the TR or *Variant 1*. However, the Latin is indisputably following either the TR's reading or *Variant 1*, i.e., the Latin does not support *Variant 2*. Hence my qualified usage of the Latin, *infra*.

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). The TR's Greek, "*epoiesate* (ye have made)," is rendered in the Vulgate by the Latin "*fecistis* (ye have made)," at Matt. 21:13; Mark 11:17; Luke 19:46. The Sangallensis Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex, and therefore the reading of the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron, "*fecistis* (ye have made)," may have been brought in from one, two, or three gospel sources. Therefore, no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron inside the closed class of sources, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, a similar problem exists with the Arabic

Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries). This is translated from the Arabic into the 19th century Latin of Ciasca as "*fecistis* (ye have made)." Hence no reference is made to Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron outside the class of sources, *infra*.

        Principal Textual Discussion.

        At Matt. 21:13, the TR's Greek, "*epoiesate* ('ye have made,' indicative active <u>aorist</u>, 2nd person plural verb, from *poieo*)," in the wider words, "but ye have made it a den of theives" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century, with a localized revowelling of the suffix from "*e*" to "*ai*" i.e., "*epoiesatai*"[27]). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century) and Basil the Great (d. 379).

        However, another reading, *Variant 1*, reads Greek, "*pepoiekate* ('ye have made,' indicative active <u>perfect</u>, 2nd person plural verb, from *poieo*)." *Variant 1* is found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

        Either the *Textus Receptus* reading, or the *Variant 1* reading, may be said to be further supported by the Latin, "*fecistis* ('ye have made,' indicative active <u>perfect</u>, 2nd person plural verb, from *facio*)." This is found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

        Yet another reading, *Variant 2*, reads Greek, "*poieite* ('ye are making' = 'ye make,' indicative active <u>present</u>, 2nd person plural verb, from *poieo*)." *Variant 2* is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 1010 (12th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Eusebius (d. 339).

        Young describes the aorist as the speaker's overall perception of an event "in its entirety, or as a single whole." Wallace describes the aorist as a "snapshot" of the action (whereas the present and imperfect tenses are like a moving picture)[28]. Thus the idea of the TR's *aorist*, "ye have made," is that Jesus is here isolating a snapshot of the action.

        The Greek *indicative perfect* is regarded by Wallace as referring to an event which though completed in the past, has an ongoing result in the present i.e., the present

---

    [27]   See Commentary Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20) at Matt. 16:8b, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," "The First Matter." Cf. Lectionary 1968, W 032, and D 05 at Matt. 21:22b in Appendix 3.

    [28]   Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 554-5; Young's *Greek*, p. 122.

state of affairs which result from a past action.   Though Young dislikes such a definition, without now discussing the merits of the matter further, Wallace's view will certainly suffice for our purposes[29].   Thus this is the idea of the *Variant 1's* indicative *perfect*, "ye have made."

What Young calls the "durative present," or Wallace calls the "broad-band present," refers to a Greek *present* tense used for an action that began in the past but continues in the present, with the emphasis on the present.   Wallace refers to disagreement amongst Greek grammarians as to whether this is a relatively common or relatively rare usage of the present tense, and also disagreement with respect to what indicators have to be present in the Greek to convey this nuance[30].   But it seems to me that this is the idea found in the *present* tense of *Variant 2*, "ye are making" or "ye make."

There is no good textual argument against the usage of the TR's aorist here at Matt. 21:13, which is therefore the correct reading.   The origins of the variants are conjectural; although it is notable that both of them appear to have originated with Origen, a heretic whose belief that he could tamper with the Word of God with impunity meant that he had no scruples about generating two different variants for the same verse.

Was *Variant 1* an accidental alteration?   Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, work with a manuscript in which "*epoiesate* (ye have made)" came at the start of a new line?   If so, due to a paper fade / loss, had it come to look something like, "*epoie:ate*"? If so, did Origen "reconstruct" this as "*pepoiekate* (ye have made)" on the basis that "there must have been a pi ('p') at the end of the former line, now lost in a paper fade," and that "the missing letter of the second line must be kappa ('k')"?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate alteration?   Both the fact that Origen appears to have been the originator of this *Variant 1*, and the fact that Origen also appears to have been the originator of a similar variant at Mark 11:17 where once again the TR's "*epoiesate* (ye have made)" is changed to "*pepoiekate* (ye have made)," strongly suggests that this is the more likely possibility.   Did Origen arrogantly form the opinion that the aorist snapshot at Matt. 21:13 and Mark 11:17 "was too staccato in tone"?   Wickedly denying the Biblical teaching of Divine inspiration (II Tim. 3:16), did Origen therefore "stylistically improve" the "somewhat crude perceptions" of "an old tax collector like Matthew" at Matt. 21:13, and "a get-around go-between like John Mark who moved to'n' fro between Peter" (I Peter 5:13) "and Paul" (Col. 4:10,10), and who at Mark 11:17 "just copied down what an old poorly educated fisherman like Peter told him anyway," by changing this to the "greater flow" of indicative *perfect*, which captures the ongoing result in the present of what was first completed in the past?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental alteration?   Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen,

---

[29]   Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, p. 573; Young's *Greek*, p. 126.

[30]   Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 519-520; Young's *Greek*, pp. 111-112.

work with a manuscript in which "*epoiesate* (ye have made)" went over two lines, with "*epoiesa*" on one line, and "*te*" on the next line?   If so, due to a paper fade / loss, did the first line come to look something like "*:poi:::*"?   Did Origen then "reconstruct" this as "*poieite* (ye make)"?   If so, was he influenced by the presence in Matthean Greek of "*poieite* (ye make)" at Matt. 3:3; 5:47; 7:12?   If so, he failed to also take into account the presence of "*epoiesate* (ye have made)" in the Matthean Greek of Matt. 25:40 (twice); 25:45 (twice).

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate alteration?   Both the fact that Origen appears to have been the originator of this *Variant 2*, and the fact that Origen also appears to have been the originator of the diverse *Variant 1* at Matt. 21:13 and Mark 11:17, strongly increases this likelihood.   Did Origen arrogantly form the opinion that the aorist snapshot at Matt. 21:13 "was too staccato in tone"?   Wickedly denying the Biblical teaching of Divine inspiration (II Tim. 3:16), did Origen therefore "stylistically improve" the "somewhat crude perceptions" of "an old tax collector like Matthew" at Matt. 21:13, by adopting the "greater flow" of the indicative present tense, "ye make," which captures the ongoing result in the present of what was begun in the past?

Deliberate or accidental alterations?   While we cannot be entirely certain, the balance of probabilities seems to here favour the former over the latter.   Indeed, it is notable that a similar flawed logic of "greater flow" can be argued for both *Variants 1 & 2*. *"Oh Origen! … Not again!!"*

The TR's reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading with no good textual argument against it, and is found in the Greek textual tradition from ancient times.   It is also attested to in ancient times by the church father and doctor, St. Basil the Great.   Moreover, it is one of two possible readings supported by the Latin textual tradition.   By contrast, both *Variants 1 & 2* have weak support in the Greek, and look very much like the type of textual corruption that Origen is known for. While it is possible to argue that *Variant 1* rather than the TR underpins the Latin, bearing in mind the exceedingly weak support for *Variant 1* in the Greek, I think we can say that on the balance of probabilities the Latin is translating the TR's Greek.   Bearing in mind the weak Greek support for the two variants, the fact that on the balance of probabilities the Latin is following the TR's Greek, and the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*; on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 21:13 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading of the TR at Matt. 21:13, "ye have made (Greek, *epoiesate*, aorist tense)," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century).   It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine

elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), and 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), 579 (13th century, mixed text); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.

Variant 1, "ye have made (Greek, *pepoiekate*, perfect tense)," is found in Minuscules 2193 (10th / 11th century, independent) and 1582 (11th century, independent in Gospels); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*.

Either the correct reading of *Textus Receptus* "ye have made (Greek, *epoiesate*, aorist tense)," or the *Variant 1* reading, "ye have made (Greek, *pepoiekate*, perfect tense)," may be said to be further followed by the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century) and the Armenian Version (5th century).

Variant 2, "ye are making" or "ye make (Greek, *poieite*, present tense)," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century) and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The erroneous *Variant 2* was adopted at Matt. 21:13 by the NU Text *et al*. Hence it is rendered in the ASV "ye make" in the wider words, "but ye make it a den of robbers" (ASV). The incorrect *Variant 2* is also found at Matt. 21:13 in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

What of the Papists here at Matt. 21:13? The *Book of the Chronicles of the Received Text* here tell an interesting tale. The old Latin Papists of the post Trent and pre-Vatican II era, here followed the Latin "*fecistis* (ye have made)" of the Clementine Vulgate. Thus the passage correctly reads in the Douay-Rheims, "but you have made it a den of theives." But some of the post Vatican II new neo-Alexandrian Papists, moseyed on up behind the old Latin Papists, and smiling said to them, "Sons, you seem a little bit sympathetic to the Protestant's Received Text on this verse." "Pardon us, Your Eminences," the old Latin Papists replied, "we did not realize that the quiet slippers of the Jesuit princes of the church had approached towards us. … Great Cardinals, who come with the Pope's authority," the old Latin Papists continued, "we must here support this reading; you see, the Latin supports it here." "Oh, I see," said one of leading new neo-Alexandrian Papist Cardinals from Milan, and then still smiling at them, suddenly pulling out sharp daggers from under their Cardinal's robes, they slipped pointed daggers into their backs, hacking them remorselessly and mercilessly till they fell down dead. And smilingly holding up their Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles that here adopt

Variant 2, they said over their dead bodies, "the Jews made the temple of God a den of theives, and we who follow in their footsteps recognize no honour among theives."

Matt. 21:15a "the children crying" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Remarks.

Two writers, Origen and Methodius (also known as Eubulius, Methodius Eubilius, and Methodius of Olympus) are here referred to as citing the TR's reading. Origen (d. 254) and Methodius (d. 3rd / early 4th century) were opponents, with the latter writing against various views of Origen. Reference to Methodius is also important because it reminds us through reference to Jerome, *infra*, that while Scriptural citations from church writers are important, especially if they are ancient (i.e., 2nd to 5th centuries), this does not mean that such church writers are in any sense infallible, or that their writings are not open to various interpretations at certain points. E.g., exactly when Methodius lived and died is disputed within ranges of over 60 years.

We know that Methodius was a Bishop of Olympus in Lycia (Turkey). Our earliest biographical knowledge of him comes from Jerome's *Illustrious Men* (*De Viris Illustribus*, chapter 83). Jerome here says that Methodius was Bishop of Olympus and later reference is made to him as Bishop of Tyre (modern Sur, Lebanon). He says he was martyred under Maximinus (Roman Emperor: 310-313), but that some say it was under Decius (Roman Emperor: 249-251) or Valerian (Roman Emperor: 253-260) at Chalcis (Island of Euboea, Greece).

This in turn gives rise to further debate. Jerome says, Latin, "*ut* (while) *alii* (some) *affirmant* (indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *affirmo*)." The Latin, *affirmo*, can mean either more strongly "to affirm" or "to confirm" or "to prove," or more weakly "to assert." What does Jerome here mean by *affirmo*?

Those following the view that Methodius died in *c.* 311, like to take the meaning of *affirmo* here as, "they assert." If one takes the view that Methodius died under Maximinus in *c.* 311, then the evidence from other sources does not support the proposition he was Bishop of Tyre e.g., Eusebius's *Church History* (*Historia Ecclesiastica* 8:13, which says Tyrannio then Paulinus were the Bishops of Tyre during this time). This gives rise to various further possibilities for those adopting this view. Was Jerome simply wrong? Or as some think, was Methodius transported to Tyre during a persecution and did he then die there, with the consequence that people referred to him as "Bishop of Tyre" not in the sense of being the Bishop of that City, but in the sense of being an exiled Bishop *at* Tyre?

By contrast, if Methodius is dated earlier, then he is a contemporary of Origen. The UBS 4th revised edition dates Methodius earlier but imprecisely as 3rd century, i.e., allowing that he might have died under either Decius or Valerian; whereas Nestle-Aland's 27th edition says Methodius died in 250 i.e., the time of Decius. In contrast to both, Tischendorf's 8th edition dates his death to 311 i.e., the time of Maximinus. But

for my purposes, I shall leave the matter as an open question and simply refer to "Methodius (d. *c.* 250 or *c.* 257 or *c.* 311)," *infra*.

Preliminary Textual Discussion.   Von Soden here says the variant reading is found in Minuscule 1010 (von Soden's ε 1266 in his Iφc group), and all manuscripts in his Iπ group except for Phi 043 (von Soden's ε 17).   The Byzantine manuscripts in von Soden's Iπ group are N 022 (6th century, von Soden's ε 19), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century, von Soden's ε 18), O 023 (6th century, von Soden's ε 21), and Phi 043 (6th century, von Soden's ε 17).   On the one hand, my printed copy of N 022 (Cronin, 1899) shows that this codex follows the variant; but on the other hand, my printed copy of Sigma 042 (Harnack, 1882/3, reprint 1991) shows that this codex supports the TR. Given that von Soden evidently here experienced some slippage in his data with respect to the Iπ group and this reading, and I cannot be sure as to what is the extent of this error, I shall not make any usage of his Iπ group data, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 21:15a, the TR's Greek, "*tous* (the) *paidas* (children) *krazontas* ('crying out' = 'crying,' AV)," i.e., "the children crying" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.).   It is also supported as Latin, "*pueros* (the children) *clamantes* ('crying out' / 'crying'),"[31] in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century[32]), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.) and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Methodius (d. *c.* 250 or *c.* 257 or *c.* 311).

However, a variant adds a definite article before "*krazontas* (crying)," thus reading, "*tous* (the) *paidas* (children) *tous* ('who' / 'that[33],' <u>masculine plural accusative,</u>

---

[31]   In Latin one can use a relative pronoun ("who," "which") from *qui-quae-quod*. The absence of a relative pronoun joined with the preceding noun ("children" / "*pueros*") here, means that the Latin form is following the TR's Greek rather than the variant's Greek.   Wheelock's *Latin Grammar* (1956 & 2005), pp 123-124 & Wheelock's *Latin Grammar* (1956 & 1963, Harper & Row, USA), p. 80.

[32]   Though of no consequence for my immediate purposes, unlike the Vulgate *et al* which read, "*et* ('and,' word 1) *pueros* ('the children,' word 2) *clamantes* ('crying,' word 3) *in* ('in,' word 4) *templo* ('the temple,' word 5)," old Latin l uses word order 1,2,4,5,3.

[33]   When put with a participle, the definite article may be rendered by e.g., "who," "that," or "those."   Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 233-234.

definite article from *o*) *krazontas* ('crying,' <u>masculine plural accusative</u>, active present participle from *kraz<u>o</u>*)," i.e., "the children who were crying."   This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex N 022 (6th century) and Minuscule 1010 (12th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must thus stand.   The origins of the variant are speculative.

Was this an accidental change?   Did a scribe, perhaps fatigued and working late at night, whose eye was darting back and forth on a line, get the "*tous*" of "*tous* (the) *paidas* (children)" mixed up in his head, and put it in a second time after "*tous* (the) *paidas* (children)" without realizing what he had done?

Was this a deliberate change?   Did a scribe consider the reading was "too curt," and "required" a "stylistic improvement" "fleshing it out" with the addition of "*tous* (who)"?

A deliberate or accidental change?   We cannot be sure.   But we can be sure that it was a change to the original text.

The TR's Greek has rock solid support in the Greek and Latin from ancient times. By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek, and no support in the Latin.   On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 21:15a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading of the TR at Matt. 21:15a, "the children crying," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04; and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century).   It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text).   It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.   It is further found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the variant, "the children who were crying," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent).

At Matt. 21:15a, the erroneous variant entered the NU Text *et al*. Reflecting a greater commitment to literal accuracy, the incorrect variant is rendered in the American Standard Version as "that were" (ASV), and in the New American Standard Bible as, "who were" (NASB). Reflecting the fact that they were translated at a time when the Authorized Version was commonly used among Protestants and they wanted "to prove" the "many inaccuracies" of the King James Bible, the incorrect variant is rendered in the Twentieth Century New Testament (1904) as "who were calling out" (TCNT); and in the Moffatt Bible (1935) as "who shouted" (Moffatt), not "who were shouting" as Moffatt simultaneously did not want to be "too literal."

Reflecting the fact that they are vague and woolly translations for whom the literalness of the ASV or NASB is regarded as "an embarrassment" they are "trying to live down," the variant of the underpinning NU Text *et al* is not rendered in the RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, TEV, NEB, REB, JB, and NJB. All of these versions therefore *prima facie* follow the neo-Byzantine *Textus Receptus*, but all of the relevant loose'n'liberal neo-Alexandrian translators would in response to such a proposition exclaim in unison, "Over the Alexandrian Text's dead body!" "A strange response," we neo-Byzantines reply, "since the Alexandrian Text is as dead as a dodo!!"

Matt. 21:23b "unto him as he was teaching" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Remarks.

Under normal circumstances I would be unlikely to discuss this variant, which was adopted by neither the old Latin Papists of the Clementine, nor the neo-Alexandrians. But I find elements of it useful for illustrating certain principles, some elements of which are further developed in the section on outside the closed class of sources in the following nearby reading of Matt. 21:24a. This reading here at Matt. 21:23b is also important for increasing our knowledge on Byzantine Text Greek Lectionaries, an area of Greek textual studies which has been all too sadly neglected, and in which much work still remains to be done. Connected with the unusual feature of this selection, there will be a much reduced textual history discussion of this variant in the section outside the closed class of sources, *infra*.

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Prima facie the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron here follows the variant in omitting Latin, "*docentem* (as he was teaching)." But due to Diatessaron formatting, the scribe of this Latin Vulgate Codex prefaced his citation from Matt. 21:23b with a citation

from Luke 21:1 in the Vulgate, which also refers to Jesus "*docente* (as he was teaching)." Thus the effect of this Diatessaron formatting is to make the repetition of "as he was teaching (*docentem*)" in the joined quote from Matt. 21:23b unnecessary, and so it may well have been omitted as a consequence of this. Hence no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 21:23b, the TR's Greek reads, "(And) *elthonti* ('coming' = when … was come') *auto* (he)[34] *eis* (into) *to* (the) *ieron* (temple), *auto didaskonti* ('unto him as he was teaching,' *infra*) *oi* ('the,' masculine plural <u>nominative</u>, definite article from *o*) *archiereis* ('chief priests,' masculine plural <u>nominative</u> noun from *archiereus*) *kai* (and) *oi* ('the,' masculine plural <u>nominative</u>, definite article from *o*) *presbuteroi* ('elders,' masculine plural <u>nominative</u> adjective from *presbuteros*) *tou* (of the) *laou* (the people), " i.e., "And when he was come into the temple, the chief priests and the elders of the people came unto him as he was teaching" (AV), etc. . This reading is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.[35]).

The key words being considered here at Matt. 21:23b, Greek, "*auto didaskonti* (as he was teaching)," are further supported in the Latin as, "*ad* ('unto,' preposition with an <u>accusative</u>) *eum* ('him,' masculine singular <u>accusative</u> pronoun, from *is-ea-id*) *docentem* ('as he was teaching,' masculine singular accusative, active present participle, from *doceo*)." This Latin reading is found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However, multiple variants seek to remove the reference here at Matt. 21:23b to Jesus' "teaching" i.e., "as [he] was teaching (*didaskonti*)."

Variant 1 simply omits, Greek, "*didaskonti* ('as he was teaching,' *infra*)." This reading is found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254). The omission of Latin, "*docentem* ('as he was teaching,' *supra*), is also found in Latin Vulgate Codices R (Rushworthianus, 8th / 9th century, Oxford) and H (Hubertianus, 9th / 10th century, London); as well as old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), h (5th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century).

Variant 2 is a minority Byzantine reading. It is found in the reading of

---

[34] See Matt. 21:23a in Appendix 3.

[35] The "*didaskonti* (διδασκοντι)" of Lectionary 1968 is written as a lower case, "δασκοντι" with an upper case delta followed by two dots, "Δ:" in the space above the lower case delta, "δ".

Lectionary 2378 (11th century) on Matt. 21:18-24 (partial), 21:28-43; which becomes partial here at verses 23 and 24, before jumping to verse 28. It reads at this section, "*Kai* (And) *elthonti* ('coming' = when … was come') *auto* (he) *eis* (into) *to* (the) *ieron* (temple), *sunegmenon* ('gathering' = 'when … gathered,' masculine plural genitive, middle present participle, from *sunago*) *ton* ('of the' = 'the,' masculine plural genitive, definite article from *o*) *archiereon* ('chief priests,' masculine plural genitive noun from *archiereus*) *kai* (and) *presbuteron* ('elders,' masculine plural genitive adjective from *presbuteros*) *tou* (of the) *laou* (the people) [verse 23]; *eipen* ('he said' i.e., Jesus said) *autois* (unto them) [verse 24], *Anos* (= *Anthropos*, 'A man') *tis* (certain[36]) *eiche* ('he had' = 'had,' AV[37]) *tekna* (sons) *duo* (two) [verse 28]," etc. i.e., "And when he was come into the temple, when the chief priests and elders of the people gathered, he said unto them, A certain man had two sons" etc. .

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is therefore correct.

The text of Lectionary 2378 here presents a clear contrast with the text of Lectionary 1968 which contains the fuller reading of Matt. 21:18-43. The change in the text of Lectionary 2378 at this point of Matt. 21:23b, to form, (what to the best of my knowledge is,) *a minority Byzantine reading not previously documented*, thus also seems to bespeak of the same type of desire to avoid reference to Christ "as he was teaching (*didaskonti*)," as seen in the alteration from "teaching (*didaskonti*)" to "gathering (*sunegmenon*)."

Why have so many Latin scribes, as well as this Greek scribe, wanted to follow in the footsteps of Origen in removing reference here at Matt. 21:23b to Jesus' "teaching (*didaskonti*)"? It is clear that the scribe of Lectionary 2378 was not following Origen's solution of simply omitting reference to "teaching (*didaskonti*)," but changed it to "gathering (*sunegmenon*)." It is thus an independent corruption calculated to have the same consequence. So why did the scribe of this Greek Lectionary undertake such "fancy footwork" in his text here to avoid saying that Jesus that "was teaching"?

The level of stylistic change to the text in Lectionary 2378, seems to require the conclusion that *Variant 2* was a deliberate scribal change.

What of *Variant 1*? Given that the rise of these two variants are speculative, it is

---

[36] Lectionary 2378 here adds "*tis* (a certain)" contrary to the TR, although it is a known minority Byzantine reading (e.g., E07 & M 021) that seems to have originated with Origen. But its contextual usefulness is seen in the fact that the AV adds "certain" in italics i.e., "A *certain* man" (Matt. 21:28, AV).

[37] The "*eiche* (ειχε)" is written in Lectionary 2378 with the "ει" joined and here looking something like a "d" with the right-hand bar of the "d" going down below the line (the same sort of distance as a "j"), followed by the "χ", with the final "ε" written in smaller script and place on top of the "χ".

of course possible that what appears to be Origen's original alteration was an accidental change. Was there an undetected paper fade of "*didaskonti* (as he was teaching)" here that Origen simply missed? If so, why were so many Latin scribes prepared to then follow this *Variant 1* over the well attested to reading of e.g., the Latin Vulgate?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate change. Its probable origins with Origen greatly enhances this possibility. But why did Origen do it?

When I was a university student in *Sydney University Regiment* (part of the Australian army Reserve), we used to sometimes "break into double-time." In those days of the mid 1980s, there were still a number of "Vietnam Vets" (Veterans of the Vietnam War) around, who had in turn been influenced by veterans of both World War II and the anti-communist Korean War. This coupled with the fact that the West's cold-war with the communist Soviet Union (modern day Russian Federation) was still in place, sometimes set the backdrop for an anti-communist sentiment. One of our military songs therefore reflected old battles with Communists, so that I remember going in double-time to the barracks at Singleton (central east New South Wales, north of Sydney), in a platoon of men chanting the song, "Kill more Communists! …, Kill more Communists! …, napalm kills babies too![38]" The song really belonged to the earlier Vietnam War era, and so our usage of it reflected the ongoing influence by old 1960s and early 1970s "Vietnam Vets" on the later 1980s Australian military culture.

The military notion of "double-time" has a corresponding concept in Greek grammar. Here at Matt. 21:23b, the "*auto*" is working double-time. It is being used as both the connecting pronoun, "unto him" with the verb "came (*proselthon*, 'they came,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *proserchomai*)" i.e., "came unto him" (AV); and simultaneously as a dative pronoun subject[39], in "*auto* ('him' as a dative pronoun subject = 'he,' AV, masculine singular dative, 3rd person personal pronoun, from *autos*) *didaskonti* ('teaching' = 'as … was teaching,' AV, masculine singular dative, active present participle, from *didasko*)," i.e., "as he was teaching" (AV). Did this double-time complexity of the Greek grammar here at Matt. 21:23b cause some confusion in Origen's mind as to where the subject of the participle was? Did he then wrongly conclude that "*didaskonti* (teaching)" had been "added," and remove it?

---

[38] Napalm was used during the Vietnam War. In anti-war protests by pacifists *who turned and ran hard when the fast bullets flew*, napalm was sometimes used as a symbol to which they attached a negative loading e.g., napalm was produced in the USA by the Dow Chemical Company (1965-1969) and so its products were sometimes boycotted on university / college campuses. It was also used in World War II, e.g., my father (b. 1921) has sometimes told me a story of napalm being dropped on nearby Japanese when he was in Papua and New Guinea (21 Brigade Sigs / Signals, Australian 7th Division, up near Gona and Buna), and of how he could "hear them screaming as they burnt" to death. Father always describes this scene with a certain horror and reserve as something quite "terrible," but unlike the pacifists, he regards it as an appropriately necessary military action, albeit regrettably so, in the context of war.

[39] Young's *Greek*, p. 45; cf. commentary at Matt. 21:23a, Appendix 3.

Is there another explanation?   A broad and general one that explains why both Origen (d. 254) and numerous Latin scribes, and then about 800 years later, the scribe of Lectionary 2378 (11th century), would follow in Origen's footsteps in seeking to remove this reference to Jesus' "teaching (*didaskonti*)"?

An answer to this conundrum appears to lie in comparison of Matt. 21:23b with Matt. 26:55; Mark 11:27; and Luke 20:1.   Specifically, in Matt. 21:23b we read that, "the chief priests and the elders of the people came unto him <u>as he was teaching</u>."   This is similar to Luke 20:1, "<u>as he taught</u> the people in the temple, and preached the gospel, the chief priest and the scribes came upon him with the elders."   In Matt. 26:55 Jesus says, "I <u>sat</u> daily with you <u>teaching in the temple</u>."   In Mark 11:27, "and <u>as he was walking</u> in the temple, there come to him the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders."

Good Christian reader, Canst thou hear some later scribes asking, "If Jesus 'sat' when he was 'teaching' (Matt. 26:55), was he sitting down and 'teaching' (Matt. 21:23b), or was he 'walking' around (Mark 11:27) when they came to him?"   We thus here see, what *prima facie* a Bible critic might claim was "a Bible blunder."   Of course, such a person is very wrong to make this claim.   For while it is true that Jesus, "<u>sat</u> daily … <u>teaching in the temple</u>" (Matt. 26:55), it is also true that he sometimes then stood up, and further "taught … people" (Luke 20:1), so that "he was teaching" (Matt.21:23b) some of them while "he was walking in the temple" (Mark 11:27), when they came to him. *There is no error in the Bible here (or anywhere else), but there may be an ERROR OF INTERPRETATION by those wrongly claiming they have "spotted a Bible blunder."*

We thus see how some of them "which corrupt the word of God" (II Cor. 2:17), appear to do so in the mistaken belief that they are "telling lies for God."   God thundered from Mt. Sinai the ninth commandment, "Thou shalt not bear false witness" (Exod. 20:16); and the incarnate God said, "I am … the truth" (John 14:6).   We are told in Scripture that it is "impossible for God to lie" (Heb. 6:18), that his perfection of character is such that "God … cannot lie" (Titus 1:2), and that he will cast all wilfully unrepentant "liars" into "the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone" (Rev. 21:8).   Those who think they should "tell lies for God" are sadly mistaken.   God tells no lies and wants no lies told.   The initial error that such persons have made is in their *fallible interpretation* of the *infallible Book*.   Rather than arrogantly setting themselves *over the Word of God* and seeking to "correct it," they need, by the grace of God, to humbly put themselves *under the Word of God*, and "ask" "God" for "wisdom" to better understand it (Jas. 1:5).

Given the slip-shod and superficial way such corrupters of God's Word first conclude that there is a so called "Bible blunder" here at Matt. 21:23b; it ought not to surprise us if these superficial scribes looked no further than the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, basing their conclusions on Matt. 21:23b; Matt. 26:55; and Mark 11:27; i.e., without specifically looking at Luke 20:1.   Hence these manuscripts do not have a comparable corruption at Luke 20:1, although to this must be made the qualification that Gospel (*Evangelion*) Lectionary 2378 has no reading in it containing Luke 20:1.   It is also to be remembered that different scribes may have worked on different parts of a

Latin manuscript, so that those who corrupted Matt. 21:23b may not have been the ones who copied out Luke 20:1; although possibly they were and by the time they had gotten to Luke 20 they had simply forgotten about the issue.

The doctrine of Divine Preservation is a doctrine of the Divinely Inspired Word of God. "The words of the Lord are pure words." "Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them" (Ps. 12:6,7). Let us thank God that he has undertaken to "preserve" his "words" "from this generation for ever" (Ps. 12:6,7) i.e., from all in any generation that seek to tamper with them. He has preserved it here at Matt. 21:23b, and he has preserved it everywhere else as well. Praise be to God!

The TR's reading has strong support in the Greek from ancient times; as well as strong support in the Latin from ancient times with St. Jerome's Vulgate and a number of old Latin versions. The variants have weak support in the Greek, although *Variant 1* has some good support in the Latin. Bearing in mind the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 21:23b an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading of the TR at Matt. 21:23b, "unto him as he was teaching," is found in most manuscripts of different text types, and hence in the NU Text *et al*.

However, the omission is found in some Syriac Versions. Von Soden (1913) refers to its omission in the Old Syriac Version (dated by von Soden at 363-368 A.D.), or referring to the same Syriac Version, Nestle's 21st edition (1952) says it is omitted in the Syriac Palimpsest (dated by Erwin Nestle to 4th or 5th century)[40]; and both Tischendorf (1869-72) and Erwin Nestle (1952) refer to its omission in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century). On the Syriac, see my comments outside the closed class of sources as Matt. 21:24a, *infra*.

The matter is of some further interest because in his 2nd edition of 1842 (Lectiones Variants, p. 7), Tischendorf criticized the Greek text of Stephanus (1550) for its Received Text reading, "*auto didaskonti* (unto him as he was teaching)." I.e., in what was to prove an ominous sign, we here see a pre Neo-Alexandrian School preference for the shorter reading when there was some "wider support" (Latin. And also Syriac?[41]).

---

[40] Lewis, A. S., *The Old Syriac Gospels*, being the text of the Sinai or Syro-Antiochene Palimpsest, London, UK, 1910 (dated by UBS, 1993, at 3rd / 4th century).

[41] William Curetonian edited and first published the Syriac version bearing his name in 1858. But he earlier brought these Syriac manuscripts from a Syrian Orthodox monastery in Egypt to the British Library in 1842. For his 1842 edition, did Tischendorf have any pre 1858 "cutting edge" access to this Syriac Curetonian Version?

But when he later came to found the Neo-Alexandrian School in the broad form we now know it, given its support in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century), Tischendorf did an about-face, and adopted this reading which is found in e.g., his 8th edition (1869-72).

One the one hand, I am in full support of a man changing his position on a matter upon receipt of better information and more careful consideration of the issues. Indeed, I myself have done so. But on the other hand, we must ask, Why did Tischendorf originally follow this variant at Matt. 21:23b? The answer seems to be its support by Origen, and Tischendorf's flawed idea that the oldest reading was the more reliable one. I.e., Tischendorf modified pre-existing anti-supernaturalist manuscript preservation ideas to this effect. Thus writing in the very year Tischendorf was born, the Anglican clergyman, the Reverend Frederick Nolan, could say disapprovingly in 1815, "To the manuscripts of the Alexandrine class … the highest rank is ascribed by … Griesbach; the authority of a few of these outweighing in his estimation that of a multitude of the Byzantine. The peculiar readings which he selects from the manuscripts of this class, he confirms … principally … from the quotations of the ancient fathers, and the versions made in the primitive ages. To the authority of Origen he however ascribes a paramount weight …; he [Griesbach] has thus formed his Corrected Text of the New Testament" as opposed to "the Received Text[42]."

While Tischendorf may have corrected his views on this particular reading at Matt. 21:23b, *he did so for the wrong reasons*. The Neo-Alexandrian School he founded was tailored more to the paramount importance of the two Alexandrian texts, one of which, Codex Sinaiticus, he discovered on the Arabian Peninsula in 1859. But his basic ideas were a double-Alexandrian Text priority modification of the principles formerly put forth by Griesbach and Lachmann. Specifically, he still e.g., retained their basic religiously liberal view that God did not Divinely preserve his Word, and that "the oldest authorities" (n.b., neo-Alexandrian use of "authorities") "were closer to New Testament times and therefore more reliable." This naïve type of idea fails to recognize that *even within New Testament times there were "many which corrupt the word of God"* (II Cor. 2:17), and so the idea, "the oldest is more reliable" is clearly wrong.

Therefore an important lesson here emerges from Matt. 21:23b, namely, that even when Tischendorf was to his satisfaction shown that the earliest reading we have, to wit, that of Origen (d. 254) was wrong, he was only prepared to modify his view *of that particular reading*, and he *was not prepared to consider a more thorough going revision that recognized that his basic anti-supernaturalist premises were wrong*. And so we are reminded that, THERE ARE NONE SO BLIND AS THOSE WHO *WILL NOT* SEE. What saith our Lord? "If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch" (Matt. 15:14). And what saith his holy Apostle on another matter, but with some relevant

---

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

principles we can cross-apply to this situation?   "Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith.   Be not high-minded, but fear" (Rom. 8:20).

Matt. 21:24a "And" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Remarks.

The primary purpose for including reference to this variant, which among the neo-Alexandrians is only definitely taken seriously by Westcott & Hort, although it may have also been followed by the semi neo-Alexandrian, Moffatt; is to further illustrate certain principles also discussed outside the closed class of sources in the previous reading of Matt. 21:23b.   Therefore a more reduced discussion occurs, *infra*.

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex.   At Mark 11:29 and Luke 20:3 the Vulgate reads, "*autem* ('and' / 'but')."   Therefore the absence of the "*autem* (and)" in the Sangallensis Diatessaron can only be because of the Vulgate's reading at Matt. 21:24a.   Hence I show the Sangallensis Diatessaron following the variant, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 21:24a the TR's Greek, "*de* (And)," in the words, "And Jesus answered," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.).   It is also supported as Latin, "*autem* ('And' / 'But')," in old Latin Versions d (5th century), f (6th century), and q (6th / 7th century).   It is further supported by the early mediaeval church writer, Pseudo-Chrysostom in a Latin work (6th century).

However, a Latin variant omitting this word occurs in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.) and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is thus correct.   The origin of the variant is conjectural.

Was this an accidental omission?   Was the Greek, "*de* (And)" or Latin, "*autem* (And)" lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was this a deliberate omission?   Was this the "stylistic improvement" of a prunist scribe seeking "a more succinct text"?

Either way, bearing in mind the maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the

system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 21:24a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading of the TR at Matt. 21:24a, "And," is found in most manuscripts of different text types, and hence in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

However, the incorrect reading omitting "And" is found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century). It is also found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions, and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version.

Notably, Westcott-Hort (1881) who rarely move away from the reading of the two leading Alexandrian texts, both of which here include, "*de* (and)," here place the "*de*" in square brackets i.e., making its usage entirely optional. (See commentary at Matt. 13:33 on Westcott-Hort's text; and cf. my comments outside the closed class of sources at Matt. 21:23b, *supra*.)

On the one hand, Westcott & Hort's evident attraction to this variant shows they were itching to apply the neo-Alexandrian rule, "The shorter reading is the better reading." And with "wider support" from the majority Latin text, as well as the Syriac and Egyptian, and Codices Z 035 and L 019, they clearly considered they had "a good case" for such an omission. But on the other hand, with both main Alexandrian texts containing the reading, they balked, and so their "solution" was to put the "*de* (and)" in brackets.

We thus here see the workings of a flawed neo-Alexandrian methodology which together with its normative Alexandrian text pincer arm, sometimes uses a non-Alexandrian text pincer arm. In the case of Westcott-Hort this non-Alexandrian text pincer arm's usage would be at one neo-Alexandrian extreme of being rarely used; and in the case of Moffatt, this non-Alexandrian text pincer arm's usage would be at such an extreme of usage as to require he be classified as a semi neo-Alexandrian. Most neo-Alexandrians fall somewhere in between these two extremes. But it is notable that exactly when and where the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm is used seems to vary greatly, so that usually they select different passages to exercise it on. This is certainly the case here, with the Westcott-Hort text standing alone in its more favourable view of this variant.

To the extent that the ASV here reads at Matt. 21:24a, "And Jesus answered," the Westcott-Hort text based ASV translators evidently agreed with the other neo-Alexandrian texts in preferring "the comfort zone" of their two main Alexandrian texts.

After all, it is important for the intellectually inter-mediate persons who control the universities, such as these neo-Alexandrian textual critics, to "live up to" an academic stereotype that is basically Alexandrian text based. They might move away from it OCCASIONALLY, "just to show that they have" the BARE PRETENCE of "an independent mind" capable of dispassionate, higher order, textual analysis, but as the great disagreement among them all as to when to do this shows, the whole thing is very largely balderdash. (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at e.g., Vol. 3 on Matt. 21:44; Matt. 22:35a; Matt. 22:38; Matt. 22:44; Matt. 23:23c; Matt. 24:36b; Matt. 24:49a; Matt. 24:49b; Matt. 25:1c; Matt. 25:4a; Matt. 25:21; *infra*; what are rare and unusual exceptions to this, with a larger number of neo-Alexandrian Versions at Matt. 22:23 and Matt. 23:17; a smaller number doing so at Matt. 22:37a; and what are unknown instances due to the confusing lack of clarity resulting from the non usage of italics for added words in so many "modern" versions at Matt. 24:49a and Matt. 25:6b. Cf. my comments in Vol. 4 at Matt. 26:17a).

The TR's reading is also found at Matt. 21:24a in the NASB (1st ed. & 2nd ed.). *Prima facie* the variant is followed at Matt. 21:24a in the NASB (3rd ed. 1995), RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, TEV, NEB, REB, TCNT, JB, and NJB. But these are such loose and liberal translations, the more likely construction to place on this is that they consider the "*de* (And)" of most neo-Alexandrian texts "is present in the Greek," but then they have omitted it here in translation.

After all, if these type of translations are prepared at the very start of the Bible to omit the "And (Hebrew, *vav* / ו; Greek LXX, *de*; Latin, *autem*)" of Gen. 1:2, so as to deny the Gap School truth of multiple worlds (Gen. 2:4; Heb. 1:2; 11:3) pre-existing the creation in six literal 24 hour days of man's wonderful world of Eden (Gen. 1:2b-2:3; 2:8-15), we ought not to be surprised that throughout these versions they make similar perversions of God's Word. Let the reader first consider these majestic words describing the creation of the universe and global earth, and covering the period in which most of the geological history of the planet earth transpired before the local creation of Eden (Gen. 1:2b-2:3) in a region of West Asia near the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers (Gen. 2:8-14), which since the end of the last Ice Age has been under the waters of the Persian Gulf. We read of the universe's and global earth's history (Gen. 1:1), followed by the local earth's pre-Adamite flood of the Persian Gulf region (Gen. 1:2a), the majestic words of the Authorized Version, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep" (AV). Now let the reader compare these with the opening words of Moffatt's Bible, using a conversational chatty style that a couple of high school girls might use in "explaining things" to one of their little sisters. The first girl might say, "This is the story of how the universe was formed" (Moffatt Bible). And then the other girl might continue, "When God began to form the universe" (Moffatt Bible) etc. .

Now when we come to Matt. 21:24a, whereas the Authorized Version reads, "And (*de*) Jesus answered and said unto them" (AV), by contrast, the Moffatt Bible reads, "Jesus replied." It is clear that Moffatt is leaving a lot of words out anyway, so how are we to know if he is following the variant or TR's underpinning Greek here?

Moffatt's footnote comments elsewhere show he might well have been attracted to the Westcott-Hort type logic of the variant here. E.g., at Matt. 16:4 he says he followed "some unicals, including … [the mixed text type] L [019] …, the old Latin, Latin and Syriac versions" over the TR; and likewise at Matt. 16:12, he says concerning the TR's "of bread" (AV), that he is "omitting" it on the basis of "strong support from the old Latin and Syriac version, as well as from [the Western text's] D [05] and [the mixed text type] Theta [038]."

Moffatt used an eclectic Greek NT text, but was primarily based on von Soden's very bad main text. While von Soden's main text here includes the "*de*," Moffatt's eclectic usage of it means that his translation could be from a different Greek reading. Usually we cannot be sure which text Moffatt followed, even though in general terms he followed von Soden's main text. Certainly the variant is referred to in von Soden's very good textual apparatus here at Matt. 21:24a. Did Moffatt here follow the variant in von Soden's textual apparatus; or did Moffatt here follow the reading in von Soden's main text, and simply omit the "*de* (And / But)" for "stylistic reasons"? We cannot be sure; and nor can any of his readers. But whether in his Greek text or in his translation, one way or the other, Moffatt in some way preferred "the shorter reading."

The definite favour here shown to the variant at Matt. 21:24a by Westcott & Hort, and the possible favour shown to it by Moffatt, is nothing new to we neo-Byzantines. Before Vatican II closed down the old Latin Papists of the post Trent Council (1545-63) and pre-Vatican II Council (1962-5) era, the old "whore" of Rome (Rev. 17:1,9), the Papal Roman Church, used to snarlingly make a similar side-swipe at the Received Text in the forlorn hope that her sharp finger nails might scratch and make bleed the beautiful face of the *Textus Receptus*, of whose radiant beauty she was understandably jealous. Thus the Clementine Vulgate omits the Latin, "*autem* ('And' / 'But');" and the Douay-Rheims reads, "Jesus answering, said to them." This omission in the Clementine and Douay-Rheims reminds us that while the methodology of neo-Alexandrians like Westcott-Hort and the semi neo-Alexandrian Moffatt is quite different to that of the old Latin Papists, they here find "common cause" in attacking what for them is the much hated *Textus Receptus*.

Matt. 21:28a "A man" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. The von Soden based majority text of Hodges & Farstad here shows the reading, "*Anthropos* (A man)" in their main text, indicating they regard it as the better reading; but a footnote says there is "a substantial division within the Majority Text" between this reading and one which adds, "*tis* (certain)" i.e., "A certain man" [43]. By contrast, the von Soden based majority text of Robinson & Pierpont shows "*Anthropos* (A man)" in their main text, with no variant reading. Under the circumstances, I must consult von Soden on a first-hand basis.

---

[43] Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xiv & 72.

Von Soden (1913) says the reading which adds "*tis* (certain)" is followed inside the K group by one manuscript from his Ki subgroup, his Kr subgroup, and of a sample of 171 manuscripts counted inside his Kx subgroup, 61 manuscripts with the other 110 manuscripts following the reading without the "*tis* (certain)."

Von Soden's Kr group contains *c.* 189 manuscripts which are exclusively Byzantine inside a wider K group that has 914 exclusively Byzantine manuscripts. Or on a more precise count of Gospel manuscripts in the K group, out of *c.* 860 K group Gospel manuscripts; inside Kr there are only 14 exclusively Byzantine manuscripts, and 1 manuscript that is Byzantine in part, that contain just the Apostolos (Acts-Jude, or portions thereof)[44] i.e., (in rounded numbers) there are *c.* 175 Gospel manuscripts. While such a small number means one can reasonably count the entire Kr group for gospels, if one were to seek *an even more precise Gospel manuscripts count*, then of *c.* 860 K group Gospel manuscripts, *c.* 175 are Kr subgroup Gospel manuscripts (plus or minus an error bar of *c.* 10% for von Soden's generalist groupings).

Von Soden's Kx group contains 513 manuscripts out of the 983 K group manuscripts. But only 171 of these were counted for this reading, *infra*. Subtracting the 513 Kx manuscripts in von Soden's K group from the 983 manuscripts, yields a total of 470 manuscripts; and then adding back in the 171 from the Kx group counted for this reading, means a total of 641 manuscripts are of relevance to us here at Matt. 21:28a. Or on a more precise count of Gospel manuscripts in the K group, out of *c.* 860 K group Gospel manuscripts; inside Kx there are only 13 manuscripts that contain just the Apostolos (Acts-Jude, or portions thereof)[45] i.e., (in rounded numbers) there are *c.* 500 Gospel manuscripts. While such a small number means one can reasonably count the entire Kx group for the gospels, if one were to seek *an even more precise Gospel manuscripts count*, then of *c.* 860 K group Gospel manuscripts, subtracting *c.* 500 that are Kx subgroup Gospel manuscripts yields *c.* 360 manuscripts and then adding back in the 171 from the Kx group counted for this reading, means a total of 531 manuscripts are of relevance to us here at Matt. 21:28a (plus or minus an error bar of *c.* 10% for von Soden's generalist groupings).

---

[44]   (Showing von Soden's numbers in brackets after their Gregory numbers): Minuscules: 604 (α 459), 634 (α 462), 1100 (α 474), 1140 (α 371), 1249 (α 454), 1725 (α 385), 1732 (α 405), 1749 (α 655), 1752 (α 362), 1855 (α 372), 1856 (α 373), 1865 (α 380), 2080 (α 406, Kr in Acts), 2218 (α 652), & 2221 (δ 557). (There is also Minuscule 1101 = von Soden's α 751, 17th century, Byzantine text type, but it is too late in time to be inside the closed class of sources).

[45]   (Showing von Soden's numbers in brackets after their Gregory numbers): Minuscules: 308 (α 456), 309 (α 351), 312 (α 187), 384 (α 355), 398 (α 189, Byzantine outside General Epistles), 464 (α 165), 465 (α 166), 466 (α 167), 601 (α 360), 613 (α 298), 1022 (α 480), 1277 (α 194), & 1860 (α 377).

When we put together the Gospel manuscripts support for the "*tis* (certain)" in von Soden's K group at Matt. 21:28a, we thus have 1 manuscript from Ki (Codex E 07 = von Soden's ε 55) + 61 manuscripts from Kx + *c.* 175 manuscripts from Kr = a total of 237 out of a total K count of 531 Gospel manuscripts here used in the K count.   This is 44.6% of the count, or *c.* 45%, so that the reading "*Anthropos* (A man)" has *c.* 55% support.   When one further recognizes an error bar of *c.* 10% for von Soden's generalist groupings, not applicable in this case for the more precisely counted sample from Kx, but still relevant to the wider Kr count, 10% of the Kr's 175 out of 531 = 10% of 33% of these manuscripts.   Thus (unlike the usual error bar of *c.*10%) in this instance we can give a figure of *c.* 45% minus 0% - *c.* 3.5% for the reading, "*Anthropos* (A man) *tis* (certain);" and a corresponding figure of *c.* 55% minus 0% - *c.* 3.5% for the reading, "*Anthropos* (A man)."

On these figures, I would have to agree with Hodges & Farstad that while there is a *prima facie* majority support for "*Anthropos* (A man)," that in fact the text is split in a major way here.   I conclude this even though I use the Robinson & Pierpont type methodology of a Byzantine text priority with regard to von Soden's K group, rather than Hodges & Farstad's I and K groups methodology.   But given that more than 90% of the *c.* 1,000 von Soden K group manuscripts are Byzantine text, and more than 85% of the *c.* 1,500 von Soden I and K group manuscripts are Byzantine text, both methodologies *should* produce the same result with respect to what the majority Byzantine text is, or should agree if it is too close to call such as here.

Bearing in mind that one must be able to compose the representative Byzantine text from a smaller or larger number of manuscripts, when the count is this close I would have to say that the text is fairly evenly divided between the two readings, and textual analysis is required to determine the better one.   Thus on this occasion, it seems to me that Robinson & Pierpont have erred badly in their calculations.   I note that in Green's Textual Apparatus (1986), Pierpont made no reference to this reading at Matt. 21:28a, and so there seems to have been some bad slippage over time by Robinson & Pierpont at this point.   (Cf. commentary at Matt. 21:22a, Appendix 1.)

The Second Matter.   Tischendorf and von Soden say Codex U 030 (9th century) supports *Reading 2* whereas Swanson says it supports *Reading 1*.   Therefore no reference is made to U 030, *infra*.

The Third Matter (The Latin Vulgate Text).   The text I use for the NT of Jerome's Latin Vulgate is that of Wordsworth & White (1911, Oxford, England).   But Merk's *Novum Testamentum* (1964, Rome) states that Latin Vulgate Codices are split over this reading, and lists about half a dozen out of about 30 Vulgate Codices that follow *Reading 1*.   This indicates that it is a minority reading among Merk's Vulgate Codices, though the one preferred by Wordsworth & White. Hence while I follow Wordsworth & White in isolating the reading of St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate as supporting *Reading 1*; there is also a rival Vulgate form which follows the variant, and which was adopted in the Clementine.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 21:28a, the representative Byzantine text is fairly evenly divided between two readings. *Reading 1*, found in Scrivener's Text is Greek, "*Anthropos* (A man)" i.e., "A man," or with "certain" in italics as an added word, "A *certain* man" (AV). This is supported by about half of the Byzantine texts e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53; abbreviating this to "*anos*" with a line on top), K 017 (9th century), Y 034 (9th century), Pi 041 (9th century); and Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*homo* (a man)," in some editions of Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), being found in a minority of Merk's Vulgate Codices e.g., Latin Vulgate Codices Z (*Codex Harleianus*, Gospels 6th / 7th century, London), A (*Codex Amiatinus*, 7th / 8th century, Firenze / Florence, Italy), H (*Codex Hubertianus*, 9th / 10th century, London); as well as in old Latin Versions *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis* (old Latin Version d, 5th century), *Codex Aureus* (old Latin Version aur, 7th century), and g2 (*Codex Sangermanensis II*, 10th century, Paris); and also the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407). It is also manifested in the Greek New Testament editions of e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550).

Reading 2 is Greek, "*Anthropos* (A man) *tis* (certain)," i.e., "A certain man." This is also supported by about half of the Byzantine texts e.g., Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), E 07 (8th century), M 021 (9th century); and (in both instances abbreviating "*anthropos*" to "*anos*" with a line on top) Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, "*homo* (a man) *quidam* (certain)," in some editions of Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), being found in a majority of Merk's Vulgate Codices e.g., Latin Vulgate Codices X (*Codex Cantabrigiensis*, 7th century, Cambridge), R (*Codex Rushworthianus*, 8th / 9th century, Oxford), and K (*Codex Karolinus*, London); as well as in old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century, *Codex Sangermanensis I* here puts these two words in word order 2,1), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); and also the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Eusebius (d. 339), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); the early mediaeval church writer, Pseudo-Athanasius (6th century) in a Latin work; and the early mediaeval church writer, Pseudo-Chrysostom in a Latin work (6th century).

In Matthean Greek, St. Matthew normatively refers to "*Anthropos* (A man)" (Matt. 12:10; 13:31; 17:14; 25:14) not "*Anthropos* (A man) *tis* (certain)," i.e., he does not use "*tis* ('certain,' masculine singular nominative pronoun, from *tis*)" with "*anthropos* ('a man,' masculine singular nominative <u>noun</u>, from *anthropos*)" as *a general reference noun*. By contrast, he uses "*tis* (certain)" or "*eis* ('one' which may contextually mean 'a certain one,' masculine singular nominative adjective, from *eis*)" with *a specific reference noun*. Thus at Matt. 8:19 he says, "*eis* (a certain) *grammateus* ('scribe,' masculine singular nominative <u>noun</u>, from *grammateus*); or at Matt. 9:18 and Matt.

12:38, "*archon* ('ruler,' masculine singular nominative <u>noun</u>, from *archon*) *eis* (a certain)[46]."

Concerning his usage of "*anthropos* (a man)," St. Matthew may convert this from *a general reference noun* to *a specific reference noun* either to create the meaning of "certain;" or to add "*tis* (certain)." Concerning the former, he refers at Matt. 18:23 and Matt. 22:2 to, "*anthropo* ('a man,' masculine singular dative <u>noun</u>, from *anthropos*) *basilei* ('a king,' masculine singular dative <u>noun</u>, from *basileus*)," i.e., "a certain king" (AV). Concerning the latter, he refers at Matt. 21:33 to, "*anthropos* (a man) *tis* (certain) *en* ('he was' = 'there was') *oikodespotes* ('a householder,' masculine singular nominative <u>noun</u>, from *oikodespotes*)," i.e., "There was a certain householder" (AV). (See commentary at Matt. 21:33, *infra*.)

In stark contrast to Matthean Greek on this matter is Lucan Greek. Unlike St. Matthew, St. Luke does use "*tis* (certain)" with *a general reference noun*. Hence St. Luke refers at Luke 8:27 to, "*aner* ('a man,' masculine singular nominative <u>noun</u>, from *aner*) *tis* (certain)," i.e., "a certain man;" or at e.g., Luke 14:2 and Luke 14:16, to "*anthropos* (a man) *tis* (certain)," i.e., "a certain man."

Therefore it is clear that *Reading 2*, "*Anthropos* (A man) *tis* (certain)," here at Matt. 21:28a presents a clear and obvious textual problem, so that even if e.g., 99% of manuscripts followed it, it would still "clang on the ears" as bad Matthean Greek. By contrast, *Reading 1*, "*Anthropos* (A man)," is clearly Matthean Greek. If St. Matthew were to use "*tis* (certain)" here with "*Anthropos* (A man)," he would also convert this *general reference noun* to *a specific reference noun* like he does at Matt. 21:33. By contrast, at Luke 15:11 St. Luke says, "*Anthropos* (A man) *tis* (certain) *eiche* (had) *duo* (two) *uious* (sons);" and this is so strikingly similar to the words of *Reading 2* at Matt. 21:28a, "*Anthropos* (A man) *tis* (certain) *eiche* (had) *tekna* (sons) *duo* (two);" that is seems clear that Matt. 21:28a was not only an assimilation to Lucan Greek in general, but a more specific *stylistic* conflation of Matt. 21:28a with Luke 15:11 in particular. Thus *Reading 1* is rightly found in Scrivener's Text. Given that Origen refers to both *Readings 1 & 2*, he is more likely than not the originator of *Reading 2*.

Was *Reading 2* an accidental *stylistic* conflation with Luke 15:11? In a manuscript line that a scribe, probably Origen, was looking at, did "*Anthropos* (A man)" come at the end of a line with a stylistic paper space of one or two letter spaces? Did this paper space containing nothing become damaged? Did Origen wrongly conclude that something had dropped out? Not understanding the subtleties of Matthean Greek, did Origen then conclude with some reference to the stylistic form at Luke 15:11 that this was the correct "Gospel Greek form" for Matt. 21:28a and so adopt it here?

Was *Reading 2* a deliberate *stylistic* conflation with Luke 15:11? Holy Jeremiah

---

[46] Cf. "*tines* ('certain,' masculine plural nominative pronoun, from *tis*) *ton* (of the) *grammateon* ('scribes,' masculine plural genitive <u>noun</u>, from *grammateus*)."

says, "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" (Jer. 17:9). Did the sinful heart of Origen, not understanding the subtleties of Matthean Greek, consider after a superficial perusal of this verse, that the stylistic form at Luke 15:11 would be "a stylistic improvement" that he would undertake here at Matt. 21:28a?

A deliberate or accidental conflation with Luke 15:11? We cannot be sure; although comparative analysis with "*tis* (certain)" changes Matt. 21:33, *infra*, suggests that a deliberate change is quite likely. But either way, we can be sure that *Reading 2* is a corruption of the text from the original *Reading 1* of the *Textus Receptus*.

Readings 1 & 2 have fairly even support in the Greek of the Byzantine textual tradition. Both readings have support among the Vulgate Codices and old Latin Versions, although in the Latin textual tradition the overall support for *Reading 2* is stronger than it is for *Reading 1*. Both readings are followed by ancient church Greek writers. Nevertheless, the textual argument very strongly favours *Reading 1* over *Reading 2*; Origen refers to both readings and *Reading 2* looks very much like the type of textual corruption that Origen would undertake. Bearing in mind these factors, together with the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*; and the support for *Reading 1* by the church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom; on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 21:28a a middling "B" (in the range of 69% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading of the TR at Matt. 21:28a, "A man" (*Reading 1*), is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); as well as Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text). It is further found in the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the incorrect reading, "A certain man" (*Reading 2*), is found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), at the hand of a "corrector" of 892 (mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (12th century, independent), and 1071 (12th century, independent). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th

century, independent), *et al.*   It is further found in all extant Syriac Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

For wrong reasons, such as the fact that it is "the shorter reading," and the fact that it is found in the two leading Alexandrian Codices; the correct reading of the TR (*Reading 1*), on this occasion entered the NU Text *et al.*   Thus *by a fluke*, the neo-Alexandrian texts adopted the correct reading at Matt. 21:28a, which is thus found as "A man" in the ASV.   This correct reading of the TR is likewise found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.   Although "dynamic equivalent" embellishment blurs the *Today's English Version* at Matt. 21:28a as it tries to turn a parable into a "once upon a time" type sounding fairy-tale with its childish and supercilious rendering, "There was once a man" (TEV).

The Burgonite Majority Text's *prima donna*[47], the NKJV, has no footnote reference here at Matt. 21:28a with regard to the divided position of the Majority Text. This is one of many omissions in the off-key operatic performance of its very incomplete and selective textual apparatus; which falsely *gives the impression* that the Majority Text is closer to the Received Text than what it actually is.   (Although it must be admitted the Majority Text is a lot closer to the Received Text than are the neo-Alexandrian texts.)
12
The old Latin Papists of the Clementine Vulgate here read, "*homo* (a man) *quidam* (certain);" and so it is to be deduced that this is the reading underpinning the Latin based Douay-Rheims translation at Matt. 21:28a, "A certain man."   Following the rise of the new neo-Alexandrian Papists in the post-Vatican II era, the Papists now look shamefacedly at the ground, swinging their left foot back'n'forth on the ground like a pendulum and declare, "Yea, well we fixed it up in the Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles.   Who cares if we got it wrong for the previous 350 years, it doesn't matter 'cause it's not the Bible that's infallible anyway, it's the Pope"   But the upright standing religiously conservative Protestants reply, "It does matter!   The Word of God is infallible; for Christ himself declared in John 10:35, 'the Scripture cannot be broken'."

Matt. 21:28c "my vineyard" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter: Greek.   Beyond the TR's "*to* ('the,' masculine singular <u>dative</u> definite article, from *o*) *ampeloni* ('vineyard,' masculine singular <u>dative</u> noun, from *ampelon*); a variant from outside the closed class of sources in the Western Text's D 05 here reads, "*ton* (masculine singular <u>accusative</u> definite article, from *o*) *ampelona* ('vineyard,' masculine singular <u>accusative</u> noun, from *ampelon*)."   The matter is of some interest for highlighting another matter, to wit, the reading of Lectionary 2378.

---

[47]   From the Latin language of Italian, meaning, "first lady."

Lectionary 2378 reads, "*to* (the) *ampelone* ('vineyard,' written with closed top omegas in continuous script as 'τωαμπελωνн')."   This is evidently a localized revowelling with the final letter being changed to an eta (*e* / η / H).   But is it changing the iota (*i* / ι) of the TR's "*ampeloni*" or the alpha (*a* / α) of the variant?   At this point we are most fortunate to have the definite article "*to* (the)" in Lectionary 2378.   Since the definite article is in the dative, we can confidently say that this is a local revowelling of the final iota to an eta.   Notably, this same local revowelling to "*to ampelone* (τω αμπελωνη)" in Lectionary 2378 (11th century, Byzantine text, Sydney University), is recorded by Swanson as also being in Minuscule 2 (12th century, Byzantine text, Basel, Switzerland).

The Second Matter: Latin.   In the *Book of Armagh*, the word before the noun, Latin, "*viniam* ('vineyard,' feminine singular accusative noun, from *vinia*)" is the preposition, "*in* ('in,' preposition with accusative)."   But this manuscript turns these two words into the one compound word, "*inviniam.*"   However, for my purposes here at Matt. 21:28c this makes no difference, and so I show this bright shining Irish jewel supporting the TR's reading, *infra*.   See "Preliminary Textual Discussion," at Matt. 21:12b, *supra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 21:28c, the TR's Greek, "*to* (the) *ampeloni* (vineyard) *mou* (of me)," i.e., "my vineyard" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codex W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, with local revowelling of word 2 to *ampelone*) and 1968 (1544 A.D.).   It is further supported as Latin, "*vinea* (vineyard) *mea* (my)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), old Latin Version 1 (7th / 8th century), and the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century); and from the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is also found as Latin, "*vineam* (vineyard) *meam* (my)," in old Latin Versions aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century); and as Latin, "*viniam* (vineyard) *meam* (my)," in the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Eusebius (d. 339), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); the early mediaeval church writer, Pseudo-Athanasius (6th century) in a Latin work; and the early mediaeval church writer, Pseudo-Chrysostom in a Latin work (6th century).

However, a variant which omits Greek, "*mou* (of me)," and thus reads simply, "*to* (the) *ampeloni* (vineyard)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in e.g., Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), K 017 (9th century), M 021 (9th century), and Y 034 (9th century).   It is further omitted in old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century).   It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and early mediaeval church Greek writer, John of Damascus (d. before 754).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading

which must thus stand. The origins of the variant are speculative. Origen refers to both readings and is the probable originator of the variant.

Was this an accidental change? Both W 032 and Lectionary 1968 remind us that a form of unnumbered verse divisions predates the numbered verses we have from the time of Stephanus in 1551. Lectionary 1968 uses a cross, something like, "+" at the end of a division e.g., here ones at the end of Matt. 21:27 and Matt. 21:28 (although these divisions are not always the same as our verse divisions e.g., here Lectionary 1968 also has a "+" inside verse 28 after "*eipe*" / "said" and before "*teknon*" / "Son"). W 032 prefers stylistic paper spaces, so that e.g., there is clear paper space of about 8 letter spaces before verse 27, another of about 3 letter spaces before verse 28, and another of about 2 letter spaces before verse 29 (although these divisions are not always the same as our verse divisions e.g., inside verse 27 W 032 here has a paper space gap of about 7 or 8 letter spaces after the "*ouk oidamen*" / "We cannot tell," and the "*ephe autois kai autos*" etc. / "And he said unto them" etc.). Did a scribe have before him a manuscript using the type of stylistic paper spaces we find in W 032? Due to a paper fade of the "*mou* (of me)" at the end of verse 28, did the scribe then simply consider this gap was part of the stylistic paper space that occurs before verse 29?

Alternatively, in W 032 when "*MOY* (*mou*)" comes at the end of a line at e.g., Luke 14:24 (p. 269), it is abbreviated to one letter space as a mu, "M" with a small omicron, "o" on top, and from the bottom a "j" shape (without the dot of a "j") coming down from the "M" i.e., doubling up on the "V" in the middle of the "M," to form the top of an upsilon, "Y." Did such an abbreviation exist in earlier times? If so, was such a one letter space abbreviation at the end of a line lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was this a deliberate change? The probable origins of this variant with Origen increases the likelihood of this. Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, deliberately prune away the "*mou* (my)" from "*ampeloni* (vineyard)" as a "stylistic improvement" against "unnecessarily long-winded and verbose terminology"?

A deliberate or accidental change? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that this was a change to the text of Scripture; and that it was probably perpetrated by Origen.

The TR's reading has rock solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine text reading against which there is no good textual argument. It also has impressive support in the Latin with St. Jerome's Vulgate and a number of old Latin versions. It is further supported by an old and holy doctor of the Christian church in St. Cyril, the Bishop of Alexandria from 412 to 444. By contrast, the variant has relatively weak support in the Greek textual tradition, though some better support in the Latin textual tradition. Moreover, this looks very much like a typical corruption of the text by Origen, who was clearly aware of both readings. Weighing up these factors, and bearing in mind the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 21:28c an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading of the TR at Matt. 21:28c, "my vineyard," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is also found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century) and Codex 0138 (13th century, mixed text type, Matt. 21:24-24:15); as well as Minuscules 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text). It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions, and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version.

However, the variant, "the vineyard," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found as the original reading of (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in all extant Syriac Versions e.g., the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; Armenian Version (5th century); Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

At Matt. 21:28c, the incorrect variant entered the NU Text *et al*, since on neo-Alexandrian principles, "the shorter reading is the better reading," and there is "external support" for the reading in e.g., the Western Text (D05) and Syriac. To which Tischendorf would no doubt want us to also add, "and in Dillmann's Ethiopic Version too!;" and the earlier neo-Alexandrians of e.g., the Nestle-Aland's 26th edition of 1979 and United Bible Society's 3rd edition of 1975 would want to jump in to add, "And don't forget about the Caesarean Text of the Armenian Version and Arabic Diatessaron's support!" Although in fairness to contemporary neo-Alexandrians, it must be said that they now have embarrassed faces that are as red as beetroot with regard to the earlier neo-Alexandrian enthusiasm for the "Caesarean" Text, Arabic Diatessaron, and Dillmann's Ethiopic Version.

The erroneous variant is found at Matt. 21:28c in the American Standard Version

as "the vineyard" (ASV).   It is likewise found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

Matt. 21:29,30c,31b: A Triple A Rating.
  Component 1: Matt. 21:29,
   "I will not: but afterward he repented, and went" (TR & AV) {A}
  Component 2: Matt. 21:30c,
   "I go, Sir: and went not" (TR & AV) {A}
  Component 3: Matt. 21:31b, "The first" (TR & AV) {A}

  Preliminary Textual Discussion.

  The First Matter: The three components. The three components of Matt. 21:29,30c,31b, must be considered together since they form divergent but related stylistic units.   Discussion of the origins of the variants will occur corporately after all three Components in "Principal Textual Discussion," *infra*.

  In *Form 1* (Inside the closed class of sources: TR, majority Byzantine text, & Vulgate; Outside the closed class of sources: Alexandrian text's Codex Sinaiticus), the first son says, "I will not: but afterward he repented, and went" (Matt. 21:29, *Component 1*); the second son says, "I go, Sir: and went not" (Matt. 21:30c, *Component 2*); and to our Lord's question, Which "did the will of his father?" the answer is "The first" (Matt. 21:31b, *Component 3*).

  In *Form 2* (Inside the closed class of sources: old Latin a, e, b, d, ff2, h, aur, 1, g1, ff1, & Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron; Outside the closed class of sources: Western text's D 05), the first son says, "I will not: but afterward he repented, and went" (Matt. 21:29, *Component 1*); the second son says, "I go, Sir: and went not" (Matt. 21:30c, *Component 2*); and to our Lord's question, Which "did the will of his father?" the answer is, "The last" (Matt. 21:31b, *Component 3*, *Variant 1* and/or *Variant 2*).

  In *Form 3* (Outside the closed class of sources: Minuscule 69 with *Component 3*, *Variant 1*; Outside the closed class of sources: Alexandrian text's Codex Vaticanus with *Component 3*, *Variant 2*), the first son says, "I go, Sir: and went not" (Matt. 21:29, *Component 1*, *Variant*); the second son says, "I will not: but afterward he repented, and went" Matt. 21:30c, *Component 2*, *Variant*); and to our Lord's question, Which "did the will of his father?" the answer is, "The last" (Matt. 21:31b, *Component 3*, *Variant 1*).

  The Second Matter: Component 3 Latin. Usually we can tell what Greek reading the Latin is supporting.   E.g., at Matt. 21:31b, we cannot doubt that e.g., Tischendorf (1869-72), is correct in considering that the Greek TR's "*O* (The) *pr*<u>*o*</u>*tos* ('first,' masculine singular nominative adjective, from *pr*<u>*o*</u>*tos-*<u>*e*</u>*-on*)," is supported in the Latin, "*Primus* ('The first,' masculine singular nominative adjective, from *primus-a-um*)," *infra*.

  However, Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), von Soden (1913), and the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, all take the view that the Latin at Matt.

21:31b, "*Novissimus* ('The last,' masculine singular nominative adjective, from *novissimus-a-um*)," is supporting *Variant 1*, Greek, "*O* (The) *eschatos* ('last,' masculine singular nominative adjective, from *eschatos-e-on*)." This conclusion evidently springs from the associated belief that these Latin manuscripts are here all based on, or influenced by a group of Greek manuscripts here represented in, the Greek Western text. I.e., the Greek Western text's D 05 broadly has the same three components, and D 05 reads at *Component 3*, "*O* (The) *eschatos* (last)."

But for we neo-Byzantines, this type of neo-Alexandrian logic is not admissible. While it is true that we have no Byzantine Greek manuscripts or church Greek writers that use *Form 2* with *Variant 2* of *Component 3* (Greek, "*o usteros*"), nor do we have any such manuscripts that use *Form 2* with *Variant 1* of *Component 3* (Greek, "*o eschatos*"). We certainly are not prepared to consider Greek manuscripts outside the closed class of sources, such as the Western Greek Text, to resolve such a dispute inside the closed class of sources. NT manuscripts outside the closed class of sources are preserved on the same principles of non-Divine Preservation that the Latin and Greek classics were preserved on; and "if push comes to shove," we "really don't give a brass farthing" what these NT manuscripts outside the closed class of sources do or do not say. *We cannot stomach the "swine" "husks" (Luke 15:16) of texts outside the closed class of sources, for we are accustomed to the "milk and honey" of the Promised Land (Josh. 5:6) found in the Greek and Latin texts inside the New Testament closed class of sources.*

Therefore, it is also possible that the Latin, "*Novissimus* (The last)," is supporting *Variant 2*, Greek, "*O* (The) *usteros* ('last,' masculine singular nominative adjective, from *usteros-a-on*)." Given that one could reconstruct either Greek "*o eschatos*" (*Variant 1*) or "*o usteros*" (*Variant 2*) from the Latin, "*novissimus*," on neo-Byzantine principles we cannot here go beyond saying that this Latin reading supports either *Variant 1* or *Variant 2* in a broad sense i.e., as opposed to either the TR's reading or *Variant 3*. Hence in considering stylistic *Form 2* of Matt. 21:29,30c,31b, at *Component 3* of Matt. 21:31b, one cannot safely go beyond saying that the answer, "The last" is followed by "*Variant 1* and/or *Variant 2*" ("The First Matter: The three components," *supra*).

Principal Textual Discussion.

Component 1: Matt. 21:29.

The TR's *Component 1* is textually unified as *Form 1* to *Components 2 & 3* by the commonality of majority Byzantine text support for all three TR components, the Vulgate, and old Latin versions f, q, & c. However, the TR's *Component 1* is textually unified as *Form 2* to *Components 2 & 3* by the commonality of old Latin Versions a, e, b, d, ff2, h, aur, 1, g1, ff1, and the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron.

At Matt. 21:29 the TR's Greek, "*Ou* (not) *thelo* (I will): *usteron* (afterwards) *de* (but) *metameletheis* ('repenting' = 'he repented') *apelthe* ([and] he went)" i.e., "I will not: but afterward he repented, and went" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and

Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.)[48]. It is further supported as Latin, "*Nolo* (I will not): *postea* (afterwards) *autem* (but) *paenitentia* ([unto] repentance) *motus* (having been moved), *abiit* (he went)," i.e., "I will not: but afterwards being moved unto repentance, he went," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century). From the Latin support for this reading, e.g., the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). In different Latin forms, *Component 1* is also supported in old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century), Origen (d. 254), Eusebius (d. 339), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); and ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367).

The *Component 1* (Matt. 21:29) variant is textually unified as *Form 3* to *Components 2* (Matt. 21:30c) *& 3* (Matt. 21:31b, *Variant 1*) by a similar reading found in Lectionary 547 (13th century). (Cf. a further discussion of this Outside the Closed Class of Sources, *infra*.)

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text here which is thus correct. The TR's reading has rock solid support in the Greek and Latin, whereas the variant has only weak support in the Greek. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 21:29 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Component 2: Matt. 21:30c.

The TR's *Component 2* is textually unified as *Form 1* to *Components 1 & 3* by the commonality of majority Byzantine text support for all three TR components, the Vulgate, and old Latin versions f, q, & c. However, the TR's *Component 2* is textually unified as *Form 2* to *Components 1 & 3* by the commonality of old Latin Versions a, e, b, d, ff2, h, aur, 1, g1, ff1, and the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron.

At Matt. 21:30c, the TR's Greek, "*Eg*o (I [go]) *Kurie* (Sir), *kai* (and) *ouk* (not) *ap*e*lthe* ([and] he went)," "I go, Sir: and went not" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.)[49]. It is further supported as Latin, "*Eo* (I go) *Domine* (Sir)[50], *et* (and)

---

[48] W 032, Sigma 042, and Lectionary 2378 all have the optional "*n*" (nu) at the end of "*ap*e*lthe* ([and] he went)," whereas Lectionary 1968, like Scrivener's text, does not.

[49] W 032, Lectionaries 2378 and 1968, all abbreviate "*Kurie* (Sir)" to "*KE*" with a line on top. W 032, Sigma 042, and Lectionary 2378 all have the optional "*n*" (nu) at end of "*ap*e*lthe* ([and] he went)," whereas Lectionary 1968, like Scrivener, does not.

non (not) *ivit* (he went)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century). From the Latin support for this reading, e.g., the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). In different Latin forms, *Component 2* is also supported in old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.) and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century), Origen (d. 254), Eusebius (d. 339), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); and ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367).

The *Component 2* (Matt. 21:30c) variant is textually unified as *Form 3* to *Components 1* (Matt. 21:29) *& 3* (Matt. 21:31b, *Variant 1*) by a similar reading found in Lectionary 547 (13th century). (Cf. a further discussion of this Outside the Closed Class of Sources, *infra*.)

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text here which must thus stand. The TR's reading has rock solid support in the Greek and Latin, whereas the variant has only weak support in the Greek. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 21:30c an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Component 3: Matt. 21:31b.

The TR's *Component 3* is textually unified as *Form 1* to *Components 1 & 2* by the commonality of majority Byzantine text support for all three TR components, the Vulgate, and old Latin versions f, q, & c.

At Matt. 21:31b, the TR's Greek, "*O* (The) *protos* (first)," in the wider words, "They say unto him, The first," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 63 (11th century, Paris, France), 185 (11th century, Christ's College, Cambridge University, England), 76 (12th century, Paris, France), 211 (12th century, Christ Church College, Oxford University, England), 2378 (11th century, Sydney University, Australia), 1642 (13th century, Chicago University, USA), 1761 (15th century, St. Catherine's Greek Orthodox Monastery, Sinai, Arabia), and 1968 (1544 A.D., Sydney University, Australia). It is also supported as Latin, "*Primus* (The first)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of

---

[50] Latin, "*Domine* (masculine singular <u>vocative</u> noun, from *dominus*)." The vocative form is used in direct address. Here meaning, "Sir," this is also the courtesy title used by school students (pupils) for a male school teacher (schoolmaster) such as myself. A local dialect Scottish form of the Latin, "*Domine*," also used in Scotland for school teachers (schoolmasters), is "*Dominie*."

Armagh (812 A.D.).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century), Origen (d. 254), Eusebius (d. 339), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

The *Component 3* (Matt. 21:31b, *Variant 1*) variant is textually unified as *Form 3* to *Components 1* (Matt. 21:29) *& 2* (Matt. 21:30c) by a similar reading found in Lectionary 547 (13th century).

The *Component 3* (Matt. 21:31b) *Variants 1 & 2* are textually unified as *Form 2* to the TR's *Components 1 & 2* by the commonality of old Latin Versions a, e, b, d, ff2, h, aur, 1, g1, ff1, and the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron.   The Greek for *Variants 1 & 2* is first discussed, then this Latin.

Component 3, *Variant 1* is Greek, "*O* (The) *eschatos* (last)," in the wider words, "They say unto him, The last."   This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscules 262 (10th century), and 1187 (11th century).

Component 3, *Variant 2* is Greek, "*O* (The) *usteros* (last)," in the wider words, "They say unto him, The last."   This is found in the ancient church Greek writer, Isidore of Pelusium (d. *c.* 435), and the early mediaeval church writer, Pseudo-Athanasius (6th century) in a Latin work.   A similar minority Byzantine reading is found in Minuscule 584 (10th century).

The Greek readings of *Component 3*, *Variant 1* and/or *Variant 2* are further followed in the Latin, "*Novissimus* (The last)."   This is found in old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).

At *Component 3* a *Variant 3* reads, "*O* (The) *deuteros* (second)," in the wider words, "They say unto him, The second."   This is found in the early mediaeval church Greek writer, John of Damascus (d. before 754).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which thus must stand.   The TR's reading has rock solid support from ancient times in the Greek, and impressive support from ancient times in the Latin with St. Jerome's Vulgate.   *Variants 1 & 2* both have weak support in the Greek, although one or both of them have support in a number of old Latin Versions.   *Variant 3* has weak support in the Greek, and no support in the Latin.   Taking into account these factors, and bearing in mind the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 21:31b an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Since *Component 1* (Matt. 21:29), *Component 2* (Matt. 21:30c), and *Component 3* (Matt. 21:31b), thus all individually received an "A" rating, this means that in a corporate

sense, the *Textus Receptus* reading of Matt. 21:29,30c,31b has *a Triple A Rating*.

The origins of the *Form 2* changes to *Component 3*, with *Variant 1* and/or *Variant 2* are speculative.

In *Form 2* (old Latin Versions a, e, b, d, ff2, h, aur, 1, g1, ff1, & Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron), the first son says, "I will not: but afterward he repented, and went" (Matt. 21:29, *Component 1*); the second son says, "I go, Sir: and went not" (Matt. 21:30c, *Component 2*); and to our Lord's question, Which "did the will of his father?" the answer is, "The last" (Matt. 21:31b, *Component 3*, *Variant 1* and/or *Variant 2*). We know of this reading inside the closed class of sources only in the Latin, although it is possible that it may have came from a Greek manuscript line. The only textual error in *Form 2* is in *Component 3*.

In *Form 2*, was this an accidental change of *Component 3*, *Variant 1* and/or *Variant 2*? Was this done by Greek or Latin scribes? Alas, the competence of scribes sometimes left something to be desired.

In a Greek manuscript, was "*pr<u>o</u>tos* (first)" written over two lines with "*pr<u>o</u>*" at the end of one line, and "*tos*" at the start of the next? Due to a paper fade, was the "*pr<u>o</u>*" lost? Did a somewhat incompetent Greek scribe then "reconstruct" this as "*eschatos* (last)" (*Component 3*, *Variant 1*)?

In a Greek manuscript, was "*pr<u>o</u>tos* (first)" written over two lines with "*pr<u>o</u>t*" at the end of one line, and "*os*" at the start of the next? Due to a paper fade, was the "*pr<u>o</u>t*" lost? Did a somewhat incompetent Greek scribe then "reconstruct" this as "*usteros* (last)" (*Component 3*, *Variant 2*)?

In a Latin manuscript, was "*Primus* (The first)" written with a generous stylistic paper space before it, because it is the start of an answer? Due to a paper fade, was the "*Pr*" lost so that it simply read, " :::*imus*"? Did a somewhat incompetent Latin scribe then "reconstruct" this as "*Novissimus* (The last)" (*Component 3*, *Variant 1* and/or *Variant 2*).

Was this a deliberate change? Did any Greek or Latin scribes, wishing to "up the anti" of anti-Semitic rhetoric, deliberately change this to "the last (Greek, *eschatos* or *usteros*; Latin, *novissimus*)," to "make the Jews look stupid"?[51] If so, any such scribe

---

[51] The term "anti-Semitic" refers to Semitic Jews. While the wider descendants of Shem include Gentile Semites (e.g., Asshur & Aram) and also descendants not of Semitic race i.e., Gentile Shemites from Elam (Gen. 10:22); in the narrowest sense of the word, "Shem" refers only to Jewish Semites (Gen. 9:26; cf. Matt. 15:22,26,27), and this is its meaning in the term, "anti-Semitic." In post NT times, large numbers of Jewish converts of Gentile race came in, e.g., the Ashkenazi Jew (Caucasian origins from Japheth, Gen. 10:3) or Ethiopian Jew (Cushitic origins from Ham, Gen. 10:6), and so one could not properly use the term "anti-Semitic" with respect to them. However, the

erred in doing so. We Christians are opposed to the Jewish rejection of the Messiah (II Cor. 3), and in harmony with the teachings of Rev. 21:8 with respect to the "unbelieving," those in Judaism are included in the anathemas of the *Athanasian Creed*. But Rev. 21:8 also condemns "all liars," and it is not for us to corrupt the Word of God, to "make the Jews look stupid." We who like myself are of Gentile race, are only now in God's great favour because those of the Jewish race rejected Christ (Rom. 9-11). "The" Jewish "branches were broken off" "because of unbelief;" so that we "standest by faith," and should "not" "be" "high-minded, but fear: for if God spared not the natural branches," we should "take heed lest he also spare not" us (Rom. 11:19-21).

Was *Component 3*, *Variant 1* and/or *Variant 2* in *Form 2* an accidental or deliberate change? We do not know. But we do know that it was a textual corruption.

Form 3 is found in a similar reading in Lectionary 547 (13th century). (Cf. a further discussion of this Outside the Closed Class of Sources, *infra*.)

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading of the TR's *Component 1* at Matt. 21:29, "*Ou* (not) *thelo* (I will): *usteron* (afterwards) *de* (but) *metameletheis* ('repenting' = 'he repented') *apelthe* ([and] he went)" i.e., "I will not: but afterward he repented, and went," is basically found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century), although it omits the "*de*"/ "but" of Component 1; as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); and Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text). It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The *Component 1* (Matt. 21:29) variant is textually unified as *Form 3* to *Components 2* (Matt. 21:30c) *& 3* (Matt. 21:31b, *Variant 1*) by the commonality of Minuscule 69 (15th century, mixed text type in e.g., Matthew's Gospel). Thus a Minuscule 69 variant at *Component 1*, *Variant 1a*, reads, "*Ypago* (I go) *kai* (and) *ouk* (not) *apelthen* ([and] he went)," i.e., "I go; and went not." *Component 1*, *Variant 1a*, is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century).

Component 1, *Variant 1b*, "*Ego* (I [go]) *Kurie* (Sir), *kai* (and) *ouk* (not) *apelthen* ([and] he went)," "I go, Sir: and went not," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century).

Component 1, *Variant 1c*, "*Ypago* (I [go]) *Kurie* (Sir), *kai* (and) *ouk* (not)

Jewish race (Rom. 9-11) was largely preserved among the Sephardic Jews (Obadiah 20).

apelthen ([and] he went),” i.e., “I go, Sir: and went not,” is found in Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent).

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading of the TR’s *Component 2* at Matt. 21:30c, “*Ego* (I [go]) *Kurie* (Sir), *kai* (and) *ouk* (not) *apelthe* ([and] he went),” i.e., “I go, Sir: and went not,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); and Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text).   It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The *Component 2* (Matt. 21:30c) variant is textually unified as *Form 3* to *Components 1* (Matt. 21:29) *& 3* (Matt. 21:31b, *Variant 1*) by the commonality of Minuscule 69 (15th century, mixed text type in e.g., Matthew’s Gospel).   Thus a Minuscule 69 variant at *Component 2* reads, “*Ou* (not) *thelo* (I will): *usteron* (afterwards) *de* (but) *metameletheis* (‘repenting’ = ‘he repented’) *apelthen* ([and] he went)” i.e., “I will not: but afterward he repented, and went.”   *Component 2*, *Variant*, is also found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century).   It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent); and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.   It is also found in the Syriac Palestinian Version (*c.* 6th century); and the Armenian Version (5th century).

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading of the TR’s *Component 3* at Matt. 21:31b, “The first (*protos*),” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century).   It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); and Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text).   It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The *Component 3* (Matt. 21:31b, *Variant 1*) variant is textually unified as *Form 3* to *Components 1* (Matt. 21:29) *& 2* (Matt. 21:30c) by the commonality of Minuscule 69 (15th century, mixed text type in e.g., Matthew’s Gospel).   Thus a Minuscule 69 variant at *Component 3*, *Variant 1*, reads, “The last (*eschatos*).”   This is also found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent); and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983

(12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.

Component 3, *Variant 2*, Greek, "The last (*usteros*)," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century).

The reading, "the last" (*Component 3*, *Variants 1 & 2*) is also found in the Armenian Version (5th century).

Amidst this bewildering array of linked variants (and for the sake of greater simplicity I have omitted some manuscripts and their readings,) the reader should consider "the big picture" in the completed *Forms 1, 2, & 3*.

In *Form 1* (Inside the closed class of sources: TR, majority Byzantine text, & Vulgate; Outside the closed class of sources: Alexandrian text's Codex Sinaiticus), the first son says, "I will not: but afterward he repented, and went" (Matt. 21:29, *Component 1*); the second son says, "I go, Sir: and went not" (Matt. 21:30c, *Component 2*); and to our Lord's question, Which "did the will of his father?" the answer is "The first" (Matt. 21:31b, *Component 3*).   The Greek text for this is found in the Majority Texts of Hodges & Farstad (1986) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005).   This is the reading found in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72, but which follows *Codex Sinaiticus* in omitting the "*de*"/ "but" of Component 1); and with various NU Text footnotes in the e.g., the UBS 3rd corrected (1983) edition, *Form 1* is also found in the main text of the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

This *Form 1* reading is found in the ASV, NASB (3rd ed., 1995), RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.   It is also found in the old Latin Papists' Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version; as well as the new neo-Alexandrian Papists JB and NJB.

In *Form 2* (Inside the closed class of sources: old Latin a, e, b, d, ff2, h, aur, 1, g1, ff1, & Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron; Outside the closed class of sources: Western text's D 05), the first son says, "I will not: but afterward he repented, and went" (Matt. 21:29, *Component 1*); the second son says, "I go, Sir: and went not" (Matt. 21:30c, *Component 2*); and to our Lord's question, Which "did the will of his father?" the answer is, "The last" (Matt. 21:31b, *Component 3*, *Variant 1* and/or *Variant 2*).

This *Form 2* reading is not found in any of the versions we consider.

In *Form 3* (Outside the closed class of sources: Minuscule 69 with *Component 3*, *Variant 1*; Outside the closed class of sources: Alexandrian text's Codex Vaticanus with *Component 3*, *Variant 2*), the first son says, "I go, Sir: and went not" (Matt. 21:29, *Component 1*, *Variant*); the second son says, "I will not: but afterward he repented, and went" Matt. 21:30c, *Component 2*, *Variant*); and to our Lord's question, Which "did the will of his father?" the answer is, "The last" (Matt. 21:31b, *Component 3*, *Variant 1*).

This transposition of sections looks very much like a deliberate scribal "improvement," and so on this occasion we can reasonably work on the presupposition

that this was a deliberate.   The reasons for these prodigious "stylistic improvements" that in combination act to create *Form 3* are speculative.   (Cf. Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, pp. 55-6; 2nd ed., 1994, pp. 44-6).

Did a scribe take the view that "it made no sense" to say "likewise" "to the second" son (Matt. 21:30), if the first son had already "went" (Matt. 21:29)?   Did he thus "have the great brainwave" of reversing the order of the first and second sons (Components 1 & 2), and thus also the Jewish response (Component 3)?   If so, he was "too smart by half."   That is because the father evidently said for *both* sons to go.

Alternatively, did a scribe seek to "harmonize" the order of the sons in Matt. 21:28-31, with the application in Matt. 21:32?   I.e., in verse 32 "John" the Baptist first "came unto you" Jews "in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not" (Matt. 21:32), like the son transposed in *Form 3* from being second to first who said, "I go, Sir: and went not;" and then "John" the Baptist went to "the publicans and the harlots" who "believed him," like the first son transposed in *Form 3* from being second to first who said, "I will not: but afterward he repented, and went."   If so, once again, such a scribe was "too smart by half."   That is because in verse 31 Jesus first says, "Verily I say unto you, That the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God" (Matt. 21:31) i.e., equating them with the first son of verse 29; and then he says, "before you" (Matt. 21:31) i.e., equating the Jews with the second son of verse 30.   It is then *in elucidation* of this application that the words of verse 32 are contextually said.

We cannot enter the mind of another man, let alone one warped into being one of the "many which corrupt the Word of God" (II Cor. 2:17).   Possibly these conjectures as to why the text was corrupted are wrong.   But while we cannot be sure as to why these corruptions of *Form 3* were made, we can be sure that they were textual corruptions to the Received Text, preserved for us in the representative Byzantine reading.

The Greek text for this *Form 3* is found in the main text of Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952), in both instances with *Component 3*, *Variant 2*, Greek, "The last (*usteros*)," from *Codex Vaticanus*.

This *Form 3* reading is found in the NASB (1st ed., 1960-71 & 2nd ed., 1977), TCNT, NEB, REB, and Moffatt Bible.

We here see the split that occurs among neo-Alexandrians when the two Alexandrian texts do not agree.   No doubt if there were three or four major Alexandrian texts, we would see even more splits!   Because *Codex Sinaiticus* follows *Form 1*, as per usual, it was followed by Tischendorf as his preferred Alexandrian text; and because *Codex Vaticanus* follows *Form 3*, as per usual, it was followed by Westcott & Hort as their preferred Alexandrian text.   Thereafter, different neo-Alexandrian texts and versions sided with one of these two neo-Alexandrians "anchor-man" texts in the *Tischendorf verses Westcott-Hort* "tug-of-war."   In this "tug-of-war" the NASB was "pulled over the line" by "the Tischendorf team" as it went from *Form 3* to *Form 1* in its 3rd edition.   But as this "tug-of-war" continues between the neo-Alexandrians, what will

the NASB's reading be if it brings out a 4th edition?   The answer to this is ultimately the same answer to the question of what any future NU text will do. … It all hangs on which neo-Alexandrians are on the Committee. … Well, at least that is, till the next edition again comes out.   *Ad infinitum* …, well actually, … this "tug-of-war" continues only until Doomsday, at which time God's Theocratic rule will see the end to all TR rivals.

Matt. 21:30b "the second" (TR & AV) {B}

   Preliminary Textual Discussion.

   The First Matter: The Greek.   Here at Matt. 21:30b, Hodges & Farstad's majority text places "*eter<u>o</u>* (other)" in their main text, and they then state through their footnote that the text here is "seriously divided" between this reading and "*deuter<u>o</u>* (second)[52]." Robinson & Pierpont's majority text places "*deuter<u>o</u>* (second)" in the main text, but they state through their sidenote that the text is "significantly divided" between this reading and "*eter<u>o</u>* (other)[53]."   Both majority texts are secondary sources that collate their data from the primary source of the von Soden source book (1913), (which is itself a secondary source relative to the actual manuscripts,) and so on this occasion it is necessary to directly consider von Soden for the relevant information.

   Von Soden says that within his K group, "*eter<u>o</u>* (other)" is followed by 102 out of 171 Kx manuscripts counted (with the remaining 69 following "*deuter<u>o</u>*" / "second,") together with his Kr group.

   Von Soden's Kx group contains 513 manuscripts out of the 983 K group manuscripts.   But only 171 of these were counted for this reading, *infra*.   Subtracting the 513 Kx manuscripts in von Soden's K group from the 983 manuscripts, yields a total of 470 manuscripts; and then adding back in the 171 from the Kx group counted for this reading, means a total of 641 manuscripts are of relevance to us here at Matt. 21:28a.   Or on a more precise count of Gospel manuscripts in the K group, there are *c.* 500 Gospel manuscripts[54].   Thus on *a most precise Gospel manuscripts count*, of *c.* 860 K group Gospel manuscripts, subtracting *c.* 500 that are Kx subgroup Gospel manuscripts yields *c.* 360 manuscripts and then adding back in the 171 from the Kx group counted for this reading, means a total of 531 manuscripts are of relevance to us here at Matt. 21:30b (plus or minus an error bar of *c.* 10% for von Soden's generalist groupings).

   Von Soden's Kr group contains *c.* 189 manuscripts which are exclusively Byzantine inside a wider K group that has 914 exclusively Byzantine manuscripts.   Or

---

[52]   Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xxi & 72.

[53]   Robinson & Pierpont (2005), pp. xviii & 47.

[54]   For Kx and Kr Gospel figures, see Matt. 21:28a, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," "The First Matter," *supra*.

on a more precise count of Gospel manuscripts in the K group, out of *c.* 860 K group Gospel manuscripts; inside there are *c.* 175 Gospel manuscripts. Thus on *a most precise Gospel manuscripts count*, of *c.* 860 K group Gospel manuscripts, *c.* 175 are Kr subgroup Gospel manuscripts (plus or minus an error bar of *c.* 10% for von Soden's generalist groupings).

When we put together the Gospel manuscripts support for the "*etero* (other)" in von Soden's K group at Matt. 21:30b, we thus have 102 manuscripts from Kx + *c.* 175 manuscripts from Kr = a total of 277 out of a total K count of 531 Gospel manuscripts here used in the K count. This is *c.* 52% of the count. When one further recognizes an error bar of *c.* 10% for von Soden's generalist groupings, not applicable in this case for the more precisely counted sample from Kx, but still relevant to the wider Kr count, 10% of the Kr's 175 out of 531 = 10% of 33% of these manuscripts. Thus (unlike the usual error bar of *c.* 10%) in this instance we can give a figure of *c.* 52% minus 0% - *c.* 3.5% for the reading, "*etero* (other);" and a corresponding figure of 48% minus 0%- *c.* 3.5% for the reading, "*deutero* (second)."

On these figures, I would have to agree with both Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont that the text is split in a major way here. Given that more than 90% of the *c.* 1,000 von Soden K group manuscripts are Byzantine text, and more than 85% of the *c.* 1,500 von Soden I and K group manuscripts are Byzantine text, both methodologies thus here reach the same conclusion i.e., the Byzantine text is fairly evenly divided between these two readings. Thus I consider it, "too close to call."

The Second Matter: The Latin. Inside the closed class of sources, Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) considers the "*alterum*" of the Vulgate and most old Latin Versions supports *Reading 2*, Greek, "*etero* (other)." By contrast, von Soden (1913) considers the "*alterum*" of the Vulgate and most old Latin Versions supports *Reading 1*, Greek, "*deutero* (second)."

The Latin word, "*alter*" can mean "other" or "second." This is seen in e.g., the translation of "*alter ego*" variously as "the other self" or "the second self." The Latin root word, "*alter*," is used as the singular <u>accusative</u> adjective "*alterum*" in the Vulgate and old Latin Versions a, e, b, ff2, aur, and c; Book of Armagh, and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century); and as the singular <u>dative</u> adjective, "*alteri*" in old Latin d. Since the Latin here could be translating either the Greek, "*deutero* (second)" (*Reading 1*) or the Greek, "*etero* (other)" (*Reading 2*), no reference is made to these Latin manuscripts.

Both *Codex Usserianus I* (old Latin r1) and *Codex Usserianus II* (old Latin r2) are held at Trinity College Dublin, and both are named in honour of His Grace, James Ussher (1581-1656), Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of the *Church of Ireland* (appointed 1634 by Charles I, Regnal Years: 1625-1649). Von Soden (1913) says both r1 and r2 support "*etero* (other)" (*Reading 2*). But Julicher only gives the reading of *Codex Usserianus I* or old Latin r1, so I cannot check the reading of *Codex Usserianus II* or old Latin r2. Old Latin r1 uses the singular accusative adjective "*alium*," from *alius-a-ud*. This has the meaning of "other" or "another" and so equates the meaning of the Greek,

eteros-a-on.   Hence, like von Soden, I refer to this old Latin version at *Reading 2*, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron also reads, Latin, "*alterum*," and so from this I would not know what the underpinning Arabic reads relative to the two readings.   However, von Soden shows the Arabic Diatessaron here following "*etero* (other)," and on this basis I also show it following *Reading 2*, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 21:30b, the representative Byzantine text is fairly evenly divided between two readings.   *Reading 1*, found in Scrivener's Text is Greek, "*deutero* (second)," in the wider words, "And he came to the second" (AV).   This is supported by about half of the Byzantine texts e.g., Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), M 021 (9th century), V 031 (9th century), Omega 045 (9th century), S 028 (10th century); Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).   It is also manifested in the Greek New Testament editions of e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633).

Reading 2 is Greek, "*etero* (other)," in the wider words, "And he came to the other."   This is also supported by about half of the Byzantine texts e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); E 07 (8th century), K 017 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), X 033 (10th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.).   It is further found as Latin, "*alium* (other)," in old Latin Version r1 (7th century, Trinity College, Dublin, southern Ireland).   It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Eusebius (d. 339), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); as well as the early mediaeval church writer, Pseudo-Athanasius (6th century) in a Latin work.

With regard to *eteros* (other, another) found in *Reading 2*, Matthean Greek always uses it to show a contrast (Matt. 8:21, "another," AV; 11:3, "another," AV; 12:45, "other," AV; 15:30, "others," AV; 16:14 "others," AV).   E.g., St. Matthew uses *eteros* with *eis* in Matt. 6:24, "No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one (*ena*[55]), and love the other (*eteron*[56]); or else he will hold to the one (*enos*[57]), and despise the other (*eterou*[58])."   I.e., *eteros* (other, another) is never used in Matthean Greek to form a contrast with *protos* (first).

With regard to *deuteros* (second) found in *Reading 1*.   In Matthean Greek, *protos*

---

[55]   Masculine singular accusative adjective, from *eis*.

[56]   Masculine singular accusative pronoun, from *eteros-a-on*.

[57]   Masculine singular genitive adjective, from *eis*.

[58]   Masculine singular genitive pronoun, from *eteros-a-on*.

(first) (Matt. 13:30; 17:11) and *deuteros* (second) (Matt. 26:42) are not necessarily used as correlatives. Moreover, *protos* (first) may be used for a long succession of things in which it is not necessarily followed by either *allos* (other), *deuteros* (second), or *eschatos* (last) (Matt. 10:2). However, even here, if the second thing is itemized as part of a wider set of sequentially numbered actions or events, it will be *deuteros* (second), such as at Matt. 22:25,26, "Now there were … seven brethren: … the first (*protos*[59]), … the second (*deuteros*[60]) also, and the third, unto the seventh."

But when *protos* (first) is used as a correlative, it is with *allos* (other), *eschatos* (last), or *deuteros* (second). Thus we find *allos* (other) at Matt. 21:36, "he sent other (*allous*[61]) servants more than the first (*pr_oto_n*[62])." Or *eschatos* (last) is so used at Matt. 19:30; 20:8,16; 27:64 e.g., "So the last (*eschatoi*[63]) shall be first (*pr_oto_i*[64]), and the first (*pr_oto_i*) last (*eschatoi*)" (Matt. 20:16). Or *deuteros* (second) is so used at Matt. 22:38,39, "This is the first (*pr_ote_*[65]) and great commandment. And the second (*deutera*[66]) is like unto it" etc. . I.e., *protos* (first) is never used in Matthean Greek as a correlative with *eteros* (other).

Here at Matt. 21:30b we find there is a correlative between *protos* and the word in the manuscript dispute between *eteros* (other, another) and *deuteros* (second). I.e., Matt. 21:28,30 reads, "A certain man had two sons; and he came to the first (*pr_oto_*[67]), … . And he came to the" "other (*eter_o_*[68])" (*Reading 2*) / "second (*deuter_o_*[69])" (*Reading 1*). In the first instance, Matthean Greek never uses *eteros* (other, another) to form a contrast with *protos* (first); and in the second instance, when *protos* (first) is used in Matthean Greek as a correlative it is with *allos* (other), *eschatos* (last), or *deuteros* (second). Therefore it follows that *Reading 2*, "*eter_o_* (other)," clangs on the ears as bad Matthean

---

[59] Masculine singular nominative adjective, from *protos-a-on*.

[60] Masculine singular nominative adjective, from *deuteros-a-on*.

[61] Masculine plural accusative pronoun, from *allos-e-o*.

[62] Masculine plural genitive adjective, from *protos-a-on*.

[63] Masculine plural nominative adjective, from *eschatos-e-on*.

[64] Masculine plural nominative adjective, from *protos-a-on*.

[65] Feminine singular nominative adjective, from *protos-a-on*.

[66] Feminine singular nominative adjective, from *deuteros-a-on*.

[67] Neuter singular dative adjective, from *protos-a-on*. Cf. vs. 31, "*protos* ('first,' masculine singular nominative adjective, from *protos-a-on*)."

[68] Masculine singular dative pronoun, from *eteros-a-on*.

[69] Neuter singular dative adjective, from *deuteros-a-on*.

Greek and so cannot possibly be correct.   By contrast, *Reading 1*, "*deuter*o (second)," looks and sounds very much like Matthean Greek.   Therefore *Reading 1* is the correct reading and we would have to adopt it even if it were a clear minority reading rather than one which in fact shares about the same Greek manuscript support as *Reading 2*.

The origins of the *Reading 2* variant are conjectural.   Origen appears to be aware of *Reading 1* in some general references to "the second (*deuteros*) son[70]," although the fact that these are not precision quotes of Matt. 20:30a means the matter might be disputed.   But either way, it seems likely that Origen is the originator of this variant.

Was this an accidental change?   Putting the TR's *Reading 1* with the words of Matt. 21:30a which immediately precede it (see Appendix 3 at Matt. 21:30a), this reads, "*Kai* (and) *proselth*o*n* ('coming' = '[he] came') *t*o (to the) *deuter*o (second)," etc. .   Did the "*Kai*" came at the end of the first line, and the "*proselth*o*n t*o *deuter*o" come at the start of the next line?   If so, due to a paper fade, was the "*Kai*" at the end of the first line lost, and did the second line come to look something like, "*proselth*o*n :: :::ter*o"?   Did a scribe "guess" that "there had to be a "*de* (and)" after "*proselth*o*n*," and this meant, "there was only enough room left for "*t*o *eter*o"?   Is this the origin of the wider variant, "*proselth*o*n* ([he] came) *de* (and) *t*o (to the) *eter*o (other)" (Matt. 21:30a variant + Matt. 21:30b *Reading 2*) (Cyril of Alexandria)?

Or did a dizzy-headed, fatigued, distracted, or ill scribe, looking at a manuscript that read, "*Kai* (and) *proselth*o*n* ([he] came) *t*o (to the) *deuter*o (second);" miss the short word, "*Kai*," and write "*proselth*o*n*," and then miss the short word, "*t*o," and write the "*de*" of "*deuter*o"?   We are not sure of who originated the variant at Matt. 21:30a, and whether or not it is in fact connected with the variant of Matt. 21:30b.   But if it is connected, then the fact that Origen seems to have originated the Matt. 21:30b variant would mean that he also originated the Matt. 21:30 a variant.   If so, (and this is only one possibility,) did Origen start day-dreaming about something to do with "*t*o (to the) *eter*o (other)" e.g., some neo-Platonist lectures he had heard from Ammonius Saccas, as he thought about "the other" side "of earthly shadows found in the heavens"?   Did "*t*o (to the) *eter*o (other)" thus become so dominant in his day-dreaming head, that he forgot about "*t*o (to the) *deuter*o (second)," and when he looked down did he just write out "*t*o (to the) *eter*o (other)"?   Unfortunately some scribes, of which Origen was one, were *something less* than *fully* professional.

Either way, is the reading "*proselth*o*n* ([he] came) *de* (and) *t*o (to the) *eter*o (other)" (Matt. 21:30a variant + Matt. 21:30b *Reading 2*) (Cyril of Alexandria) thus the more ancient corruption?   I.e., on comparison between this corrupted reading of "*proselth*o*n* ([he] came) *de* (and) *t*o (to the) *eter*o (other)," and the TR's reading of "*Kai* (and) *proselth*o*n* ([he] came) *t*o (to the) *deuter*o (second);" did another scribe later then seek "to resolve this" by the conflation, "*Kai* (and) *proselth*o*n* ([he] came) *t*o (to the) *eter*o (other)" (Matt. 21:30a + Matt. 21:30b *Reading 2*) (e.g., W 032, K 017, &

---

[70]   Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), quoting Migne "3,770" (= Vol. 13, Greek, p. 1484) & "3,786" (= Vol. 13, Greek, p. 1513).

Minuscule 2)?

Alternatively, was "*Kai* (and) *proselth<u>on</u>* ([he] came) *t<u>o</u>* (to the) *deuter<u>o</u>* (second)," written in continuous script over two lines? Did the first line contain the words, "*Kaiproselth<u>ontode</u>*" and the next line the "*uter<u>o</u>*"? If so, due to a paper fade, had the first line come to look something "*Kaiproselth<u>onto</u>::*", and the second line something like, "*:ter<u>o</u>*"? Did Origen not realize that a fade had occurred on the first line, and did he then "reconstruct" the second line as "*eter<u>o</u>*", thus giving rise to the reading, "*Kai* (and) *proselth<u>on</u>* ([he] came) *t<u>o</u>* (to the) *eter<u>o</u>* (other)"? I.e., is this form of Matt. 22:30b the more ancient of the two corruptions, with the Matt. 21:30a variant then coming later?

Was this a deliberate change? The probable origins of this variant with Origen increase this likelihood, but given that *when his standards were bad, they were very bad*, it does not conclusively prove it, since it might just be an example of a bad slip-up by a slip-shod Origen, *supra*. If deliberate, did Origen here fancy himself as some kind of "textual critic" i.e., of the low quality type and kind associated with the later Alexandrian School? Was he aware of the fact that Greek, "*eter<u>o</u>* (other)" is more common in St. Matthew's Gospel (Matt. 6:24 twice; 8:21; 11:3; 12:45; 15:30; 16:14) than is Greek, "*deuter<u>o</u>* (second)" (Matt. 22:26,39; 26:42); and was he also aware of the fact that St. Matthew uses "*eter<u>o</u>* (other)" to show a contrast, *supra*? Did Origen thus think he might make "a stylistic improvement" that "was still in keeping with Matthean Greek"?

A deliberate or accidental change by Origen? We cannot be sure, though when we come to a well know corrupter of the Word like Origen, the former is probably more likely here at Matt. 21:30 than the latter.

On the one hand, the TR's reading (*Reading 1*) has the support of about half the Byzantine Greek manuscripts, and can be found in ancient times with the church father and doctor, holy Chrysostom, sometime Archbishop of Constantinople (398-407). It is also clearly supported by textual analysis of Matthean Greek; whereas the variant looks like the type of textual corruption Origen might well have perpetrated. But on the other hand, the variant (*Reading 2*) also has the support of about half the Byzantine Greek manuscripts, some slim amount of Latin, and a few ancient church writers. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 21:30b a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading of the TR at Matt. 21:30b, "second" (*Reading 1*), is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is further found at the hand of a later "corrector" scribe of one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus, who on this occasion was evidently concerned at the damage done to the text by one of his fellow Alexandrian School scribes; and also at the hand of a later "corrector" scribe of (the mixed text type) Codex C 04. It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); and Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424

(9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.

However, the variant, "other" (*Reading 2*), is found as the original reading in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found as the original reading of (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent). It is also found in the Armenian Version (5th century); Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

"Stress less," said the old Latin Papists to the Neo-Alexandrians and Burgonites[71]. "When we saw Latin, '*alterum*,' which you'll find in the Clementine, we just flipped a coin to decide between 'other' and 'second.' Thus the Douay-Rheims reads, 'And coming to the other.' But who cares what it reads, the Latin will allow either, so they're both okay." "Oh no," replied the Neo-Alexandrians and Burgonites, we must follow some form of the Greek.

With the two leading Alexandrian texts split down the middle, the neo-Alexandrians then reached for the headache pills. "I know," said Tischendorf, who then somewhat predictably said, "The better of the two Alexandrian texts is, naturally enough, the one I discovered, *Codex Sinaiticus*;" and hence he adopted "*etero* (other)" (*Reading 2*) in the main text of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72). "I know," said Westcott and Hort, "The better of the two Alexandrian texts is, naturally enough, the one that reminds us Puseyites that its best to be Romeward and homeward, *Codex Vaticanus*;" and hence they adopted "*deutero* (second)" (*Reading 1*) in Westcott-Hort (1881). "I reckon Westcott and Hort guessed right," said Erwin Nestle, who then adopted "*deutero* (second)" (*Reading 1*) in the main text of Nestle's 21st edition (1952). "No, I reckon Tischendorf guessed right," said the NU Text Committee, who then adopted "*etero* (other)" (*Reading 2*) in the main text of the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). Lining up with those neo-Alexandrian texts of *Reading 1* is the ASV, NASB, RSV, and NRSV; and lining up with

---

[71]   I am obviously here giving a fictionalized allegorical account of what was said and done, but it is historical allegory in that it states the historical facts of the readings adopted.

those neo-Alexandrian texts of *Reading 2* is the ESV, NIV, and TEV.

"Hand us that jar of headache pills," the Majority Text Burgonites then said to the Neo-Alexandrians. "I'll guess it's … *etero* (other)," said Hodges & Farstad (1985), who then adopted *Reading 2* in their main text while referring in a footnote to the split nature of the text here. "Well just to be different to Hodges & Farstad, we're gonna' guess the other way," said Robinson & Pierpont, who then adopted *Reading 1* in their main text while referring in a footnote to the split nature of the text here.

The old Latin Papists, the Neo-Alexandrians, and the Burgonites are all left guessing here at Matt. 21:30b. In the case of the old Latin Papists because the Latin can be translated two ways; and in the case of the Neo- Alexandrians and Burgonites because both have split texts. All three groups lack requisite God-given skills of textual analysis. "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision" (Ps. 2:4). They thus both here exhibit what in their fuming frustration were a series of "50:50 guesses."

Fortunately, God provides neo-Byzantine textual analysts for his catholic or universal church (Eph. 5:32). He may do so e.g., on the basis of Gentile racial gifts with regard to the New Testament Oracles, that he gives to unsaved men who nevertheless are through common grace godly, such as the most learnèd Erasmus; or he may do so on the basis of giving the gift of being "teachers" to saved men who through both common and special grace are godly men, such as Stephanus and Beza. God tells us that he sometimes greatly blesses unsaved men in this life, so that they "do flourish," giving them good things now because "they shall be destroyed forever" (Ps. 92:7). Thus I stoop down low and greatly honour the name of the most learnèd and godly Erasmus of Rotterdam, giving him special and double honour among the neo-Byzantine textual analysts here in this world and in this life; for he denied the Protestant Reformation and accordingly has been barred access to heaven over on the other side of eternity. But I also give great honour to those who were saved and godly neo-Byzantines of the 16th and 17th centuries, such as the holy Protestant saints: Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzevirs, thanking God for their Christian examples and labours. But irrespective of which of these two ways God chooses to make neo-Byzantine textual analysts, God undertakes to protect and preserve his Received Text, so that we here have the correct reading at Matt. 21:30b preserved for us. *Thanks be to God!*

Matt. 21:31a "unto him" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*auto* (unto him)," in the words, "They say unto him, The first" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., *Codex Freerianus* (W 032, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), the purple parchment, *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century); and the two Sydney University Lectionaries written in brown ink with colourful red illumination of key letters and section markers, to wit, *Sidneiensis Universitatis* Lectionary 2378 (11th century)[72] and

---

[72] Lectionary 2378 writes the "*auto* (αυτω)" with the final omega closed i.e.,

Sidneiensis Universitatis Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D).   It is also supported as Latin, "*ei* (unto him)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339).

However, a variant omits Greek, "*auto* (unto him)," and thus reads simply, "They say."   The omission is further found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions d (5th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is thus correct.   The origins of the variant are speculative.

Was this an accidental alteration?   Was the "*auto* (unto him)" lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was this a deliberate alteration?   Did a prunist scribe remove the "*auto* (unto him)" on the basis of "redundancy," considering this to be "unnecessary wordage"?

A deliberate or accidental alteration?   We do not know.   But we do know that the correct reading has been here preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

The *Textus Receptus* (TR) reading has rock solid support in the Greek from ancient times, and the support of the majority of old Latin Versions also dating from ancient times, together with an ancient church Greek writer.   By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek, and what support it does have comes mainly from the Latin. Bearing in mind the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 21:31a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading of the TR at Matt. 21:31a, "unto him," in the words, "They say unto him," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and Codex 0138 (13th century, mixed text type, Matt. 21:24-24:15).   It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (12th

---

something like, "αυ∞", and then the "τ" is placed over the omega in the middle.

century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is further found in all extant Syriac Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions, and a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; as well as Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the incorrect variant that omits "unto him," and so reads simply, "They say," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in Codex L 019 (8th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 892 (9th century, mixed text type); and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); Armenian Version (5th century); Anglo-Saxon Version (8th to 10th centuries); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The erroneous variant entered the NU Text *et al*. Hence at Matt. 21:31a the ASV reads simply, "They say." This omission is also found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

Matt. 21:33 "a certain householder" (TR & AV) {A}

At Matt. 21:33, the representative Byzantine text is fairly evenly divided between two readings. *Reading 1*, found in Scrivener's Text is Greek, "*anthropos* (a man) *tis* (certain) *en* ('he was' = 'there was') *oikodespotes* ('a householder,' masculine singular nominative noun, from *oikodespotes*)," i.e., "There was a certain householder" (AV). This is supported by about half of the Byzantine texts e.g., Codices E 07 (8th century), X 033 (10th century), Minuscule 2 (12th century), and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.[73]). It is also supported as Latin, "*quidam* (certain)," in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), and f (6th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century), Eusebius (d. 339), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444). It is also manifested in the Greek New Testament editions of e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633).

---

[73] Lectionaries 2378 & 1968 abbreviate "*anthropos*" to "*anoc*" (with a line on top). The letter eta / *e* / η has multiple forms in Lectionary 1968's script. One form, used here for the "*en* (he was)," looks something like a U with a bar (-) coming out from the top left of the letter. Due to a copyist's writing error, the scribe also left off the first two letters, "*oi*" from the "*oikodespotes* (a householder)."

Reading 2 is Greek, "*anthropos* (a man) _en_ ('he was' = 'there was') *oikodespotes* ('a householder,' masculine singular nominative <u>noun</u>, from *oikodespotes*)," i.e., "There was a householder" or "There was a man *who was* a householder." This is also supported by about half of the Byzantine texts e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53[74]), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), K 017 (9th century), and S 028 (10th century). It is further found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.) and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367) and Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370).

As discussed at Matt. 21:28a, *supra*, with regard to his usage of "*anthropos* (a man)," St. Matthew may convert *a general reference noun* to *a specific reference noun* either to create the meaning of "certain," or to add "*tis* (certain)." Here at Matt. 21:33 we find what for one who does not understand Matthean Greek, it may *prima facie* appear to be a cumbersome set of words. But when this terminology is understood through reference to this Matthean technique of converting *a general reference noun* to *a specific reference noun* either to create the meaning of "certain" or to add "*tis* (certain)," it turns out to be an economical usage of words through which St. Matthew clearly indicates that he wishes to use "*tis*" to isolate a "certain (*tis*)" man.

Thus if St. Matthew had not wanted to use "*tis* (certain)" here at Matt. 21:33; in harmony with Matt. 13:52; 20:1 referring to, "*anthropo* ('to a man,' masculine singular dative noun, from *anthropos*) *oikodespote* ('an householder,' masculine singular dative noun, from *oikodespotes*)," i.e., (adding as the AV does in italics) "a man *that is* an householder" (AV); or Matt. 18:23; 22:2 "*anthropo* ('a man,' masculine singular dative noun, from *anthropos*) *basilei* ('a king,' masculine singular dative noun, from *basileus*)," i.e., "a certain king" (AV); then St. Matthew would simply have said at Matt. 21:33, "*anthropos* ('a man,' masculine singular nominative noun, from *anthropos*) *oikodespotes* ('an householder,' masculine singular nominative noun, from *oikodespotes*)." Yet there is no textual dispute here as to the fact that St. Matthew additionally finds it necessary to supply the "_en_ ('he was' = 'there was,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *eimi*)." Relative to the Matthean Greek of Matt. 13:52; 18:23; 20:1; 22:2 this is notably different. In the context of Matthean Greek, this verb therefore implies the existence of something not present at Matt, 13:52, *et al*. But what? Given that St. Matthew is contextually converting *a general reference noun* to *a specific reference noun*, the answer must therefore most likely be something grammatically linked to this. This is what we find in *Reading 1* with the pronoun, "*tis* ('certain,' masculine singular nominative pronoun, from *tis*)," which therefore must be the correct reading.

---

[74] W 032 abbreviates "*anthropos*" to "ANOC" (with a line on top) and "_en_ (HN)" at the end of a line to "H" with a bar to the top right for "N."

The origins of the variant are conjectural.   But *once again*, it looks like Origen "had his sticky finger in the pie."

Was this an accidental omission?   Was the "*tis* (certain)," possibly coming at the end of a line, lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was this a deliberate omission?   Comparative analysis with "*tis* (certain)" changes at Matt. 21:28a, strongly suggests that this is the more likely possibility here. As discussed at Matt. 21:28a, *supra*, Origen does not seem to have understood the subtleties of this Matthean Greek nuance, and appears to have been attracted on this "*tis* (certain)" issue at Matt. 21:28a to a "Gospel Greek" *stylistic* conflation with Luke 15:11. Working on a similar faulty logic, did Origen think that the absence of "*tis* (certain)" at Matt. 13:52; 18:23; 20:1; 22:2 required a comparable absence of "*tis* (certain)" at Matt. 21:33?   If so, his "hacker's job" of "ripping out" the "*tis* (certain)" here at Matt. 21:33, left behind "the bleeding and wounded body" of a text still containing the "*en* (he was)" as evidence of this "gory" textual "assault."

Like the wider Byzantine Greek text, Chrysostom refers to both readings.   On the one hand, the TR has the support of about half the Greek manuscripts for *Reading 1*; and several old Latin versions, of which a few are ancient.   It also enjoys the support of several ancient writers, including St. John Chrysostom and St. Cyril.   It is further supported by textual analysis; and *Reading 2* looks like the type of textual corruption more commonly associated with the name of Origen.   But on the other hand, the variant has the support of about half the Greek manuscripts for *Reading 2*; the Vulgate and most old Latin versions dating from ancient times; and several ancient church writers. Weighing up these considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 21:33 a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading of the TR at Matt. 21:33, including "certain," in the words of *Reading 1*, "a certain householder," is found in Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent), and 1071 (12th century, independent).   It is further found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); and Armenian Version (5th century).

The variant, *Reading 2*, "There was a man *that was* an householder," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century).   It is also found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The erroneous variant entered the NU Text *et al*. The continued presence of the "*en* ('he was' = 'there was')" in the variant of *Reading 2*, means that in comparative analysis with Matt. 13:52; 20:1 ("a man *that is* an householder"), its sense may be conveyed as, "There was a man *that was* an householder" (*Form 1*) which (without the words in italics being placed in italics,) is the rendering found in the ASV. However, one might also render it, "There was a householder" (*Form 2*), which is the rendering found in the Moffatt Bible. The incorrect variant (*Reading 2*) is also found in some type of *Form 2* in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

Meditation: Men sometimes commit some sin, and then want to walk away from it, claiming they are not responsible for its roll on effects. E.g., some bad example of Decalogue-breaking such as taking God's name in vain (3rd commandment, Exod. 20:7), picked up and replicated by such a person's friends or perhaps others who hear it as they casually pass by. Of course, on one level, these people who replicate the sin are still guilty for their sin of e.g., taking God's name in vain; but on another level, it is simultaneously true that *some of the blame lies with instigator.* Thus on the one hand, if God has forgiven a man's sins then we do not hold it against him either (Matt. 18:23-35); but on the other hand, in human terms, the consequences of a person's sins may continue to impact people "unto the third and fourth generation" (Exod. 20:5) or more.

In our own day and age, we see this tragedy writ large in the fact that in the USA abortion case of *Roe verses Wade* (USA Supreme Court, 1973), the woman known as "Jane Roe," has since repented of her vile involvement in this bloodthirsty case, in which violation of the sixth commandment, "Thou shalt not kill" (Exod. 20:13), was "legally" set aside to allow easy mass abortion by the US Supreme Court[75]. Though we repudiate "Jane Roe's" entanglement in Roman Catholic works righteousness (Gal. 1:6-9; 2:16; 3:11), we thank God that she has now repented of her sin as abortion instigator in *Roe v. Wade* (1973), and that from 1995 she has joined the anti-abortion and pro-life movement. Yet her repentance cannot stop the flow of blood from millions upon millions of abortions that were "legally" started in the USA by her earlier wicked lusts in 1973, and whose bad example has also echoed and redounded throughout the Western world in even more abortions. We thus see how *an instigator can start a problem* with serious roll on effects beyond their control, which they may later come to regret[76].

---

[75] Self-defence is a basic legal defence to the charge of murder if this is the least force reasonably necessary to save one's life. Thus in harmony with this wider defence, if an abortion is necessary to save the mother's life, then it is not murder. But this is the only exception to permit an abortion that Biblically based morals will allow.

[76] Her real name is Norma McCorvey of Texas, USA (b. 1947). Her upbringing was in the Jehovah's Witnesses cult. She became an atheist. She then lived a wild and wicked life which in her 1994 autobiography, "I am Roe," refers to what was then her Lesbian Sodomite partner, saying, "We're Lesbians together." She then "converted," first becoming a Baptist in 1995, being baptized in a backyard swimming pool at Dallas, Texas, on USA wide Television by a Baptist Minister called Flip Benham. (USA Americans sometimes like names such as "Chuck" for "Charles," or "Flip;" although the

We also see a good example here at Matt. 21:33 of this principle of *an instigator starting a problem* which then has serious roll on effects as others carry it on. There is a gap in time of about seventeen centuries between Origen (d. 254) and the contemporary NU Text (1993) which here follows Origen's *Reading 2*. But the serious roll on effects of Origen's sin still continues to plague us.

Matt. 21:38 "let us seize on" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Remarks.

The issues raised at Matt. 21:38 press hard on the matter of what the Greek says, in this instance with regard to a nuance subjectively regarded by some as present and by others as not present; and the concomitant matter of what one then regards as an accurate translation of it into English. If the rendering found for the TR's reading, "*kataschomen*" in e.g., Tyndale (1526) or the Geneva Bible (1560) were followed, namely, "let us hold" or "let us seize" translated as "and <u>let us take</u> his inheritance;" then this would be the same as the rendering found for the variant's reading, "*schomen*" in the ASV, "and <u>take</u> his inheritance." If so, this reading would be placed in Appendix 3, and dealt with in a good less detail. But on this occasion, I think the extremeness of the general description of men who first say, "let us kill him," is matched by the stronger nuance of the TR's reading as "let us hold <u>fast</u>" or "let us hold <u>down</u>" or "let us seize <u>on</u>" (AV); as opposed to the weaker meaning of "let us hold" or "let us seize." Thus I concur with the AV as to what is the contextually correct Greek nuance here.

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter: Greek.

Australian colloquial meaning of "a flip," as a stupidly <u>flip</u>pant person, militates against any such popular usage of "Flip" as a person's given name in the Land of the Southern Cross.) But Jane Roe (Norma McCorvey) was evidently not genuinely converted, for the antecedent sin of idolatry that resulted in her being given over as a judgment by God to Lesbian Sodomy (Rom. 1:20-26) came back in some form, and she also started hankering for the works righteousness of her Jehovah's Witnesses' background. Thus to fulfil both her idolatrous lusts and her works righteousness hankerings, in 1998 she became a Papist. *This is a classic technique of the Devil i.e., first tempt someone to commit a sin like abortion and hog-tie them for hell by irreligion; and then, if they look like repenting, hold out the Roman Church, so as to hog-tie them for hell via a false gospel of works' righteousness.* Thus by her bad example as a Papist, she is now *instigating another problem* of promoting the Devilish errors of Popery, with e.g., its idolatry (Exod. 20:3-6) of Mariolatry and adoration of the Communion bread related to "transubstantiation" (I John 4:2,3; 5:21); and denial of justification by faith (Gal. 3:11) for the false gospel of Romish justification by a combination of faith and works (Gal. 1:6-9; 2:16). "Norma McCorvey," *Wikipedia* (1 Feb. 2010) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Norma_McCorvey).

In following the TR's reading, "*kataschomen* (let us seize on)," Sydney University Lectionary 2378 writes this word at the end of a line.   After the third last letter, a mu (*m* / μ), the last letter, nu (*n* / ν) is written above the μ something like the shape in the following box:

Z

.

This is of some interest.   Firstly, because in this form, it looks something like the shape of the "standard" Greek "n" (nu / ν) when it is a capital letter, i.e., "N," even though it is turned at an angle; whereas the nu commonly used in Lectionary 2378 looks like a mu (μ) without the right-hand bar.   Secondly, this is an example of the Lectionary's numerous abbreviations.

The Second Matter: Latin.   Both Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) consider old Latin ff1 here supports the TR's reading with Latin, "*possideamus* (subjunctive active present, 1st person plural verb, from *possideo*)." Tischendorf does not show old Latin q in support of the TR, indicating he did not appreciate a capacity for Latin, *optineo* to mean, "hold fast;" although he does refer to Pseudo-Chrysostom's Latin of *obtineo*, indicating he appreciated the nuance of "hold fast" here.   Nestle-Aland lists old Latin q in support of the TR's reading, indicating that they appreciate this nuance capacity for Latin, *optineo*; but they also list ff1 is support of the TR's reading, indicating they consider Latin *possideo* has this meaning here.

The Oxford English Dictionaries is sometimes called, "the prince of dictionaries," and I think it fair to say that the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1968-82) is also "a prince." The context of Matt. 21:38 is property, for the husbandmen seek "the vineyard."   With respect to property, the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* refers to a diversity of nuance in which *possideo* may be used with a stronger nuance meaning "to hold land" (the stronger sense); and also with a weaker nuance meaning "to occupy" or "inhabit" a place.   Thus both Tischendorf and Nestle-Aland have equated the stronger nuance of the Latin *possideo* with the Greek "*kataschomen* (let us hold fast)" (TR), and so made a distinction between this and the weaker nuance which would thus equate the Greek "*schomen* (let us hold)" (variant).

On the one hand I would agree with Tischendorf and Nestle-Aland that the Greek here distinguishes between a stronger nuance meaning of Greek "*kataschomen*" as e.g., "let us hold fast" (TR), as opposed to either a weaker nuance meaning of Greek "*kataschomen*" as e.g., "let us hold," or the weaker meaning of Greek "*schomen*" as e.g., "let us hold" (variant).   And I would also agree that the Latin *possideo* has a stronger nuance of "to hold land" and a weaker nuance of "to occupy" or "inhabit" a place.   But on the other hand, I cannot accept that these Greek and Latin words are equivalents.   The "*possideamus*" of old Latin ff1 would be rendered as "let us hold" irrespective of its nuance, and it is quite different to the Greek "*kataschomen*" which depending on context can have the nuance of "let us hold" (as it does not here at Matt. 21:38), or "let us hold fast" (as it does here at Matt. 21:38).

Thus here at Matt. 21:38, the meaning of old Latin ff1's "*possideamus*" as "let us hold" is in my opinion most naturally rendering the Greek variant, "*sch*o*men*."   I.e., the stronger nuance of the Latin *possideo* is doubtless intended, but this represents the weaker meaning of the Greek readings.   Therefore I shall show old Latin ff1 following the variant, *infra.*

The Third Matter: More Latin.   The reading at Matt. 21:38 of old Latin e, "*et* (and) *nostra* (ours) *erit* (it shall be) *hereditas* (the inheritance)," i.e., "and the inheritance shall be ours," is quite different to the Matthean reading.   But it is the same as the Marcan reading of the Vulgate at Mark 12:7.   It thus appears to be a "gospel harmonization" with Mark 12:7, and so I make no reference to old Latin e, *infra.*

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 21:38 the TR's Greek, "*katasch*o*men* ('let us hold fast,' or 'let us hold down' = 'let us seize on,' subjunctive active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from *katecho* = *kata* / down + *echo* / to hold = 'to hold down')," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.).   It is also supported as Latin, "*optineamus* ('we may hold fast,' subjunctive active present, 1st person plural verb, from *optineo*)," in old Latin Version q (6th / 7th century); and as Latin, "*obtinebimus* ('we shall hold fast,' indicative active future, 1st person plural verb, from *obtineo*)," by the early mediaeval church writer, Pseudo-Chrysostom in a Latin work (6th century).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Eusebius (d. 339) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, a variant, Greek "*sch*o*men* ('let us hold' = 'let us seize,' subjunctive active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from *echo*)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 924 (12th century).   It is also found as Latin, "*habebimus* ('we shall hold' or 'we shall have' or 'let us hold[77],' indicative active future, 1st person plural verb, from *habeo*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century); and the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is further found as Latin, "*habeamus* ('we may hold' or 'we may have' = 'let us hold,' subjunctive active present, 1st person plural verb, from *habeo*)," in Latin Vulgate Codex E (*Codex Egertonensis*, 8th / 9th century, London, UK), old Latin Version d (5th century), and the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.); as Latin, "*habemus* ('we do hold' or 'we do have' = 'let us hold,' indicative active present, 1st person plural verb, from *habeo*)," in old Latin Version ff2 (5th century); and as Latin, "*possideamus* ('we may hold' = 'let us hold,' subjunctive active present, 1st person plural verb, from *possideo*)," in old Latin Version ff1 (10th / 11th century).   It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

---

[77]   In this paragraph, I shall show the 1st person plural verb in the "we" form before the rendering, "let us," to help show the reader the differences between them.

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which thus must stand. The origins of the variant are speculative.

Was this an accidental change? Was "*kataschomen* (let us hold down)" written over two lines, with "*kata*" at the end of one line, and the next line starting with "*schomen*"? Due to an undetected paper fade of the "*kata*," did this inadvertently become "*schomen* (let us hold)"?

Was this a deliberate change? The probable origins of this variant with Origen increases the likelihood of this probability. Did Origen, not appreciating the subtlety of the different contextual nuances in "*kataschomen* ('let us hold fast' or 'let us hold down')" and "*schomen* (let us hold)," consider that the prefix "*kata*" here was "unnecessary" and "redundant wordage"? If so, did he then prune off the prefix "*kata*" as a "stylistic improvement"?

A deliberate or accidental change? We do not know. But we do know that this was a change to the *Textus Receptus* here preserved for us in the representative Byzantine reading.

The TR's reading has strong support in the Greek, and some minimalist support in the Latin. But it has the support from ancient times of the church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom. It also looks exactly like the type of corruption that Origen would perpetrate. By contrast, the variant has minimalist Greek support and strong Latin support. Bearing in mind these factors, and the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 21:38 a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading of the TR at Matt. 21:38, "let us hold fast" or "let us hold down" or "let us seize on," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex 0138 (13th century, Matt. 21:24-24:15). It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text). It is also found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions.

However the variant, "let us hold" or "let us seize," is found in the two leading

Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type); and the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) and Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) Versions; and Armenian Version (5th century).

The erroneous variant was adopted in the NU Text *et al.* Thus the incorrect reading from Greek "*schomen* ('let us hold' = 'let us seize') is found at Matt. 21:38 as "take" in the ASV, "seize" in the NASB, "have" in the ESV, or "we will get" in the TEV. The variant is likewise found in the RSV, NRSV, and NIV.

A complicating factor here at Matt. 21:38 has already been referred to in the "Preliminary Remarks," *supra*. The TR's "*kataschomen* ('let us hold fast,' or 'let us hold down' = 'let us seize on,' AV) is from *katecho*. On the one hand, this root word is rendered, "hold fast" (AV) in Heb. 3:6; 10:23; but on the other hand, is rendered, "hold" (AV) in Rom. 1:18[78]. The issue of whether or not this nuance should be translated relates to other NT passages also, e.g., at Luke 8:15 "keep[79]" in the AV is rendered "hold … fast" in the ASV and NASB, or at I Cor. 11:2 "keep[80]" in the AV is rendered "hold fast" in the ASV and "hold firmly" in the NASB.

On the one hand, we find *katecho* rendered in I Cor. 7:30 of the AV as "they possessed." But on the other hand, we find *echo* rendered in I Tim. 6:16 of the NASB as "possess." What are we to make of the antithetical parallelism in II Cor. 6:10, "as having (*echo*)[81] nothing, and yet possessing (*katecho*)[82] all things" (AV)?

---

[78] Cf. *katecho* in Luke 4:42 ("stayed"); 14:9 ("to take"); John 5:4 ("he had"); Acts 27:40 ("made"); Rom. 7:6 ("we were held"); I Cor. 7:30 ("they possessed"); 15:2 ("ye keep [in memory]"); II Cor. 6:10 ("possessing"); Philemon 13 ("have retained"); II Thess. 2:6 ("what withholdeth"); 2:7 ("[he who] letteth"); & Heb. 3:14 ("we hold"). Cf. *echo* in Mark 3:22 ("he hath"); 9:17 ("which hath"); Luke 4:33 ("which had"); 8:27 ("had"); II Cor. 6:10 ("having"); & II Tim. 6:16 ("hath").

[79] Greek, "*katechousi*," indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *katecho*.

[80] Greek, "*katechete*," indicative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *katecho*.

[81] Greek, "*echontes*," masculine plural nominative, active present participle, from *echo*.

[82] Greek, "*katechontes*," masculine plural nominative, active present participle,

Here at Matt. 21:38, we find that the New King James Version does not consider this nuance should be translated, and so their rendering from "*kataschomen*" (TR) of "seize" (NKJV), is indistinguishable from Moffatt's rendering of "*schomen*" (variant) as "seize" (Moffatt Bible).

Nevertheless, I maintain that the extremity of the tone and language, "come, let us kill him," most naturally expects the stronger nuance of "*kataschomen*" to follow with, "and let us hold fast his inheritance" i.e., let us *grab tightly* his inheritance.   Hence I think this is rightly rendered in the Authorized Version's "let us seize on his inheritance."

Matt. 21:44 "And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on
        whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him
        to powder" (entire verse) (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Remarks.

Greek and Latin are two tongues of the Aryan Linguistic Family.   Studied from a grammatical approach, both have some remarkable similarities, so that if one has formally studied one of these from a grammatical approach, one can, with relative ease, pick the other one up by private study.   I.e., once one has familiarity with certain grammatical categories of thought from the study of e.g., Greek, there is a sense in which the study Latin is "just more of the same," or *vice versa*.   E.g., William Pierpont (d. 2003) who compiled Green's Textual Apparatus (1986) and jointly edited the Byzantine Greek Majority Text of Robinson & Pierpont (1991 & 2005), first studied Latin at High School and then Greek at University, though his Greek was mostly self-taught from private study.

However, these similarities between Greek and Latin are a generalist and not absolutist rule; for it must also be said that there are some grammatical differences between the two   E.g., the Greek aorist tense (used says Young as the speaker's overall perception of an event "in its entirety, or as a single whole," or says Wallace as a "snapshot" of the action[83],) does not exist in the Latin; nor is the Latin ablative case (used to modify or limit a verb,) found in the Greek[84].

We have here at 21:44 an interesting example of the Latin *future perfect* tense. As a special Latin treat for the interested reader, let the reader note carefully the footnotes in the first paragraph.   These will help him to compare and contrast how the Latin here works relative to the Greek.

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

---

from *katecho*.

[83]   Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 554-5; Young's *Greek*, p. 122.

[84]   Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, pp. 10-11.

The First Matter. Some confusion exists in the textual apparatuses as to whether Ireaneus follows the variant only in a later Latin translation (Tischendorf & UBS 4th revised edition) of *c.* 395 A.D., or also in the earlier Greek original (UBS 3rd & 3rd corrected editions) of the 2nd century. Therefore I shall broadly assume that the latter UBS 4th revised edition corrects its own earlier editions; while still allowing for the possibility that Origen might have copied this error from another, *infra.* In this context, I also include reference to Cyprian (d. 258).

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting).

The presence of similar words as Matt. 21:44 at Luke 20:18 might lead to the conclusion that one cannot tell from which of these two sources in the Latin Vulgate the Sangallensis Diatessaron is drawing on. But the fact that it is contextualized after Matt. 21:42,43, coupled with the fact that where there are differences between these two readings in the Vulgate, and the readings of Matt. 21:44 are generally followed, indicates to me that it is essentially coming from Matt. 21:44 in the Vulgate. However, the Sangallensis Diatessaron clearly did assimilate a small amount from the Vulgate's reading at Luke 20:18. Specifically, the Sangallensis Diatessaron lacks the "*Et* (And)" of the Vulgate's Matt. 21:44, reading instead the "*Omnis* ('every' + '*qui*' / 'who' or 'whosoever' = 'whosoever') of the Vulgate's Luke 20:18; and instead of the "*vero* (but)" of the Vulgate's Matt. 21:44; it reads the "*autem* (but)" of the Vulgate's Luke 20:18. Nevertheless, I consider that on this occasion one can still say that it is here supporting the TR's reading, *infra.*

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 21:44, the TR's Greek reads, "*Kai* (And) *o* ('the [one]' = 'whosoever') *peson* ('falling[85]' = 'shall fall') *epi* (on) *ton* (-) *lithon* (stone) *touton* (this) *sunthlasthesetai* (future tense[86], 'he shall be broken' = 'shall be broken'): *eph* (on) *on* (whom) *de* (but) *an* (ever) [i.e., *on* + *an* = 'whomsoever'] *pese* ('it might fall' = 'it shall fall[87]'), *likmesei* (future tense[88], 'it will grind to powder') *auton* (him)." It is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is also found as Latin, "*Et* (And) *qui* (whosoever) *ceciderit* (future perfect tense[89], 'it will / shall have fallen' =

---

[85] Masculine singular nominative, active aorist participle, from *pipto.*

[86] Indicative passive future, 3rd person singular verb, from *sunthlao.*

[87] Subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *pipto.*

[88] Indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *likmao.*

[89] Indicative active future perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *cado.* In general, the Latin future perfect tense acts to look at the consequence of a completed action. Hence the first "*ceciderit* (it shall have fallen)" is grammatically linked to the

'shall fall') *super* (on) *lapidem* (stone) *istum* (this), *confringetur* (future tense[90], 'he shall be broken' = 'shall be broken'): *super* (on) *quem* (whom) *vero* (but) *ceciderit* (future perfect tense, 'it will / shall have fallen' = 'shall fall'), *conteret* (future tense[91], 'it will grind to powder,') *eum* (him)."   This is the Latin reading of Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions f (6th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D., which lacks the "*Et* / And").   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

Similar Latin readings to those of the Vulgate with the same basic meaning, are found in old Latin Versions h (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century); and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   The TR's reading is further found in the ancient church Greek writers, Chrysostom (d. 407) and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church writer, Pseudo-Chrysostom in a Latin work (6th century).

However, a variant omits this entire verse 44.   It is so omitted in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), and ff2 (5th century).   It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writer, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation (*c.* 395); the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and the ancient church Latin writer, Cyprian (d. 258)[92].

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is thus correct.   The origin of the variant is speculative.

Was this an accidental alteration?   In *Codex Freerianus* (W 032) we find that many of our presently numbered verses, first given formal verse numbers by Stephanus in 1551, existed in earlier unnumbered verse divisions in ancient times.   Thus we find that here at Matt. 5:44, following verse 43 and before verse 44, there is a stylistic paper space of about half a dozen letter spaces; and that verse 44 ends about three-fifths of the way across the line and the other two-fifths is then left blank as a stylistic paper space before verse 45 starts at the beginning of the next line.

On this basis, it is reasonable to conjecture that another scribe may have started

---

consequence, "*confringetur* (future tense, 'he shall be broken'); and the second "*ceciderit* (it shall have fallen)" is grammatically linked to the consequence, "*conteret* (it will grind to powder) *eum* (him)."   (See Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, pp. 77-8.)   Compare the Greek (for which reason I include relevant declensions in the above footnotes).

[90]   Indicative passive future, 3rd person singular verb, from *confringo*.

[91]   Indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *contero*.

[92]   Hans Freiherr von Soden's *Das Lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur zeit Cyprians*, in Harnack, A, & Schmidt, C., *op. cit.*, pp. 366-588, at p. 412.

both verse 44 and 45 at the starts of new lines, before which were stylistic paper spaces. If so, verse 43 ends with the words, "*dothesetai* (given) *ethnei* (to a nation) *poiounti* (bringing forth) *tous* (the) *karpous* (fruits) *autes* ('of it[93]' = 'thereof,' AV); and verse 45 starts with the words, "*Kai* (And) *akousantes* (hearing);" and so in a manuscript where words go over two lines (possibly in continuous script,) a scribe may have been examining a page that looked something like the following:

thesetai ethnei poiounti tous karpous autes.
Kai o peson epi ton lithon touton sunthlas
thesetai: eph on de an peselikmesei auton.
Kai akousantes (etc.).

It might also be noted that abbreviations are sometimes used at the end of lines for the suffixes of words such as "*autes* (thereof)" and "*auton* (him)." E.g., in Lectionary 1968, "*auten* (same)[94]" at the end of a line becomes, "*aut~*" (with something like a "^\" over the tau). While this 16th century Lectionary is some 1200 or 1300 years removed from the time in question, such abbreviations might have existed. Certainly in the 5th century W 032 codex, which is closer by about 1,100 years to the time in question, one also finds such abbreviations. E.g., here at Matt. 21:44, the "*lithon* / λIθON (stone)" is abbreviated to "λIθO" with a line-bar starting over the "O" and projecting out to the right. And if such abbreviations were in usage, the difference between "*autes*" and "*auton*" might have been the difference between something like, "*aut~*" and "*aut--*". But while I allow this as a further possibility here, due to the additionally speculative nature of this, I shall on this occasion leave out of the equation the possible usage of such abbreviations.

Looking at such a page as that above, did a scribe, perhaps drowsy, ill, or working late at night by flickering candle-light, first copy out to the end of verse 43, up to the "*autes* (thereof)"? Did his mind then becomes confused with the "*thesetai*" followed by "*Kai*" repeating itself, and his eye drop by such ellipsis to the "*Kai*" of verse 45, and so start writing "*Kai akousantes*" etc. . Hence did he accidentally omit verse 44?

Was this a deliberate omission? This omission is certainly ancient. It is referred to by both Origen (d. 254) and Cyprian (d. 258). It is possible that this omission of Matt. 21:44 is found in the earlier ancient church Greek writer, Irenaeus (2nd century), as it appears in a later Latin translation of his writings (*c*. 395). But the words of this later Latin translation of Irenaeus may have been modified by a fourth century Latin scribe so as to omit this verse i.e., the earliest definite references we have to this omission are with Origen in the Greek and Cyprian in the Latin. Under these circumstances, it is certainly possible, though by no means certain, that Origen was the originator of this variant.

The imagery of these words at Matt. 21:44 do NOT use a ceramic plate for the weaker object, but to first understand the meaning of this imagery I shall use this as an

---

[93] Feminine singular genitive, 3rd person personal pronoun, from *autos-e-o*.

[94] I Cor. 3:18 (Lectionary 1968, p. 81b).

example.   I.e., the broad idea is that if a weaker object e.g., a ceramic plate, were dropped onto a stone i.e., "whosoever shall fall on this stone," or if a stone were to be thrown down at e.g., a ceramic plate i.e., "on whomsoever it shall fall," either way, the plate would be "broken" by the stone.

However, the specific imagery for the weaker object can only be understood through reference to the imagery to which this alludes i.e., Dan. 2:45.   This follows a sixth century B.C. vision that King Nebuchadnezzar had in ancient Babylon, and which the holy prophet, Daniel, then explains some 600 to 700 years before the time of Christ. Daniel says "the stone" "brake in pieces the iron" (the fourth empire of Rome, Dan. 2:33,40; together with elements of the white "iron" Caucasian bloodline mingled by mixed marriages prohibited in e.g., Ezra 9 & 10 with coloured "clay" in the fifth miscegenationist empire, Dan. 2:33,41-43, cf. Gen. 6:1-4,9; Matt. 24:37-39[95]), "the brass" (the third empire of Medo-Persia, Dan. 2:,32,39), "the clay" (elements of the coloured races mingled by mixed marriages, prohibited in e.g., Deut. 23 & Neh. 13, with white Caucasian "iron" in the fifth miscegenationist empire, Dan. 2:33,41-43), "the silver" (the second empire of Greece, Dan. 2:32,39), "and the gold" (the first empire of Babylon, Dan. 2:32,38)

Christ here unites teachings about his First and Second Advents through the imagery of "the stone."   Concerning this First Advent, he says with reference to Ps. 118:21-23, that "the stone" (the Messiah) "which the builders" (the Jewish Church) "rejected, the same is become the head of the corner" i.e., of the Christian Church (I Peter 2:5-8), after his resurrection (Acts 4:10,11).   Indeed, it is for this reason, that we know the next words of this psalm, "This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it" (Ps. 118:24), therefore refer in their greater fulfilment to the Sunday of the resurrection (Matt. 28; Mark 16; Luke24; John 20), for which reason the Christian Sunday (John 20:26; Acts 20:7; I Cor. 16:2) is called, "the Lord's Day" (Rev. 1:10). Christ here thus looks forward to the institution of the Christian Church which will replace the Jewish Church as Christ's bride (Rev. 12).   For "the kingdom of God shall be taken from you" (the Jewish nation of Abraham's racial descendants), "and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" (the worldwide Christian "nation" of Abraham's spiritual descendants, by race both Jews and Gentiles).

And concerning his Second Advent, Christ then refers to the imagery of the stone in Dan. 2:45 in Matt. 21:44.   For our purposes here, this statement of Matt. 21:44 broadly equates Christ's statement to the Jews in Matt. 26:64, "hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven."   I.e., it is a statement by Christ that he is the Messiah of the First and Second Advents, and that the Old Testament Messianic prophecies about him should be subdivided into those elements dealing with his First Advent (Ps. 118:21-23) and those dealing with his Second Advent (Dan. 2:45).

---

[95]   See McGrath, G.B. (myself), "Sons of God" (Gen. 6:1-4), *British Church Newspaper*, 12 Feb. 2010, p. 9.

Given this message of judgment against the Jews at both the Messiah's First and Second Advents, "the chief priests and Pharisees" "perceived that he spake of them." And so "they sought to lay hands on him," "but" "they feared the multitude, because they took him for a prophet" (Matt. 21:45,46).

But in the final analysis, it was not just the unbelieving Jews that Jesus here spake against, but also unbelieving Gentiles. For Scripture says to we Christians of Gentile race, "Be not high-minded, but fear: for if God spared not the natural" Jewish race "branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee" (Rom. 11:20,21). "Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear: for our God is a consuming fire" (Heb. 12:28,29).

Yet even as these Jews would not accept these words of Christ in Matt. 21:44, "And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder;" so likewise some Gentiles have not been prepared to accept them either. For example, the heretic Origen (d. 254), set aside this Biblical teaching, found in Article 8 of the *Apostles' Creed* which says of "Jesus Christ" "our Lord" (Article 2), who "sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty" (Article 7), that "from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead" (Article 8). Origen also effectively denied the reality of "hell" referred to in Article 4 of the *Apostles' Creed* (Ps. 16:10; Acts 2:27,31), turning it into a universalist purgatory for those not admitted to heaven. Origen was a universalist who contrary to such clear Biblical passages as e.g., Matt. 10:28; 18:9; Luke 16:23,24, denied the reality of hell; and contrary to such clear Biblical passages as e.g., Matt. 24 & 25, denied the Final Judgement. Rather, Origen claimed that all men (and indeed all devils) would ultimately be saved and go into heaven. Clearly then, the heretic Origen had a theological reason for finding offence at Matt. 21:44, which far from saying the unrighteous will be saved, says that at his Second Advent Christ will "grind" them "to powder."

Did such a universalist heretic, whether Origen himself, or a scribe before Origen with whom Origen then later happily concurred, i.e., one who denied the doctrine of Articles 4 & 8 of the *Apostles' Creed*, deliberately remove Matt. 21:44? Whether Origen originated this omission, or simply replicated an earlier omission, we cannot doubt that the type of universalist heresy held by Origen would be one reason as to why Matt. 21:44 may have been deliberately omitted, quite possibly, first by Origen.

Was the removal of Matt. 21:44 a deliberate or accidental omission? Was it by Origen or another? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that it was an omission from the Received Text of Holy Scripture, Providentially preserved for us here in the Greek in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR's reading has strong support in the Greek from ancient times as the representative Byzantine text against which there is no good textual argument. It has the further support of St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate, and also dating from ancient times about two-thirds of the old Latin Versions, *supra*. It enjoys further support from the church

fathers, St. John Chrysostom, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Jerome and St. Augustine. By contrast, the support for the variant in the Greek is limited to Origen, who may well be its originator; and although it has some stronger support in the Latin, the number of old Latin Versions following it is still only about half the number that support the TR's reading. Weighing up these factors, and bearing in mind the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 21:44 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading of the TR at Matt. 21:44 (entire verse), is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in Codex Z 035 (6th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (11th century, independent outside of the General Epistles), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), 579 (13th century, mixed text), and 205 (15th century, independent in the Gospels & Revelation). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Slavic Version (9th century); Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and Ethiopic Versions (*c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant omitting Matt. 21:44 (entire verse), is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type); as well as the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century); and the ancient Greek writer, Eusebius, according to Ephraem (d. 373) in the Syriac tongue.

Prima facie it might be thought that the neo-Alexandrian texts would follow the TR's reading due its strong support in the two main Alexandrian texts. But we here see the non-Alexandrian text neo-Alexandrian's pincer arm coming into play. The combination of the neo-Alexandrian rule, "the shorter reading is the better one;" plus the

difficulty they have in believing that two Gospels could say the same thing, meant the presence of this verse in Luke 20:18 was taken to be "just what" they "were looking for" to "prove" a Gospel "interpolation" here at Matt. 21:44 from that source; and so all this started the ball rolling for them in the wrong direction. When to this was added the fact that the variant has support from the Western Text (D05), some old Latin versions, the neo-Alexandrian's so called "queen of minuscules," Minuscule 33, and the Syriac, "topped off" with ancient support from Origen; it was all just too overpoweringly strong for most neo-Alexandrians; for whom the idea that "the Received Text would have an entire verse wrong" greatly pandered to their bigoted prejudices. And so it was that the Neo-Alexandrian School, having first made a set a bad rules, designed for persons with no skills in textual analysis to pretend that they were textual analysts, then collectively all "hid behind their rules," as they smiled gloatingly at each other.

Thus the variant entered Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) at Matt. 21:44, which has no verse 44. But with some unease about this, it was placed inside square brackets by Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). What might these square brackets here mean? One of the two "leading lights" of the NU Text Committee, Bruce Metzger (d. 2007) tells us. "While considering the verse to be an accretion to the text, yet because of the antiquity of the reading and its importance in the textual tradition, the [NU Text] Committee decided to retain it in the text, enclosed within square brackets" (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 2nd ed., 1994, p. 47).

However, square brackets can be difficult to interpret; especially if they usually mean that a reading's inclusion is entirely optional, but Metzger, Aland, and others on the NU Text Committee are trying to convey some esoterical meaning of them here at Matt. 21:44, that neo-Alexandrian translators may not pick up. *Neo-Alexandrian translators seem to have thrown a coin up in the air to determine which way they should go on this one.*

Solution 1: "The coin comes down heads." The NASB, evidently edgy about departing so radically from the two main Alexandrian Texts, included Matt. 21:44. This format was also followed by the TCNT, and the highly erratic Moffatt Bible.

Solution 2: "The coin comes down tails." The ASV includes Matt. 21:44, but a footnote says, "Some ancient authorities omit ver. 44" (ASV ftn). This format was also followed by the ESV, NRSV, and NIV.

Solution 3: "The coin hits the polished wooden floor-boards of a first floor room, and falls through the cracks of some loose floor boards. … 'O Oh, what are we gonna' do now?'." The RSV omits Matt. 21:44 from the main text, but has a footnote referring to it. This format was also followed by the TEV, NEB, and REB.

The old "whore" of Rome (Rev. 17:1,9) "in the ground floor room underneath the first floor, grabs the coin as it falls through the cracks from the first floor, and smiles. … 'I'd better give ya' something for ya' money,'" she says. Even though the TR had been

followed by the post Trent Council and pre-Vatican II Council old Latin Papists of the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version; the post-Vatican II Council new neo-Alexandrian Papists omit Matt. 21:44 in their Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles. Thus *Solution 3* was also followed by the JB and NJB.

Matt. 22:7 "But when the king heard" (TR & AV) {B}

Of *Readings 1a*, *1b*, *& 1c*, only *Reading 1a* has Greek support. All three readings have the same meaning in both the Greek and English. *Reading 1b & 1c* are itemized here as stylistic variants, and discussed, *infra*.

Reading 1a is Greek "*o* ('the,' word 1) *de* ('But,' word 2a) *basileus* ('king,' word 3) *akousas* ('hearing' = 'when … heard,' masculine singular nominative, active aorist participle, from *akouo̱*, word 4)," i.e., "But when the king heard" (AV). This is found as Latin, "*Rex* ('the king,' word 3) *autem* ('But,' word 2) *cum* ('when,' word 4a) *audisset* ('he might have heard,' word 4b[96])," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions h (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.); and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found as Latin, "*Rex* ('the king,' word 3) *vero* ('But,' word 2) *cum* ('when,' word 4a) *audisset* ('he might have heard,' word 4b)," in old Latin Version ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation (*c.* 395); the ancient church Greek writers, Eusebius (d. 339) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604)[97].

A form of *Reading 1a* in Greek word order 4,2,1,3 forms *Reading 1b*. Scrivener's Text reads, "*akousas* ('when … heard,' word 4) *de* ('But,' word 2a) *o* ('the,' word 1) *basileus* ('king,' word 3)," i.e., "But when the king heard" This is a form found in a number of 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantine Greek NT texts, e.g., Erasmus (1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633).

Another form of *Reading 1a* in Greek word order 4,2,3, but omitting word 1, forms *Reading 1c*. Erasmus's text of 1516 reads, "*akousas* ('when … heard,' word 4) *de* ('But,' word 2a) *basileus* ('[the] king,' word 3)," i.e., "But when the king heard."

Reading 2, is Greek, "*Kai* ('But,' word 2b) *akousas* ('hearing' = 'when … heard,' word 4) *o* ('the,' word 1) *basileus* ('king,' word 3) *ekeinos* ('that,' masculine singular nominative pronoun, from *ekeinos*, word 5)," i.e., "But when the king heard that." This

---

[96] Word 4b is a subjunctive active pluperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *audio*. It is here joined (through the possessive case) with word 4a, "*cum* ('when,' a possessive adverb of the verb word 4b). Thus the Latin words 4a & 4b mean, "when … had heard," and so for our purposes equate the Greek participle of word 4.

[97] Bishop Gregory follows the same form as the Vulgate.

is the majority Byzantine text reading, e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.).   It is also found as Latin, "*Et* (And) *audiens* ('hearing' = 'when … heard') *rex* (the king) *ille* (that)," in old Latin Versions f (6th century) and q (6th / 7th century); as Latin, "*Ille* ('that,' word 5) *autem* ('But,' word 2) *basileus* ('king,' word 3) *cum* ('when,' word 4a) *audisset* ('he might have heard,' word 4b)," in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), ff2 (5th century), and c (12th / 13th century).   It is further found in the early mediaeval church Greek writer, John of Damascus (d. before 754).

Reading 3 is Latin, "*Ille* ('that,' word 5) *basileus* ('king,' word 3) *cum* ('when,' word 4a) *audisset* ('he might have heard,' word 4b)," i.e., "When the king heard that." This is found in old Latin Versions b (5th century) and d (5th century).

Reading 4, is Greek "*o* (the) *de* (But) *basileus* (king)," i.e., "But the king."   This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscules 1187 (11th century), 924 (12th century), and 1604 (13th century).   It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

In the great Neo-Byzantine School of textual analysis, our starting point is always the representative Byzantine Greek text.   Here at Matt. 22:7 this is *Reading 2*, "*Kai* (But) *akousas* (when … heard) *o* (the) *basileus* (king) *ekeinos* (that)," i.e., "But when the king heard that."

In Greek, the demonstrative pronoun, "*outos* (this)" may refer to a near object, and the demonstrative pronoun, "*ekeinos* (that)" to a far object[98].   (A similar nuance may be present in the Latin "*hic*" / "this" for something near the speaker / addressee, and "*ille*" / "that" for something distant from both[99].   Hence the propriety of rendering the Greek, "*ekeinos*" as Latin, "*ille*," *supra*.)   But the relevant issue here at Matt. 22:7 does not primarily relate to "*ekeinos* (that)," a word in this very declension found elsewhere in St. Matthew's Gospel (Matt. 18:28; 24:46; 26:24; 27:8; 27:63), as well as in other declensions (e.g., Matt. 24:19,29,36).   Rather, the relevant textual issue primarily relates to the Matthean usage of *akouo* (to hear), especially as a participle; and thus the more specific usage of *ekeinos* is actually only of secondary importance to the textual analysis.

Matthean Greek does not qualify the participle from *akouo* with *ekeinos* (that). Rather, one of two things happen.   Either there may be a greater specification; or that which follows the participle from *akouo* may be implied as part of the act of hearing.

Concerning the first possibility i.e., greater specification.   St. Matthew refers to "after they heard (*akousantes*[100]) the (*ton*) word (*logon*)" i.e., "after they heard this

---

[98]   Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 325-9; Young's *Greek*, p. 78.

[99]   Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, p. 56.

[100]   Masculine plural nominative, active aorist participle, from *akouo*.

saying" (AV) (Matt. 15:12); "when the chief priests and Pharisees had heard ('when ... had heard,' *akousantes*) the (*tas*) parables (*paraboloas*) of him (*autou*)" i.e., "when the chief priests and Pharisees had heard his parables" (AV) (Matt. 21:45); "when the Pharisees had heard ('when ... had heard,' *akousantes*) that (*oti*) he had put the Sadducees to silence" (AV) (Matt. 22:34); or "every one that that heareth (*akouon*[101]) these (*toutous*) sayings (*tous logous*)" (AV) (Matt. 7:26). Of a similar style is the verbal form of *akouo* in the words, "heareth (*akouei*[102]) these (*toutous*) sayings (*tous logous*)" (AV) (Matt. 7:24).

Concerning the second possibility i.e., that which follows the participle being implied as part of the hearing. After the same declension as occurs here in this reading of Matt. 22:7 (*akousas*[103]), rendered "when had heard" or "when heard," the AV translators supply in italics, "these things" (Matt. 2:3), "of it" (Matt. 14:13), or "that saying" (Matt. 19:22); and after the same declension in the plural form, likewise is supplied in the AV's italics after "when heard," "when they heard," or "heard (*akousantes*[104])," "it" (Matt. 17:6; 19:25; 20:24), "these words" (Matt. 22:22), "this" (Matt. 22:33), or "that" (Matt. 27:47).

Here at Matt. 22:7 we find that the majority Byzantine reading has the initial form of the participle from *akouo* i.e., "*Kai* (But) *akousas* ('hearing' = 'when ... heard') *o* (the) *basileus* (king);" but this is not then either followed by the first type of Matthean addition of greater specificity, nor the second type of Matthean implied words that need to be added in italics when translating into English. Rather, the "*akousas* (when ... heard)" is followed by what for St. Matthew would be an implied word, to wit, "*ekeinos* (that)." *But this is not the way St. Matthew writes. This clangs on the ears as not being Matthean Greek. This cannot be right!* (For a wider *ekeinos* adding scribal proclivity in St. Matthew's Gospel, see Textual Commentary Vol. 2 at Matt. 18:26a & Vol. 3 at Matt. 24:38b.)

Prima facie this might lead us to simply modify the representative Byzantine reading to, "*Kai* (But) *akousas* (when ... heard) *o* (the) *basileus* (king)." In Matthean Greek the stronger stylistic break of "*de* (but)" would be more expected here than "*kai* (but)," since there is a clear change in focus in verse 7 (cf. commentary on "*kai*" and "*de*" at Matt. 21:7c; 22:39; 23:23b). Yet we neo-Byzantines do not create our own variants, but adopt a minority Byzantine reading, or one reconstructed from the Latin. While it might be theoretically possible to reconstruct "*Kai* (But) *akousas* (when ... heard) *o* (the) *basileus* (king)" from the Latin, we can hardly justify this when the Greek we have that underpins the relevant Latin readings monolithically reads "*o* (the) *de* (But) *basileus*

---

[101]   Masculine singular nominative, active present participle, from *akouo*.

[102]   Indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *akouo*.

[103]   Masculine singular nominative, active aorist participle, from *akouo*.

[104]   Masculine plural nominative, active aorist participle, from *akouo*.

(king) *akousas* (when … heard) (*Reading 1a*)" i.e., word order 1,2,3,4.

But there is also the form in Scrivener's text of "*akousas* (when … heard) *de* (But) *o* (the) *basileus* (king)" (*Reading 1b*) i.e., word order 4,2,1,3; or Erasmus's 1516 text of "*akousas* ('when … heard,' word 4) *de* ('But,' word 2) *basileus* ('[the] king,' word 3)" (*Reading 1c*) i.e., word order 4,2,[1],3 in which the word 1 definite article is implied, and so the overall word order is essentially the same as that for *Reading 1b*. *Readings 1a*, *1b*, & *1c* all translate the same into English and mean the same thing, i.e., "But when the king heard" (AV). Therefore, if all three had Greek support, at this point, we would be left to adopt one of them. But in fact, only *Reading 1a* has such Greek support.

Before considering this matter further, let us consider the style of *Readings 1a*, *1b*, and *1c* relative to wider Matthean Greek.

In the precisely same singular form, "*akousas*," more similar to *Reading 1a* is the form of Matt. 14:13, "*Kai* (But) *akousas* (when … heard) *o* (-, untranslated) *Iesous* (Jesus)." Although of similar style to *Reading 1b* (or *Reading 1c*), the Greek form in Matt. 2:3 is, "*akousas* (when … had heard) *de* (-, untranslated) … *o* (the) *basileus* (king);" and Matt. 19:22 "*akousas* (when … had heard) *de* (But) *o* (the) *neaniskos* (young man)."

In the plural form, "*akousantes*," of similar style to *Reading 1a* is the form of Matt. 17:6, "*Kai* (And) *akousantes* (when heard) *oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples);" Matt. 20:24, "*Kai* (And) *akousantes* (when heard) *oi* (the) *deka* (ten);" Matt. 22:22, "*Kai* (-, untranslated) *akousantes* (When they had heard);" and Matt. 22:33, "*Kai* (And) *akousantes* (when heard) *oi* (the) *ochloi* (multitude)." More similar to *Reading 1b* (or *Reading 1c*), the Greek form in Matt. 19:25 is, "*akousantes* (when heard) *de* (-, untranslated) *oi* (-, untranslated) *mathetai* (disciples) *autou* (his)." Though the style is not that similar, Matt. 27:47 does also follow a pattern of "*de* (-, untranslated) … *akousantes* (when they heard)."

What is clear from this is that *Readings 1a*, *1b*, & *1c* in general, and *Reading 1a* or *Reading 1b* in particular, could be said to broadly conform to Matthean Greek. Yet we have no Greek textual basis for *Reading 1b* which seems to be a rearrangement of the Greek words of *Reading 1a:* "*o* ('the,' word 1) *de* ('But,' word 2) *basileus* ('king,' word 3) *akousas* ('hearing' = 'when … heard,' word 4)," to word order 4,2,1,3. It looks like Erasmus was playing around with a "textual trademark" here as early as 1516 when with *Reading 1c* he used this *Reading 1a* in word order 4,2,[1],3 in which he omitted word 1 on the basis that contextually the definite article is implied. But the presence of the definite article in both *Reading 1a* and the similar grammatical structures in St. Matthew's Gospel, *supra*, evidently gave Erasmus some pause for thought, and so between 1516 and 1522 he then developed "a new and improved" "textual trademark" of *Reading 1b* (1522) upon the base of his earlier "textual trademark" of *Reading 1c* (1516).

Therefore it looks like in both Erasmus's 1516 and 1522 editions, the indisputable

similarity of *Readings 1b & 1c* to that of Matt. 2:3, "*akousas* (when … had heard) *de* (-, untranslated) … *o* (the) *basileus* (king)," first gave rise to the Erasmus "textual trademark" of word order 4,2,[1],3 in *Reading 1c* (1516), and that this same factor led to the reintroduction of the word 1 "*o* (the)" in the refined "textual trademark" word order 4,2,1,3 of *Reading 1b* (1522). Did Erasmus rest in his mind on the "validity" of such a stylistic rearrangement of *Reading 1a* to *Readings 1b* (1522) and *1c* (1516), on the basis of a rearranged Latin word order of the Vulgate to 3,2,4 [4 includes 1] i.e., in concluding that the word order might be changed since the meaning is the same? If so, was the original omission of the Greek definite article in *Reading 1c* (1516) meant as a "pointer" to the Latin, which (as per usual for Latin,) also has no specific definite article here? Did Erasmus further think he "was in good company," because quite apart from the addition of word 5, *Reading 2* follows word order 2,4,1,3; and so did he consider this to be "an ancient textual trademark," indeed, one that also alters word 2a (*de*) for word 2b (*kai*) just like he omitted word 1 "*o* (the)" in *Reading 1c*?

If this type of thing was Erasmus's thinking, then it should be remembered that other explanations may exist for the altered word order of *Reading 2*, *infra*. Furthermore, I could not accept the propriety of any such analogy with the Latin since word order can change in Greek to Latin translation, even as it may change in Greek to English translation. *Thus it is quite another thing to change the Greek word order for the purposes of creating "textual trademarks" that in a series of combination act to identify one's text in contradistinction to another's Greek NT text!*

Erasmus of Rotterdam (d. 1536) thus produced in his 1522 edition an intricate intertwining of neo-Byzantine textual analysis (removal of "*ekeinos*" / "that" from the majority Byzantine reading,) with the creation of a textual trademark (altering word order of minority Byzantine *Reading 1a* to the word order 4,2,1,3, of *Reading 1b*). On the one hand, I greatly respect this past master of the Neo-Byzantine School, and thank God for his wonderful gifts of textual analysis that spotted the incongruity of "*ekeinos* (that)" in the representative Byzantine reading. As an unsaved Gentile in the religiously apostate Christianity of Roman Catholicism, who was seeking to preserve the NT Oracles (Rom. 10:2), he was graciously given these gifts on the same basis that unsaved Jews in religiously apostate Judaism seeking to preserve the OT Oracles (Rom. 10:2) may be given relevant gifts (Rom. 3:2; 11:29), i.e., a mix of racial gifts and common grace[105]. Like e.g., Beza or Elzevir, my own skills of textual analysis are given on a somewhat different basis in that they include the element of special grace, i.e., as members of "the

---

[105] We know that Erasmus was an unsaved man for he tragically failed to support the gospel teaching proclaimed by Luther, "The just shall live by faith" (Gal. 3:11); choosing sadly instead to oppose Martin Luther by maintaining the false gospel (Gal. 1:6-9) of works' righteousness (Gal. 2:16) found in Roman Catholicism. Erasmus was thus very much like the unsaved Jews St. Paul refers to, who "have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge" (Rom. 10:2), and yet whose zeal extends to diligent and commendable work in preserving the Oracles of the living God (Rom. 3:2; 11:29).

holy catholic church" (Article 10, *Apostles' Creed*), that is, the universal church (Eph. 5:31,32; Heb. 2:12; Rev. 12:17), we are "teachers" (Eph. 3:11) of the Neo-Byzantine Text. In my particular instance, being one who explains and defends certain matters of the *Textus Receptus* in these textual commentaries.

Like e.g., Stephanus, Beza, and Elzevir, I honour the name of Erasmus. With no element of false humility present, I acknowledge Erasmus as my better in this realm of textual analysis. And indeed, it must also be candidly said that later 16th and 17th century Protestant neo-Byzantine textual analysts paid Erasmus the same compliment, among other things, expressing this in the perpetuation of so many of his "textual trademarks." But on the other hand, I am no fan of these type of "textual trademarks" which here in *Reading 1b* shows that this is the reading of an Erasmus text (1522), followed in honour of Erasmus by e.g., Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633). I hold that the textual analytical work of Erasmus here should properly stand; but I also hold that the "textual trademark" element of Erasmus's work here should be removed. I thus find that here at Matt. 22:7, Scrivener's Text should be amended to that of *Reading 1a.* But let the AV remain unchanged, since in harmony with "textual trademark" principles, the rendering into English is the same, whether one follows *Reading 1a* or *Reading 1b*. Thus the AV contains the correct reading here at Matt. 22:7.

The origins of the variant *Readings 2*, *3*, & *4* are speculative.

The variant, *Reading 2*, is "*Kai* ('But,' word 2b) *akousas* ('when … heard,' word 4) *o* ('the,' word 1) *basileus* ('king,' word 3) *ekeinos* ('that,' word 5)," i.e., "But when the king heard that." In its final form it appears to have been the result of deliberate alteration. But did the scribe start with a manuscript that had inadvertently altered word 2a (*de*) to word 2b (*kai*) following a detected paper fade / loss of word 2a?

Did a scribe, looking at the TR's *Reading 1a*, "*o* ('the,' word 1) *de* ('But,' word 2a) *basileus* ('king,' word 3) *akousas* ('when … heard,' word 4)," first consider "it would be more appropriate" and thus a "stylistic improvement" to put the definite article (word 1) immediately before the matching noun (word 3)? Did he then either alter the "*de*" (word 2a) to what he wrongly took to be the synonymous "*kai*" (word 2b) (St. Matthew would in fact be more likely to use the stronger stylistic break of "*de*" / "but" here than "*kai*"/ but," *supra*); or did he have a manuscript which had first been inadvertently changed to word 2b, *supra*; and either way, did he then transpose the position of "*akousas* ('when … heard,' word 4)," as a further "stylistic improvement" because he liked the "k" (kappa) alliteration of "*Kai* ('But,' word 2b) *akousas* ('when … heard,' word 4)"? Or was his work to this point that of an ancient "textual trademark"?

Whatever his reasons for going to word order 2,4,1,3 with an alteration of word 2a (*de*) for word 2b (*kai*), did this scribe then add in word 5, "*ekeinos* (that)," as a "stylistic improvement" to "better bring out the meaning of the text"?

With regard to the word order 5,[1,]3,4 of *Reading 3* as Latin, "*Ille* ('that,' word 5) *basileus* ('king,' word 3) *cum* ('when,' word 4a) *audisset* ('he might have heard,' word

4b),” did this come about as act of translation from Greek to Latin?   If not, this was probably a deliberate “stylistic improvement” seeking to stylistically emphasis the “that” by putting it at the front of the sentence, whether by a Greek scribe whose work was subsequently translated into Latin, or by a Latin scribe.   Was the loss of word 2 (“But,” Greek, *de*; Latin, *autem / vero*) also part of such a deliberate alteration, deemed to be “redundant” now that “the stylistic emphasis was improved” with the placement of word 5 at the start of the sentence”?   Or was the loss of word 2 an inadvertent element due to an undetected paper fade?

Was *Reading 4* an accidental alteration?   Did a manuscript reading the TR’s *Reading 1a*, “*o* (‘the,’ word 1) *de* (‘But,’ word 2a) *basileus* (‘king,’ word 3) *akousas* (‘when … heard,’ word 4),” have word 4 at the end of a line, “squeezed in” in smaller writing?   Was word 4 then lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was *Reading 4* a deliberate alteration?   Did a scribe consider that “*akousas* (‘when … heard,’ word 4)” here was “unnecessary wordage” and “redundant”?   Did he then deliberately prune away word 4 as a “stylistic improvement”?

There is so much we do not know in the dark ages (i.e., historically unrecorded ages,) of textual transmission history, that we are just left guessing, *we hope with educated guesses rather than blind guesses*, as to what might or might not have been the origins of readings such as those of the variants found in *Readings 2, 3, & 4*.   But we are not left guessing about this fact.   The *Textus Receptus* has been preserved for us in *Reading 1a*.   Thanks be to God!

The TR’s *Reading 1a* has weak support in the Byzantine Greek textual tradition as a tiny minority Byzantine reading.   But it has impressive support in the Latin textual tradition with St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, together with several old Latin Versions, one of which dates from ancient times.   The textual analysis is on the Greek as the starting and finishing point (Neo-Byzantine School), rather than on the Latin as the starting and finishing point (old Latin Papists’ School).   We thus see the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, bending low, as well it should, in dutiful submission to the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin.*   We neo-Byzantines of the *Textus Receptus* thus use this maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, as it should be used, and not at all like the old Latin Papists, who unnaturally elevated it over and above the servant maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin.*

Reading 1a is strongly supported by textual analysis, *supra*.   The earliest attestation of the TR’s *Reading 1a* is unclear since while the ancient church Greek writer, Irenaeus, dates from the 2nd century, our source is a later Latin translation (*c.* 395), and so it therefore remains possible that a Latin scribe altered this reading to the correct text of the TR when translating Irenaeus.   But irrespective of such uncertainties, this citation in support of the *Textus Receptus* from Irenaeus (or possibly Pseudo-Irenaeus) is still ancient.   Moreover, the TR’s *Reading 1a* enjoys the support of the great cleric and godly preacher, Archbishop Chrysostom, a Greek writing father and doctor of the Eastern Church; and also of the pious cleric, Bishop Gregory, a Latin writing doctor of the

Western Church. Putting together the combined weight of such factors as the textual argument in its favour, the support of St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate, and its attestation by the church doctors, St. John Chrysostom and St. Gregory the Great, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 22:7 a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading of the TR at Matt. 22:7, "But when the king heard" (*Reading 1a*), is found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century); Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century); and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version. It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), rendered in Ciasca's Latin translation of the Arabic as "*Rex* ('the king,' word 3) *autem* ('But,' word 2), *cum* ('when,' word 4a) *audisset* ('he might have heard,' word 4b)."

The variant, *Reading 2*, "But when the king heard that," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex 0138 (13th century, Matt. 21:24-24:15); as well as Minuscules 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text). It is also found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version.

The variant, *Reading 3*, "When the king heard that," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).

The variant, *Reading 4*, "But the king," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex 085 (6th century, Matt. 20:3-32 & 22:3-16) and (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) and 700 (11th century, independent); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) and Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version.

The variant, *Reading 2*, was adopted by the Burgonite majority texts of Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005).

Is the variant, *Reading 3*, followed by the Douay-Rheims? The non-usage of italics for added words creates uncertainty as to which reading the old Latin Papists of the Douay-Rheims followed in their rendering, "But when the king had heard of it." Is this the TR's reading of the Vulgate *et al* i.e., *Reading 1a*, in which "of it" is added and so should be placed in italics? Or is this the variant *Reading 3* of old Latin Versions b and d in which, "*Ille* ('that,' word 5)," has been somewhat loosely rendered as "of it." In my opinion, more probably the former than the later, but given this no-usage of italics, we cannot be sure, and nor can any Papistical users of the Douay-Rheims Version of 1582.

The variant, *Reading 4*, was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. Thus Matt. 22:7 reads in the American Standard Version, "But the king" etc. (ASV). The erroneous variant of *Reading 4* is likewise found in the NASB.

But there was something about this variant *Reading 4* pruning down of the TR's reading here at Matt. 22:7, that "stuck in the throats" of the other neo-Alexandrian versions we consider. However, good Christian reader, you ought not to thereby conclude that these other neo-Alexandrian Versions therefore did the right thing. Far from it. For what "stuck in their throats," was the fact that the Alexandrian School's pruned down Matt. 22:7, as followed in the neo-Alexandrian School's texts, *was not pruned down ENOUGH!* And so, to remedy this "defect," the other neo-Alexandrian versions we consider, all here followed the variant *Reading 4* ONLY AFTER THEY FIRST GRATUITOUSLY OMITTED THE "BUT." Hence this FURTHER PRUNED DOWN TEXT of Scripture, found in the Moffatt Bible as "The king" etc., is likewise found in the RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, TEV, TCNT, NEB, REB, and Popish JB and NJB.

On the one hand, the learnèd Erasmus of Rotterdam here produced in his 1522 edition an intricate intertwining of neo-Byzantine textual analysis with the removal of "*ekeinos* (that)" from the majority Byzantine reading, coupled with the creation of a textual trademark in his altering of the word order of the TR's minority Byzantine *Reading 1a* to the word order of *Reading 1b* (and earlier *Reading 1c*). Both Burgonite and neo-Alexandrian alike appear to have been baffled and astounded by this *Reading 1b* (or earlier *Reading 1c*). But on the other hand, the neo-Alexandrian's "simple-Simon" belief that "the shorter reading is the better reading," held to as they clutch at their straw Alexandrian texts, was here developed even further by most of the neo-Alexandrian versions who freely omitted a further word, "*de* ('But,' word 2a)," preserved in their faulty variant *Reading 4* from the TR's *Reading 1a*.

But he who said of "the law" meaning the written Old Testament, "one jot or one tittle shall in now wise pass from the law" (Matt. 5:18), and "heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away" (Matt. 24:35), preserved his Word through time and over time. Here at Matt. 22:7, this was accomplished through e.g., St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate, and the writings of the church doctors, St. Chrysostom and St. Gregory. In the words of the Latin Motto of the Lutheran Reformation, *Verbum Domini Manet in*

Aeternum! [106]

Matt. 22:10b "the wedding" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The *New King James Version* of 1982 renders the TR's "*o* (the) *gamos* (wedding)" here at Matt. 22:10b, with "hall" in italics as added, i.e., "wedding *hall*" (NKJV). This raises the issue of whether or not there is in fact any difference in meaning between the TR's reading, "*o* (the) *gamos* (wedding)," and that of the variant, "*o* (the) *numphon* ('bridechamber' or 'wedding hall')."

Possibly this "conclusion" is to some extent influenced by "the parallel reading" at Luke 14:15-24, where "a certain man made a great supper" (Luke 14:16) i.e., putting the emphasis on a "supper." I for one do not regard these as "parallel gospel readings." Our Lord's Ministry went for 3½ years (Dan. 9:27), not 3½ months. During that time he evidently told the same or similar parables and lessons on multiple occasions, slightly changing elements to tailor them to that occasion. Even the *Lord's Prayer* was subject to this phenomenon, being recorded in St. Matthew's Gospel in *The Sermon on the Mount* (Matt. 6:9-13), and in St. Luke's Gospel with some differences, in quite a different context (Luke 11:1-4). Even at the same general event, Christ might tell the same parable or lesson multiple times to multiple groups, so that the idea of "parallel gospel accounts," though containing truth in some instances, e.g., there was only one resurrection on Easter Sunday, nevertheless, must be treated with caution.

Liddell & Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon* says that the root word, *gamos*, can mean a wedding, such as earlier in this passage at Matt. 22:2, rendered in the AV as "marriage." But it can also be used in the context of "furnish forth *a wedding*," and it has this sense in e.g., Homer's (*c.* 700 B.C.) *Odyssey* 1:277; 4:3, 770[107], and Mimographus's *Testamentum Epicetatae* 7:86 (3rd century B.C.). Likewise in Lampe's *Patristic Greek Lexicon*[108], the meaning is "marriage" not "marriage hall."

Some relevant usage of *gamos* is also found in the Greek Septuagint translation of the Old Testament together with the Apocrypha. Looking at Sir Lancelot Brenton's *Greek-English Septuagint*, on the English renderings of it made by Brenton in the OT, the

---

[106] Drawn from I Peter 1:25 in St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate, "The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever."

[107] Though by tradition the poet Homer (*c.* 700 B.C.) wrote the *Odyssey* in the 8th / 7th century, this tradition is not a verifiable fact. A problem also exists in determining exactly when the standard Greek text for this work was fixed.

[108] Lampe, G.W.H., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, England, 1961, lithographic reprint 1968, pp. 307-8.

root word *gamos* can have a wider meaning of a "marriage" (Esther 2:18, LXX), or a narrower meaning of "a marriage feast" (Gen. 29:22, LXX) or "wedding-feast" (Esther 1:5, LXX). And as a carry over cross-application from this narrower meaning, it sometimes has an even narrower meaning of "feasting" i.e., in a non-marriage feast context without any wedding connotation (Esther 9:22, LXX).

This same type of meaning is also found in the Septuagint's Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Thus Brenton renders the root word *gamos* variously as "marriage" (Tobit 8:20, LXX Apocrypha; I Macc. 9:37,41, LXX Apocrypha), "marriages" (Wisdom 14:24,26, LXX Apocrypha), "wedding" (Tobit 9:2,6; 10:7; 11:19 LXX Apocrypha), "nuptial" (III Macc. 4:8, LXX Pseudepigrapha), and "wedding feast" (Tobit 8:19, LXX Apocrypha). E.g., with reference to Alexander Epiphanes Balas, King of Syria and Pergamum, and ruler of the remains of the Seleucid Empire (150-145 B.C.), we read in I Maccabees 10:57,58 (LXX Apocrypha), "So Ptolomee went out of Egypt with his daughter Cleopatra, and they came to Ptolemais in" 150 B.C., "where king Alexander meeting him, he gave him his daughter Cleopatra, and celebrated her marriage (*gamos*[109]) at Ptolemais with great glory, as the manner of kings is."

Hence on the data presently available to me, the most natural rendering at Matt. 22:10b is either "the wedding was furnished with guests" (AV), or "the wedding-feast was furnished with guests." But either way, one could not reasonably argue in agreement with the NKJV's translators that the meaning here is "wedding hall." The AV's translation here is the same as that found in Tyndale (1526 & 1534), Cranmer (1539), and the Geneva Bible (1557 & 1560). It also equates the Latin Vulgate's "*nuptiae*," which was rendered by Wycliffe as, "the bridal [party] (*nuptiae*) was filled with men …" (1380); and was translated by the Douay-Rheims as, "the marriage (*nuptiae*) was filled with guests" (1582).

Thus if the broader meaning of "*o* (the) *gamos* (wedding)" is applicable here, then it refers to "the wedding *party*" of attendees, and so depending on where one was thinking of it being placed, it might include the wedding party when they were in a synagogue for a marriage service; or the wedding party when they were walking down the road from the synagogue to the place of the reception; or the wedding party either outside in a garden if that was where the reception was held, or inside a hall if that was where the reception was held. Or if the narrower meaning of "*o* (the) *gamos* (wedding-feast)" is applicable here, then it refers to "the wedding-feast." Thus whether one considers that at Matt. 22:10b *gamos* contextually means "wedding" (AV) or "wedding–feast," even if one considered they were all in a wedding hall, the concept of a "wedding hall" would still be *a derivative conclusion from context, rather than an intrinsic element of the Greek word "gamos."*

Therefore the only reference I know of that might potentially be used to argue that the Greek, "*gamos*," means "wedding hall," is the passage of Matt. 22:10b itself. But this is surely arguing in a highly circular manner from a reference that is *in dubio*. While

---

[109]   LXX Greek, *gamon*, masculine singular accusative noun, from *gamos*.

I am open to fresh evidence for such a usage based on any clear instances of it in Greek writings, on the basis of my present information, *supra*, I would be unable to accept this as even *a possible* translation of "*gamos*" at Matt. 22:10b, let alone *the* intended meaning; since even if one could sustain the claim that "*gamos*" *might* mean this, one would still have to overcome the problem that St. Matthew's usage is contextually similar to that of e.g., Homer, Mimographus, and the Septuagint *supra*, and hence it is most naturally rendered here at Matt. 22:10b as either "wedding" (AV) or "wedding-feast."

The variant's root word of "*numphon*" at Matt. 20:10b[110], is used at Matt. 9:15[111] for "bridechamber" (AV) or "wedding hall."   It is thus quite different to the TR's root word of "*gamos*" here meaning, "wedding" or "wedding-feast[112]."   Thus if the meaning of "*gamos*" here at Matt. 22:10b is the broader sense, then the reference is to the "wedding *party*," rather than any narrower sense of a "wedding *hall*," even if, at some point the *wedding party* of attendees did in fact go into a *wedding hall*.   And if *gamos* here has a narrower sense, then the reference is to "wedding-feast" not "wedding *hall*," even if one derivatively concludes that the "wedding-feast" was "therefore held in a *wedding hall*."   In the absence of any evidence before me to the contrary, I thus consider that the TR's reading and the variant here are quite different.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 22:10b, the TR's Greek, "*o* (the) *gamos* (wedding)," in the wider words, "and the wedding was furnished with guests" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.).   It is also supported as Latin, "*nuptiae* (wedding)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.) and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation; the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407); ancient church Latin writers, Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370), Chromatius (d. 407), and Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

---

[110]   Greek, "*o* (the) *numphon* ('bridechamber,' masculine singular nominative noun, from *numphon*)" (Matt. 20:10b, variant).

[111]   Greek, "*tou* (the) *numphonos* ('bridechamber,' masculine singular genitive noun, from *numphon*)" (Matt. 9:15; cf. Mark 2:19; Luke 5:34).

[112]   Greek, "*o* (the) *gamos* ('wedding,' masculine singular nominative noun, from *gamos*)" (Matt. 20:10b, TR).

However, a variant reading Greek, "*o* (the) *numphon* ('bridechamber' or 'wedding hall')," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 1010 (12th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must thus stand. The origins of the variant are conjectural.

Was this an accidental alteration? Did "*o* (the) *gamos* (wedding)" come at the end of a line in a manuscript? Due to a paper fade, did "*o gamos*" come to look something like, "*o ::m::*"? Through reference to the definite article, "*o* ('the,' <u>masculine singular nominative</u> definite article, from *o*)," and the usage of the root word "*numphon*" at Matt. 9:15, did a scribe then "reconstruct" this as "*o* (the) *numph<u>on</u>* (bridechamber)"?

Was this a deliberate alteration? Did a scribe, labouring under the erroneous idea that Matt. 22:1-14 and Luke 14:15-24 were "parallel Gospel accounts," and also labouring under the false idea that he could "improve" God's Word by tampering with it, consider that the reference to "a great supper" in Luke 14:16 "justified" him in making "a stylistic clarification" at Matt. 22:10b to "*o* (the) *numph<u>on</u>* (wedding hall)"?

A deliberate or accidental alteration? We cannot be sure. We simply do not know. But we do know that this variant was an alteration to the "pure words" "of the Lord," that God did faithfully "preserve" (Ps. 12:6,7) for us in the *Textus Receptus*.

The TR's reading has impressively overpowering support in both the Greek and Latin textual traditions. It further enjoys the support of, e.g., the ancient church fathers and doctors, St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine, as well as the early mediaeval church doctor, St. Gregory. By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek, and no support in the Latin. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 22:10b an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 22:10b, "the wedding," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex 085 (6th century, Matt. 20:3-32 & 22:3-16), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (11th century, independent outside of the General Epistles), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), 579 (13th century, mixed text), and 205 (15th century, independent in the Gospels & Revelation). It is further found in the Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Slavic Version (9th century).

However, the variant of "the bridechamber" or "wedding hall," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); as well as Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type). It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century) as Latin, "*domus* (house) *convivii* (feast[113])" i.e., "the feast-house."

On the one hand, with the two Alexandrian texts in its favour, and some "external support" in L 019 and 892, and of more importance for neo-Alexandrians in former times than latter times, also the Arabic Diatessaron, the variant was adopted by Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952).

But on the other hand, the greater weight put on "external support" more commonly by latter neo-Alexandrians (although some internal variation among neo-Alexandrians among contemporaries of different eras seems to have existed), together with the demise in their eyes of the Arabic Diatessaron, meant that the variant appeared to be *skating on dangerously thin ice*. Against this backdrop, the NU Text Committee took a more critical look at it than had their neo-Alexandrian predecessors, and drew the conclusion that the variant, "*o numphon* (here meaning 'the wedding hall')," was "an Alexandrian correction introduced in the place of "*o* [the] *gamos* [wedding], which may have seemed to be somewhat inappropriate with the verb 'filled'[114]." Though the NU Text Committee does not say so, if this was the Alexandrian School's thinking, then they evidently were unaware of the established usage of "filled" or "furnished" with "marriage" in such Greek writers as Homer and Mimographus, *supra*. This is thus an unintended admission by the NU Text Committee of the Alexandrian School's lack of grip on the finer points of the Greek tongue. Unfortunately, they failed to develop this logic further with the concomitant conclusion and realization that if this is so, one needs to be a great deal more weary of the ancient Alexandrian School readings than the modern Neo-Alexandrian School in fact is. Thus for a mix of good and bad reasons, the NU Text Committee adopted the correct reading of the TR, which is that found in the main text of the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

With such mixed messages from the Neo-Alexandrian textual critics about this reading here at Matt. 22:10b, some corresponding confusion occurred further on down the line among their minion Neo-Alexandrian School translators.

Thus in harmony with the type of thinking more common among latter neo-Alexandrian textual critics such as those on the NU Text Committee, the correct reading

---

[113]   Neuter singular locative noun, from *convivium*. The locative case is used for place. See Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, p. 262 (locative case & *domus*).

[114]   Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 58; 2nd ed., 1994, p. 47.

of the TR is found at Matt. 22:10b in the American Standard Version as, "the wedding" (ASV).

Von Soden's main text which was the basic text used by Moffatt, here follows the variant, "*o* (the) *numphon* (wedding hall)." But it seems "the pull of the Western Text," when accompanied with the Latin text and Armenian Version ("Caesarean" Text), all in agreement with the Byzantine text, was just "too much" for Moffatt to resist. Thus for partly the right reasons, and partly the wrong reasons, he here jettisoned von Soden's preference for the variant, and adopted the TR's reading as, "the marriage-banquet" (Moffatt Bible). But this rendering of "*o* (the) *gamos* (wedding)" as, "the marriage-banquet," is itself somewhat interpretative; and so Moffatt here seems to simultaneously be giving some kind of recognition to the type of thinking behind the variant.

In harmony with the two main Alexandrian texts, and the thinking more common among earlier neo-Alexandrian textual critics, the incorrect variant is found at Matt. 22:10b in the ASV's better son, the New American Standard Bible, as "the wedding hall" (NASB). The erroneous variant is likewise found in the ASV's worst son, the RSV, together with the ASV's better grandson, the ESV, and ASV's worst grandson, the NRSV. This incorrect variant is also found in the NIV, TEV, TCNT, NEB, REB, and Papists' JB and NJB. Most of the neo-Alexandrian Version translators thus preferred "the comfort zone" of the two main Alexandrian texts over the types of concerns that led the NU Text Committee to drop this variant "like a hot potato."

In following the Latin, the old Latin Papists of the post Trent and pre-Vatican II Councils, here rendered Matt. 22:10b correctly as "the marriage" (Douay-Rheims). In following the two main Alexandrian texts, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of the post-Vatican II Council here followed the variant (JB & NJB). Thus notwithstanding the fact that the NU Text Committee of the contemporary NU Text (1993), which included the Romish Cardinal Carlo Martini, said of the TR's reading, that "the text is almost certain[115]," the Romish translators of the JB and NJB took a different view, namely, that the text of the variant was so certain, that they did not even need a footnote referring to the TR's reading. We here see that the problems common to neo-Alexandrian more generally, are present among post-Vatican II neo-Alexandrian Papists, namely, that for so many of these internal neo-Alexandrian disputes, it all hangs on "who's on the neo-Alexandrian NU Text Committee," or "who's on the neo-Alexandrian translation Committee."

Given such vacillations down the slippery slope of neo-Alexandrian textual criticism, we cannot be confident of how Papist neo-Alexandrians, or apostate Protestant neo-Alexandrians will go on this reading here at Matt. 22:10b. But we can be confident of how neo-Byzantine Protestants will resolve upon this reading here at Matt. 22:10b. Like our Lord who inspired and preserved his Holy Oracles, it is "the same yesterday,

---

[115] UBS 4th Revised Edition (1993), pp. 3* & 84.

and to day, and for ever" (Heb. 13:8).   It is the reading of the *Textus Receptus* and Authorized Version.   It is the reading, "*o* (the) *gamos* (wedding)."   Let us not exchange the certainties of such an unchanging Received Text backed by such an unchanging God, for the fleeting fancies of what one neo-Alexandrian textual critic, named "Zig," thinks, with this or that other neo-Alexandrian textual critic taking another view again, thinks, named "Zag,"; as Zig'n'Zag zigzag all over the place.   "For" "in all the churches of the saints," "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace" (I Cor. 14:33).

Matt. 22:13b "Bind him hand and foot, and take him away,
     and cast [him]" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Remarks.

The absence of the "*kai* ('and,' word 8)" in the variant, does not necessarily affect English translation, since one might add "and," not in italics but as part of the act of translating, as indeed occurs in the ASV.   The preservation of the "*auton* ('him,' word 7)" in the variant, means it attaches to the "*ekbalete* ('cast,' word 9a)."   Hence whereas in the AV it was necessary to supply the "him" connected to "cast" in italics i.e., "Bind him hand and foot, and take him (*auton*, word 7) away, and (*kai*, word 8) cast *him* (-) into outer darkness" (AV & TR); in this rearrangement of the "*auton* ('him,' word 7)" in the variant, this later "him" no longer needs to be placed in italics.   Thus it was not necessary for the ASV to supply this "him" in italics, i.e., "Bind him hand and foot, and (-) cast him (*auton*, word 7) out into the outer darkness" (ASV & Westcott-Hort).

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

In Lectionary 2378, "*Desantes* (Binding)" is *prima facie* revowelled in the second letter to upsilon ("*u*") and the final sigma ("*s*") is omitted.   I have inspected the original of Lectionary 2378 and there is no indication of a paper fade of the final sigma ("*s*") there.   "*Desantes* (Binding)" is masculine plural nominative, active first aorist participle, from *deo*, and so in its standard Greek form it should have a "*santes*" suffix declining from the first aorist stem of "*desa*" (or "*edesa*").   "*Desantes* (Binding)" is also found at Matt. 27:2, and this reading is found twice in Lectionary 2378 (Matt. 26:21-27:2 at pp. 72a-74b; & Matt. 27:1-38 at pp. 94a-95b).   Here it is spelt in the standard Greek form, "*desantes*" (p. 74b & 94a), on both occasions.

Does the combination of the changed second letter to a "*u*" and omission of the final "*s*," indicate that "*Desantes* (Binding)" was inadvertently misspelt at Matt. 22:13b (p. 37b)?   If so, is the fact that the final epsilon (ε) is written much like a sigma (c) relevant?   It is written like a "c" that then has a small bar added in the middle to make it an epsilon.   Did the scribe, having made the letter shape "c," and then crossed it to make an epsilon, get confused in his mind thinking he had already written the "c"?   Does the combination of this and the alteration of the second letter to an upsilon indicate that he was not thinking too clearly at this point in time?

Or was "*dusante*" a recognized local dialect form of "*desantes* (binding)" that could be optionally used as an alternative local dialect form to the standard Greek form of

"*d<u>e</u>santes*"?   None of the textual apparatuses I consult, (Tischendorf's 8th edition, von Soden, Swanson, Nestle's 21st ed., Nestle-Aland's 27th ed., or UBS 3rd, 3rd corrected, & 4th editions,) make any reference to spelling variants for "*d<u>e</u>santes*" at Matt. 22:13 or 27:2; and only Swanson makes reference to one at Mark 15:1.   Swanson records that at Mark 15:1 the second letter of "*d<u>e</u>santes*" is revowelled in E 07 (8th century, Basel University Library, Switzerland) to an iota, thus making the spelling, "*disantes*."   This in turn leads us to ask if "*disantes*" was an accidental change in which e.g., a capital eta, "H," underwent a partial paper fade to become a capital iota, "I;" or whether this was a deliberate local dialect revowelling to "*disantes*"?   While "*disantes*" (E 07) is not "*dusante*" (Lectionary 2378), this does nevertheless raise the possibility from a quite different source that the second letter of this word *might* have sometimes be revowelled.

E 07 was brought to Europe from the East for the *Council of Basel* in 1431. However, I do not have sufficient data on the local Greek dialect that either Codex E 07 was written in during the 8th century; nor that Lectionary 2378 was written in at Constantinople during the 11th century, to answer the question of whether or not "*disantes*" (E 07) and / or "*dusante*" (Lectionary 2378) is such a revowelling.   I am prepared to revisit this matter if and when I receive any further relevant information.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 22:13b, the TR's Greek, "*D<u>e</u>santes* ('Binding' = 'Bind,' word 1) *autou* ('of him' = 'him,' word 2) *podas* ('feet' = 'foot,' word 3a) *kai* ('and,' word 4) *cheiras* ('hands' = 'hand,' word 5a) *arate* ('[and] ye take away' = 'take … away,' word 6) *auton* ('him,' word 7) *kai* ('and,' word 8) *ekbalete* ('ye cast' = 'cast,' word 9a)," i.e., writing the third him in italics as added, "Bind him hand and foot, take him away, and cast *him*" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53, with a localized revowelling of the word 9a suffix from "*e*" to "*ai*" i.e., "*ekbaletai*"[116]) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, spelling word 1 as "*Dusante*," *supra*, and a localized revowelling of the word 4 suffix from "*e*" to "*ai*" i.e., "*ekbaletai*") and 1968 (1544 A.D., swapping the positions of words 3 & 5).   It is also found as Latin, "*Allegate* ('Bind,' word 1) *ei* ('him,' word 2) *pedes* ('feet' = 'foot,' word 3) *et* ('and,' word 4) *manus* ('hands' = 'hand,' word 5) *et* (and) *tollite* ('ye take away' = 'take … away,' word 6) *eum* ('him,' word 7) *mittite* ([and]'ye cast' = 'cast,' word 9)," in old Latin Version f (6th century).   It is further supported in the early mediaeval Latin writer, Pseudo-Ambrose (6th century).

Variant 1a, Latin, "*Tollite* ('Take … away,' word 6) *illum* ('that [one]' = 'him,' word 7) *pedibus* ('feet' = 'foot,' word 3) *et* ('and,' word 4) *manibus* ('hands' = 'hand,' word 5) *et* (and) *mittite* ('cast,' word 9) *eum* (him)," i.e., "Take him away, hand and foot,

---

[116]   Concerning this revowelling of word 9a in W 032 & Lectionary 2378 inside the closed class of sources at Matt. 22:13b; and of word 9b in D 05 outside the closed class of sources at Matt. 22:13b, *infra*; see Commentary Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20) at Matt. 16:8b, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," "The First Matter."

and cast him," is found in old Latin Versions b (5th century), e (4th / 5th century), d (5th century), and q (6th / 7th century). *Variant 1b*, Latin, "*Tollite* ('Take … away,' word 6) *illum* ('that [one]' = 'him,' word 7) *pedibus* ('feet' = 'foot,' word 3) *et* ('and,' word 4) *manibus* ('hands' = 'hand,' word 5) *et* (and) *mittite* ('cast,' word 9) *illum* ('that [one]' = 'him'), is the most probable reading of old Latin Version a (4th century), although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain. *Variant 1c*, Latin, "*Tollite* ('Take … away,' word 6) *illum* ('that [one]' = 'him,' word 7) *manibus* ('hands' = 'hand,' word 5) *et* ('and,' word 4) *pedibus* ('feet' = 'foot,' word 3) *et* (and) *mittite* ('cast,' word 9) *eum* (him)," is found in old Latin Versions ff2 (5th century) and c (12th / 13th century). *Variant 1d*, Latin, "*Tollite* ('Take … away,' word 6) *eum* ('him,' word 7) *manibus* ('hands' = 'hand,' word 5) *et* ('and,' word 4) *pedibus* ('feet' = 'foot,' word 3) *et* (and) *mittite* ('cast,' word 9) *eum* (him)," is found in old Latin Version h (5th century). *Variant 1e*, Latin, "*Tollite* ('Take … away,' word 6) *illum* ('that [one]' = 'him,' word 7) *pedibus* ('feet' = 'foot,' word 3) *et* ('and,' word 4) *manibus* ('hands' = 'hand,' word 5) *et* (and) *mittite* ('cast [him],' word 9)," is found in old Latin Version b (5th century).

Variant 2 omitting words 6 and 8, and making word 7 attach to word 9, Greek, "*D<u>e</u>santes* ('Bind,' word 1) *autou* ('of him' = 'him,' word 2) *podas* ('feet' = 'foot,' word 3a) *kai* ('and,' word 4) *cheiras* ('hands' = 'hand,' word 5a) *ekbalete* ('[and] ye cast' = 'cast,' imperative active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *ekball<u>o</u>* = *ek* / 'out' + *ball<u>o</u>* / 'cast', word 9a) *auton* ('him,' word 7)" i.e., "Bind him hand and foot and cast him," is found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

Variant 2 is also found as Latin, "*Ligatis* ('Bind,' word 1) *pedibus* ('feet' = 'foot,' word 3) *eius* ('of him' = 'him,' word 2) *et* ('and,' word 4) *manibus* ('hands' = 'hand,' word 5) *mittite* ([and] 'ye cast' = 'cast,' imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *mitto*, word 9) *eum* ('him,' word 7)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions aur (7th century, where word 1 is "*Alligate*" = "Bind"), 1 (7th / 8th century), and g1 (8th / 9th century); as well as and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is further found as Latin, "*Ligatis* ('Bind,' word 1) *manibus* ('hands' = 'hand,' word 5) *et* ('and,' word 4) *pedibus* ('feet' = 'foot,' word 3) *mittite* ([and] 'ye cast' = 'cast,' word 9) *eum* ('him,' word 7)," in the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.) From the Latin support for this reading in the Vulgate, and the rearranged word order of words 3 & 5 supported other than for word 2 in the Book of Armagh, and also found in e.g., Vulgate Codices L (7th / 8th century), B (8th / 9th century), and R (10th century); and with word 2 after word 3 as in the Vulgate *et al*, *supra*; the reading, "*Ligatis* ('Bind,' word 1) *manibus* ('hands' = 'hand,' word 5) *et* ('and,' word 4) *pedibus* ('feet' = 'foot,' word 3) *eius* ('of him' = 'him,' word 2) *mittite* ([and] 'ye cast' = 'cast,' word 9) *eum* ('him,' word 7)," is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

Variant 2 is also found in several Latin forms in the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604). "*Ligate* ('Bind,' word 1) *ei* ('him,' word 2) *manus* ('hand,' word 5) *et* ('and,' word 4) *pedes* ('foot,' word 3), *et* (and) *mittite* ('cast,' word 9) *eum* ('him,' word 7)" (Migne 76:334). "*Ligatis* ('Bind,' word 1) *pedibus* ('feet' = 'foot,' word 3) *eius* ('of him' = 'him,' word 2) *ac* ('and,' word 4) *manibus* ('hands' = 'hand,'

word 5), *mittite* ([and] 'ye cast' = 'cast,' word 9) *eum* ('him,' word 7)" (Migne 76:885). "*Ligatis* ('Bind,' word 1) *manibus* ('hands' = 'hand,' word 5) *eius* ('of him' = 'him,' word 2) *et* ('and,' word 4) *pedibus* ('feet' = 'foot,' word 3) *mittite* ([and] 'ye cast' = 'cast,' word 9) *eum* ('him,' word 7)" (Migne 76:1282). "*Ligatis* ('Bind [him],' word 1) *manibus* ('hands' = 'hand,' word 5) *et* ('and,' word 4) *pedibus* ('feet' = 'foot,' word 3), *projecite* ([and] 'ye cast out [him]' = 'cast out' or 'cast,' imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *projicio*, word 9)" (Migne 79:117). And "*Ligatis* ('Bind [him],' word 1) *pedibus* ('feet' = 'foot,' word 3) *et* ('and,' word 4) *manibus* ('hands' = 'hand,' word 5), *projecite* ([and] 'ye cast out [him]' = 'cast out' or 'cast,' word 9)" (Migne 79:416).

There is no good textual argument against the reading of the representative Byzantine text which is thus correct. The origins of the variants are speculative.

Was *Variant 1* an accidental alteration? In the TR's Greek, "*Desantes* ('Bind,' word 1) *autou* ('him,' word 2) *podas* ('foot,' word 3) *kai* ('and,' word 4) *cheiras* ('hand,' word 5) *arate* ('[and] take … away,' word 6) *auton* ('him,' word 7) *kai* ('and,' word 8) *ekbalete* ('cast,' word 9a)," was word 1 first lost on an ellipsis with the previous word, so that a scribe looking at, "*diakonois* (servants) *desantes* ('Bind,' word 1)," first wrote "*diakonois*," and then thinking in his mind of the word "starting with "*d*" (delta) and ending with "*s*" (sigma), jump in his mind over word 1, and simply write word 2? Did a second scribe, looking at this later, and realizing that a mistake had been made, then conclude that "*autou* ('him,' word 2)" therefore "must be a misspelt form" of word 7, which the earlier scribe "put in after he realized he had forgotten it"? Did scribe 2 then further conclude that since words 6 and 7 come together that these should be transposed forward?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate alteration? Did a prunist scribe, consider it a "stylistic improvement" to cut away "the unnecessary wordage" of words 1 and 2, and by then transferring words 6 and 7 forward, to thus make "a more succinct text"?

In Lectionary 1968, we find such abbreviations as "*auten* (same)[117]," written as "*aut~*" with something like "^\\" written above the line. Was *Variant 1* some combination of accidental and deliberate alteration? Did words 1 and 2 come at the end of a line, with word 2 abbreviated to something like "*aut~*"? Were these accidentally lost in an undetected paper fade? Did a later scribe then deliberately transfer words 6 and 7 forward to create a "better sounding" text?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental alteration? Did word 6 ("*arate*," "[and] take … away") come at the end of a line, and was word 8 ("*kai*," "and") in an abbreviated form that only took up about one letter space? Were both then lost in undetected paper fades? Did a later scribe, first accidentally miss the short word 7, ("*auton*," "him") and so write word 9a ("*ekbalete*," "cast"), and then realizing his error, add back in word 7, thus changing the word order from 7,9a, to 9a,7?

---

[117] Lectionary 1968, p. 81b, II Cor. 3:18.

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate alteration?   Did a prunist scribe, consider it a "stylistic improvement" to cut away "the unnecessary wordage" of words 6 and 8; and together with the further "stylistic improvement" of changing around the word order from 7,9a, to 9a,7; thus create both "a more succinct text" and "better sounding" text?

Was *Variant 2* some combination of accidental and deliberate alteration?   Did word 6 ("*arate*" / "[and] take … away") come at the end of a line, and was word 8 ("*kai*" / "and") in an abbreviated form that only took up about one letter space?   Were both then lost in undetected paper fades?   Did a later scribe, not realizing there had been a loss, then deliberately change around the word order from 7,9a, to 9a,7; to make a "better sounding" text?

Were *Variants 1 & 2* accidental or deliberate alterations or some combination thereof?   We do not know, we cannot now know.   But we can now know that these were changes to the original text of Scripture preserved for us here in the representative Byzantine Text.

The *Textus Receptus* reading at Matt. 22:13b has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading with no clear and obvious textual problem with it. It also has some slim support in the Latin.   In its multiple forms, *Variant 1* has some good support in the Latin, but none in the Greek, and no good textual argument to commend it.   In its multiple forms, *Variant 2* has some good support in the Latin, but quite weak support in the Greek.   *Variant 2* appears to have originated with Origen (*Variant 2*), and has no good textual argument to commend it.   Weighing up these factors, and bearing in mind the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 22:13b a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 22:13b, "Bind him hand and foot, take him away, and cast *him*" is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century).   It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent; changing the position of words 3a, "foot" and 5a, "hand"), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere; changing the position of words 3a, "foot" and 5a, "hand," and spelling word 9a, "cast," with two "l"s as *ekballete*), 157 (12th century, independent; changing the position of words 3a, "foot" and 5a, "hand"), 1071 (12th century, independent; changing the position of words 3a, "foot" and 5a, "hand"), and 579 (13th century, mixed text).   It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version.

Variant 1, is found as Greek, "*Arate* ('Take … away,' word 6) *auton* ('him,' word 7) *pod<u>o</u>n* ('of feet' = 'foot,' word 3b) *kai* ('and,' word 4) *cheir<u>o</u>n* ('of hands' = 'hand,'

word 5b) *kai* ('and,' word 8) *baletai* ('cast,' word 9b, with a localized revowelling of the "*balete*" suffix from "*e*" to "*ai*") *auton* (him)," i.e., "Take him away, hand and foot, and cast him," in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). Were the suffixes of words 3a & 3b lost in paper fades and "reconstructed;" or deliberately changed as "stylistic improvements"?   Given the presence of a more generally revowelling of "*e*" suffixes to "*ai*" in D 05, surely indicates that this was a deliberate revowelling of D 05 here[118].   Was the "*ek*" prefix of word 9b lost in an undetected paper fade, or deliberately changed as a "stylistic improvement"?

A similar reading to *Variant 1* is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) and Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) Versions.

Variant 2, "Bind him hand and foot, *and* cast him," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century).   It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex 085 (6th century, Matt. 20:3-32 & 22:3-16), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century).   It is further found in Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) and 700 (11th century, independent); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*.   It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), where it is translated from the Arabic as Latin, "*Ligate* ('Bind,' word 1) *manus* ('hands' = 'hand,' word 5) *et* ('and,' word 4) *pedes* ('feet' = 'foot,' word 3) *eius* ('of him' = 'him,' word 2), *et* (and) *eiicite* ('ye cast' = 'cast,[119]' word 9) *eum* ('him,' word 7)."

A similar reading to *Variant 2* is further found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text; reading word 9b & omitting word 7) and 13 (13th century, independent; reading word 9b).   A similar reading is also found in the Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century).

The incorrect *Variant 2* entered the NU Text *et al*.   Hence omitting the TR's words, "and take … away" (AV), (without italics for the second "and,") *Variant 2* is found at Matt. 22:13b in the ASV as, "Bind him hand and foot, and cast him" etc. .   The erroneous *Variant 2* is also found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

The old Latin Papists of the pre-Vatican II era supported the erroneous *Variant 2* in the Clementine Vulgate, rendering it from the Latin in the Douay-Rheims Version as,

---

[118]   See such a revowelling in D 05 at e.g., Matt. 6:8,16; 9:4; 10:12.

[119]   Imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *ejicio*.

"Bind his hands and feet, and cast him" etc. .   So too, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of the post-Vatican II era support the erroneous *Variant 2* in their Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles.   The *Book of the Chronicles of Neo-Byzantine Defence of the Received Text* records that following the Vatican II Council, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists, holding hands with neo-Alexandrian apostate Protestants, skipped up in a girlish dancing fashion, to neo-Byzantine Protestants, or given that they were adult males, in what might be called a "poofish" fashion.   And having so "skipped up" while "holding hands" to the neo-Byzantine Protestants, who said among themselves, "I don't like the look of these poofish flower-boys;" they came to the neo-Byzantines here at Matt. 22:13b with these lines, "Gweat [great] indeed is the power of the NU Text Committee, for we take away the words 'take … away' because we like to make ourselves bigger and bigger."   The apostate Protestant group then said, "Gweat [great] indeed is the power of Bwuce [Bruce] Metzger and Kurt Aland."   And the Papist group then continued, "Gweat [great] indeed is the power of the Roman Church to take away 'take … away,' and gweat [great] is the power of our Jesuitical Cardinal Martini on the NU Text Committee."   They then smiled poofishly at each other.

To this the neo-Byzantine Protestants replied, "So you like to make things bigger by taking away from the Word of God do you?"   And as these neo-Alexandrians smugly smiled in the affirmative, the neo-Byzantine Protestants "pulled the rug out" from underneath them, plunging them into a hitherto concealed large dark hole.   And as they fell into that hole the neo-Byzantine Protestants were heard to declare, "If you like things that get bigger and bigger the more you take away, then you must like big holes!"

Matt. 22:20 "he saith" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Diatessaron formatting.   Inside the closed class of sources, the Gospel readings of the Latin Vulgate at Mark 12:16 and Luke 20:23-24 lack the name, "Jesus." Therefore the reading of the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron which includes "*Ihesus* ('Jesus,' words 4 & 5)," must be based on the Vulgate's reading of Matt. 22:20.   Hence I show the Sangallensis Diatessaron following the variant, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, a similar logic means I also show the Arabic Diatessaron following the variant, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 22:20 the TR's Greek, "*Kai* ('And,' word 1) *legei* ('he saith,' word 2) *autois* ('unto them,' word 3)," i.e., "And he saith unto them," is supported by the representative Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings).   It is further found as Latin, "*Et* ('And,' word 1) *ait* ('he saith,' word 2) *illis* ('unto those [ones]' = 'unto them,' word 3)," in old Latin Version f (6th century).

However, a variant adding, "*o* ('the', redundant in English translation) *I̲e̲sous* (Jesus)," and thus reading, Greek, "*Kai* ('And,' word 1) *legei* ('he saith,' word 2) *autois* ('unto them,' word 3) "*o* (-, word 4) *I̲e̲sous* ('Jesus,' word 5)," i.e., "And Jesus saith unto them," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex Phi 043 (6th century), and Minuscule 1010 (12th century). It is further found as Latin, "*Et* ('And,' word 1) *ait* ('he saith,' word 2) *illis* ('unto those [ones]' = 'unto them,' word 3) *Iesus* ('Jesus,' words 4 & 5)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found as Latin, "*Et* ('And,' word 1) *dicit* ('he saith,' word 2) *eis* ('unto them,' word 3) *Iesus* ('Jesus,' words 4 & 5)," in old Latin Version d (5th century); and as Latin, "*Ait* ('he saith,' word 2) *illis* ('unto those [ones]' = 'unto them,' word 3) *Iesus* ('Jesus,' words 4 & 5)," in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D., spelling words 4 & 5 as "*Ihesus*").

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must thus stand. The origins of the variant are conjectural.

Was this an accidental addition? Both here at Matt. 22:20 and also in the next verse of Matt. 22:21, we find that immediately following the "*autois* (unto them)," the word "*I̲e̲sous* (Jesus)" is added in some manuscripts. In Codex Phi 043 this is "*o* (-) *I̲e̲sous* (Jesus)" at Matt. 22:20, and simply "*I̲e̲sous* (Jesus)" at Matt. 22:21." In Greek manuscripts known to me, it is not uncommon to abbreviate "*O* (-) IHCOYC (Jesus)" to "*OIC*" with a line on top, or "*IHCOYC* (Jesus)" to "*IC*" with a line on top. Given that in both instances this addition comes after "*AYTOIC* (unto them)," did tired and weary scribes, possibly working by a flickering candle-light that moved shadows back'n'forth on their page, on either one occasion (Matt. 22:20) or two consecutive occasions (also Matt. 22:21), first repeat the final "*OIC*" of "*AYTOIC* (unto them)" at Matt. 22:20, and in some instances also the final "*IC*" of "*AYTOIC* (unto them)" at Matt. 22:21, and then from habit just add the bar on top without thinking about the matter very much?

Was this a deliberate addition?

As already referred to, *supra*, a number of the mainly Latin, but also Greek manuscripts, that have this addition at Matt. 22:20, *likewise have such an addition at the next verse*. Thus at Matt. 22:21, "Jesus" (Greek, "*I̲e̲sous*;" Latin, "*Iesus*"), is also added i.e., "Then saith Jesus unto them," in Phi 043, and old Latin a, b, h, f, 1, ff1, & c. Does this indicate that a number of scribes considered that the movement from the singular "he" of "he saith" (or "saith he") in referring to Jesus at Matt. 22:20,21, to the plural "unto them" for "the Pharisees" (Matt. 22:15), was not a sufficient distinction "for the reader to pick up," or at least, "to pick up easily"? Did they then decide to bring out "with greater clarity" the name of "Jesus" in this two-way dialogue as "a stylistic improvement"? Did those who so made only the first addition at Matt. 22:20 therefore

consider this was enough to then cover verse 20 as well; in contrast to those scribes who thought a further reference in verse 21 was also needed?   Therefore, contrasting and comparing what happened with the addition of "Jesus" at both Matt. 22:20 and Matt. 22:21, does this mean that among a number of scribes it was considered that in a close two-way dialogue of this type, it would be "a stylistic improvement" to specify the name of Jesus at least once (Matt. 22:20), and possibly twice (Matt. 22:21)?   *Were these the scribal machinations among "the many which corrupt the word of God"* (II Cor. 3:17)?

A deliberate or accidental addition?   We cannot be sure.   But we can be sure that in both instances these were additions to the text of Scripture, in both instances (Matt. 22:20,21) preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

The reading of the *Textus Receptus* has rock solid support in the Greek from ancient times as the representative Byzantine reading against which there is no good textual argument.   It also has some slim minority support in the Latin textual tradition.   By contrast, the variant has slim minority support in the Greek textual tradition, but overwhelming majority support in the Latin textual tradition.   Balancing out these considerations, and bearing in mind the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 22:20 a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 22:20, "And he saith unto them," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century).   It is also found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex 0138 (13th century, Matt. 21:24-24:15); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*.   It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); and an edition of the Armenian Version.

However, the variant, "And Jesus saith unto them," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is also found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century).   It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 157 (12th century, independent), and 1071 (12th century, independent); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.   It is also found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century)

and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; some editions of the Armenian Version; and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).   It is translated from the Arabic as Latin, "*Ait* ('he saith,' word 2) *illis* ('unto those [ones]' = 'unto them,' word 3) *Iesus* ('Jesus,' words 4 & 5)," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The neo-Alexandrians were split and confused about what to do here at Matt. 22:20.   The wide textual support for the variant in the Latin, Western Text, "Caesarean Text" ("pre-Caesarean:" Family 13 manuscripts & "Caesarean" Proper: most Armenian Version editions); "queen of minuscules," 33; Syriac; and in the case of the older neo-Alexandrians, the Arabic (Diatessaron) and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann); when coupled with a general "suspicion" of the Byzantine Text and associated psychological hankering to disagree with it; and the possibility that "*OIC*" might have been lost in ellipsis on the previous "*AYTOIC*;" all no doubt contributed to the decision to adopt the variant by Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72); or put it in a side-note as an alternative reading to be taken seriously in the very limited Westcott-Hort (1881) textual apparatus.   But other neo-Alexandrians were not so sure.   Did they really want to disagree with BOTH main Alexandrian Texts?   And "is not the shorter reading the better one"?   Thus for the wrong reasons, the TR's reading was adopted in the main texts of Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993); in all instances other than UBS, showing the variant as a footnote alternative.

The neo-Alexandrian translators were evidently uneasy about just what to do here at Matt. 22:20.   On the one hand, Is not Tischendorf the founding father of the Neo-Alexandrian School?   Has not even Westcott and Hort on this occasion questioned "the neutrality" of the Alexandrian Texts?   But on the other hand, Could both main Alexandrian Texts really be wrong?   "Is not the shorter reading the better one"?

In the end, for the wrong reasons the TR's reading was followed at Matt. 22:20 in the ASV as "And he saith unto them."   It was likewise followed by the NASB, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.   It as also followed after gratuitously omitting words 1 "And (*Kai*)" and 3 "unto them (*autois*)," by the TCNT.

However, the variant was followed by the RSV, ESV, and Moffatt.   E.g., no doubt influenced first and foremost by the combination of Latin, Western Greek, and Syriac support for Variant 2, Moffatt reads, "Then Jesus said to them" (Moffatt Bible). The variant is also followed after gratuitously omitting words 1 "And (*Kai*)" and 3 "unto them (*autois*)," by the NEB and REB

The post-Vatican II new neo-Alexandrian Papists thought they had better "play safe" and "go with" the two main Alexandrian texts on this reading at Matt. 22:20, and thus for the wrong reasons, the correct reading is found in the Papists' JB & NJB; although "just for good measure," they first gratuitously pruned away word 3 "unto them (*autois*)."   "After all, one wouldn't want to be too literal, would one"?   The *Book of the Chronicles of Neo-Byzantine Defence of the Received Text* records that the Jesuit loving

Papists of the Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles were aware of the fact that the old Latin Papists of the Clementine and Douay-Rheims had followed the variant here at Matt. 22:20. These Chronicles state: "Shrouded under their black robes, with their legs made nimble for flight, the neo-Alexandrian Papists gave the order, 'Shhhh, Shhhh, don't tell anyone we've changed the Clementine and Douay-Rheims here. We want them to think the Roman Church never changes.' And then, with their black robes fluttering in the air, they hurried away under the cover of darkness, returning to their Popish lair."

Matt. 22:23 "which say" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter: Greek. Lectionary 2378 contains a reading of Matt. 22:15-33; 24:1-2. But the text is broken at Matt. 22:23 (p. 66b), and the page here looks like "a real mess" in both my positive and negative microfilm photocopies. Fortunately, when I inspected the original at Sydney University, holding my magnifying glass in one hand, this detective work paid some dividends, albeit leaving some of its mysteries unresolved.

At the end of one line, the scribe who was writing out Matt. 22:23 got up to the, "*aut<u>o</u>* (to him) *Saddoukaioi* (Sadduccees)," and wrote the first part of this word as "*Saddouke*" (i.e., ending with an epsilon rather than an omicron) at the end of one line. The next two lines are a fade-in and fade-out of letters, some of which are difficult to see, and some of which, at least without a high resolution scanner technology that I lack, are simply not discernable to the naked eye, even with a magnifying glass.

THE BIG MYSTERY is the fact that the brown ink changes at the very start of this line to a red ink with what looks like a flat bottomed omicron, with a line in the middle of it going up about half-way, followed by a downward stoke that presumably is a capital iota. There is then a fade for about 3 or 4 letter spaces before one can discern the "*ontes*" of "*legontes* (saying)." It seems unlikely that there would be enough space in the fade section to fit "*oi*," since if this were so, it would have had to have been written in much smaller letters that the surrounding letters, and where such words are "squeezed in" in manuscripts I have seen, it is at then ends of lines, rather than in the middle of lines. I shall return to this section, *infra*.

Before examining in greater detail this element of the lines to do with "*legontes* (saying)" and thus the readings we are considering here at Matt. 22:23; I wish to state that it is clear to me that there is enough visible in these two lines to detect that we are here looking at verse 23. Moreover, this conclusion is harmonious with the general context of what we can read, which here expects this section from verse 23. The relevant part of verse 23 and start of verse 24 reads in the TR, "*oi* (which) *legontes* ('saying' = 'say') *m<u>e</u>* (not) *einai* (to be) *anastasin* (a resurrection), *kai* (and) *ep<u>e</u>r<u>o</u>t<u>e</u>san* (they asked) *auton* (him) *legontes* (saying) *Didiaskale* (Master), *M<u>o</u>s<u>e</u>s* (Moses) *eipen* (said), *Ean* (If) *tis* ('anyone' = 'a man') *apothan<u>e</u>* (die)" etc. .

Specifically, in Lectionary 2378 after the "*ontes*" there are about two letter spaces

that would thus fit the "*me* (not)" and one can then read and "*ei*" and half of a capital "*n*" (nu) followed by about 2 letter spaces that would be the "*einai* (to be)." This is then followed by the "*an*" of "*anastasin* (a resurrection)" at which point this line ends with a one letter space fade which could be the "*a*" of "*anastasin*." On the next line, there is a fade letter that looks like an "*s*" and "I" which would be the "*st*" of "*anastasin*" with the top of the tau or "τ" lost in the paper fade. This is then followed by the "*asin*" of "*anastasin* (a resurrection)." Next comes the faded but visible "*kai* (and)," followed by an epsilon (ε) and the first half of a pi (π) then an eta (H) and rho (ρ)," which is followed by an elevated tau (τ) and the rest is faded. These thus form the "*eper*" of "*eperotesan* (they asked)," which in some abbreviated form had the "*t*" (tau) of this word elevated in the middle of the line.

The next line then becomes visible again, and has "*auto* (to him)" (rather than the TR's "*auton*" / "him*") then "*legontes* (saying)" from the start of Matt. 22:24. There is then missing the words, "*Didiaskale* (Master), *Moses* (Moses) *eipen* (said)," but the next word in this sequence, "*Ean* (If)," follows immediately on after the earlier "*legontes* (saying)" with no paper space break between them indicating a fade of these words, and then the following "*tis* ('anyone' = 'man')" of the TR becomes "*tes*." But the text thereafter resume normally with "*apothane* (die)" etc. .

There was some damage in transmission of the text here at verses 23 and 24. Was this scribal error by the scribe of Lectionary 2378? Or was he copying out from an already corrupted and erroneous manuscript? What should we make of the "*tes* (the)" for "*tis* (man)"? *Prima facie* "*tes*" means "the" (feminine singular genitive, definite article from *e*)." But if this is a local dialect revowelling of "*tis* ('anyone' = 'man')," then this fits better with the context. Or was this an accidental misspelling?

Without entering further into these questions, *the salient point for our purposes is that enough of this area of the manuscript is readable for us to safely say that the relevant section of Matt. 22:23 we are considering for this reading is found in Lectionary 2378, supra*. Therefore I now return to the point made above. I.e., the brown ink changes at the very start of the line where the paper fade is to a red ink, with what looks like a flat bottomed omicron, with a line in the middle of it going up about half-way, followed by a downward stoke that presumably is an iota. There is then a fade for about 3 or 4 letter spaces before one can discern the "*ontes*" of "*legontes* (saying)." Therefore, putting in bold the parts in red ink, the most likely construction of this is that Lectionary 2378 originally read at the end of one line, "*auto* (to him) *Saddouke*," and then at the start of the next line, "**oi** *legontes* (saying)."

But as one who has a general familiarity with Lectionary 2378, I would have to say that this usage of red ink here *is most unusual*. More normatively, Lectionary 2378 is written in brown ink with red illumination of key letters and section markers, e.g., this reading of Matt. 22:15-33; 24:1-2 starts (p. 66a) with a red epsilon for "**Ek** (from) *tou* (the [gospel]) *kata* (according to[120]) *Mathaion* (Matthew)." The reading then starts with one

---

[120] The "*kata* (=κ,τ\)" is abbreviated in Lectionary 2378 as a kappa (κ) with a

of the standard introductory words for Lectionary readings, "*To* ('the,' redundant in English translation) *kairo* (time) *ekeino* (that)," i.e., "At that time," in which the first tau or "T" of the "*To* (-)," is put to the left i.e., in between the two columns of page 66a, written in a large form that goes about 5 lines, and is ornately written in red ink.

This then leads me to make the following fascinating speculation.   Putting in bold that which we find in red ink in Lectionary 2378 here at Matt. 22:23, is "*Saddoukeoi legontes* (saying)" an abbreviated form in which the line going up about half-way of the omicron in "*oi*" means "twice"?   If so, this then reads, "*Saddoukeoi* (Sadducees) *oi* (which) *legontes* (say)" i.e., the reading of the TR (*Reading 1*).   If so, does this also explain the loss of the "*oi* (which)" in the variant (*Reading 2*)?   I.e., did a scribe looking at a manuscript reading "*Saddoukeoi legontes*," either not knowing this form of abbreviation or intending to come back later with some red ink but then forgetting to do so, simply copy this all out in one colour ink?   Did this original scribe, or a subsequent one, then omit the slight line in the middle of the omicron of the original "*oi*" as "a scribal slippage of the pen," thus giving rise to the variant's reading, "*Saddoukaioi* (Sadduccees) *legontes*" (*Reading 2*)?

I am not sufficiently familiar with enough manuscripts from enough eras, to be able to say whether or not what might be reconstructible from this medieval 11th century manuscript, might also have happened in ancient times.   Therefore, lacking sufficient manuscript data I cannot say whether or not this is a reasonable conjecture for the much earlier time during which the variant arose.   I am prepared to revisit this matter if and when I receive any further relevant information.   Alas, I must now leave such questions in abeyance.   Suffice to now note here, that no reference will be made to Lectionary 2378, *infra*.

The Second Matter: Latin.   In support of the TR (*Reading 1*), the Vulgate and most old Latin Versions decline *dico* as an <u>indicative</u> active present verb in the third declension; whereas old Latin g1 declines it as a <u>subjunctive</u> active present verb in the third declension.   I.e., the subjunctive has the element of contingency, because while the Sadducees always denied the resurrection, on a given occasion "the Sadducees," are they "which *may* say that there is no resurrection," but on another occasion they may just keep quiet about their views.   (I shall not now enter discussion as to whether or not this Latin translation properly understands the underpinning Greek, or whether it is overly interpretative of what the Greek means.)

The rendering of g1 as "*dicant* ('they may say' = 'say,' subjunctive active present, 3rd person plural verb, <u>3rd declension</u>, from *dico*)," reminds us that while "*dico*" as a third declension verb means *to say*; there is also a first declension *dico* which means *to show* or *to dedicate*.   Thus *prima facie* "*dicant*" could e.g., also mean "they show" (indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, <u>1st declension</u>, from *dico*)."   Hence in theory a heretic who denied Article 12 of the *Apostles' Creed*, "I believe in … the

---

short line something like a comma (,) then above this in between the two lines the tau (τ) over the "," followed by a back slopping short line (\).

resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting," might falsely claim the meaning of g1 here is, "the Sadducees, which show that there is no resurrection."   But it is clear that the context which upholds "the resurrection" in Matt. 22:30 rules out any such theoretical *prima facie* possibility[121] (not that this would necessarily stop such a heretic from so misusing old Latin g1).

   But the matter is of some noteworthiness, since while occasionally the *same* Latin word may be declined in different declensions (see my comments at Matt. 3:8, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," Volume 1), at other times, as seen by *dico*, a different declension indicates that it is a *different* word.

   The Third Matter Latin.   (Diatessaron formatting).   Inside the closed class of sources, *prima facie* the reading, Latin, "*qui* (who) *dicunt* (say)" of the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron follows the TR's reading.   But this same reading is found at both Matt. 22:23 and Mark 12:18 in the Vulgate.   Since the Sangallensis Diatessaron is a Latin Vulgate Codex, we cannot be sure as to whether or not this reading was a conflation of Matt. 22:23 and Mark 12:18 as a consequence of Diatessaron formatting, as these Latin scribes cross-applied the ancient Diatessaron ideas of Tatian to create their own mediaeval Diatessaron.   Hence no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

   Outside the closed class of sources, the reading, Latin, "*et* (and) *dixerunt* (they declared) *ei* (unto him), *Mortuis* ([From] the dead) *non* (no) *est* ('it is' = 'there is') *vita* (life)," i.e., "and they declared unto him, [From] the dead there is no life," is found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century). *Prima facie* this follows the variant (*Reading 2*), but without knowing what Matt. 22:33 looks like in the Arabic when compared with the Arabic of Mark 12:18 and Luke 20:27 (for this Semitic tongue is one that I do not know,) I think it safest to make no reference to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

   Principal Textual Discussion.

   At Matt. 22:23, the Greek of *Reading 1*, "*oi* ('the [ones]' = 'who' or 'which') *legontes* ('saying' = 'say,' masculine plural nominative, active present participle, from *leg<u>o</u>*)" i.e., "which say" in the wider words, "the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection" (AV), is supported by about half of the Byzantine texts e.g., Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), E 07 (8th century), H 013 (9th century); one of multiple readings in Lectionary 185 (11th century, Christ's College, Cambridge, England); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D., Sydney University, Australia).   It is also found as Latin, "*qui* (who) *dicunt* ('they say' = 'say,' indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *dico*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th

---

[121]   *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1968-82), p. 537 (*dico* meanings 1 & 2); & Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, p. 452 (1st & 3rd declensions).

century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It further found as Latin, "*qui* (who) *dicant* ('they may say' = 'say,' subjunctive active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *dico*)," in old Latin Version g1 (8th / 9th century).

However, the Greek of *Reading 2*, "*legontes* (saying)" i.e., "saying," in the wider words, "the Sadducees, saying that there is no resurrection," is also supported by about half of the Byzantine texts e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), M 021 (9th century), S 028 (10th century); and one of multiple readings in Lectionary 185 (11th century, Christ's College, Cambridge, England).   It is further found as Latin, "*dicentes* (saying)," in old Latin Version d (5th century); and as Latin, "*negantes* (denying) *resurrectionem* (the resurrection)," in old Latin Version ff1 (10th / 11th century).   It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Methodius (d. *c.* 250 or *c.* 257 or *c.* 311), and Epiphanes (d. 403).

Reading 1 is a description of the unorthodox theological beliefs of the Sadducees, i.e., these are they "which say that there is no resurrection."   By contrast, *Reading 2* is a description of these Sadducees coming to Christ, and stating their unorthodox beliefs to him, i.e., "saying that there is no resurrection."

Matthean Greek uses the terminology of "*legontes* (saying)," i.e., of the type and kind *prima facie* found in *Reading 2*.   St. Matthew uses this is four broad ways.   Firstly (*Type 1*), as a saying that expects and receives a response e.g., in Matt. 8:25,26: "And his disciples came to him, and awoke him, saying (*legontes*), Lord save us: we perish.   And he saith unto them, Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?" (Matt. 2:2,3; 8:31,32; 9:14,15; 9:27,28; 12:10,11; 12:38,39; 13:36,37; 14:15,16; 15:1,3; 15:23,24; 17:10,11; 18:1-3; 19:3,4; 19:25,26; 20:12,13; 20:30,31; 20:31,32; 21:23,24; 26:17,18; 24:3,4; & 27:63,65.)

Secondly (*Type 2*), it is used to introduce words that are a response to something that has just happened.   E.g., at Matt. 27:54, "Now when the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the earthquake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly, saying (*legontes*), Truly this was the Son of God."   (Matt. 8:27; 9:33; 14:26; 14:33; 16:7; 21:9; 21:20; 21:25; 26:8; 27:40; 27:23; 27:54; & 28:13.)

Thirdly (*Type 3*), it is used in quoting a statement.   E.g., at Matt. 10:7, "And as ye go, preach, saying (*legontes*), The kingdom of heaven is at hand."   (Matt. 6:31; 24:5; 25:37; & 25:44.)   Fourthly (*Type 4*), it is used for a rhetorical question, for we read of the sufferings of Christ at Matt. 26:67,68, "Then they did spit in his face, and buffeted him; and others smote him with the palms of their hands, saying (*legontes*), Prophesy unto us thou Christ, who is he that smote thee?"

By contrast, Matthean Greek uses the terminology of "*oi* (which) *legontes* ('saying' = 'say')" in a reportive manner.   Thus we read in Matt. 23:16, "Woe unto you, ye blind guides, which (*oi*) say (*legontes*), Whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is

nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is a debtor!"

Looking at Matt. 22:23 with *Reading 2*, "*legontes* ('saying' = 'say')" i.e., "saying," in the wider words, "The same day came to him the Sadducees, saying (*legontes*) that there is no resurrection, and asked him, saying, Master, Moses said" etc., thus poses a clear and obvious textual problem.   This usage of "*legontes* ('saying' = 'say')" does not receive an immediate response (*Type 1*); is not used to introduce words that are a response to something that has just happened (*Type 2*); is not quoting a statement (*Type 3*); and is not a rhetorical question (*Type 4*).   The internal contrast inside Matt. 22:23,24,29 is itself quite striking, "The same day came to him the Sadducees, saying (*legontes*) that there is no resurrection, and asked him, saying (*legontes*), Master, Moses said," etc., and "Jesus answered and said unto them" etc. .   With a *Type 1* usage of "*legontes* ('saying' = 'say')" at the very start of the next verse, verse 24, *Reading 2* in verse 23 is "a double-clanger" on the ears.   *Reading 2* thus *clangs on the ears as bad Matthean Greek.   What one-eyed cyclops could not see that this is simply not the way St. Matthew writes!*

By contrast, *Reading 1*, "*oi* (which) *legontes* ('saying' = 'say')" i.e., "which say" in the wider words, "The same day came to him the Sadducees, which (*oi*) say (*legontes*) that there is no resurrection, and asked him, saying, Master, Moses said," is simply reportive.   This conforms to the terminology of Matthean Greek.   Therefore, *Reading 1* must be the correct reading.

It might also be remarked that certain wider stylistic considerations of this passage are also harmonious with this recognition that *Reading 1* is the correct reading. In the first place, it does not make contextual sense if first they come, "saying that there is no resurrection" (variant, *Reading 2*), and then "Asked him" (Matt. 22:23) a question about what happens "in the resurrection" (Matt. 22:28), designed, so they hoped, *to trip him up*.   In the second place, the direct approach of *Reading 2* is generally out of character for the Jewish leaders who came to him as they tried to ask "a trick question" (Matt. 15:1; 19:3); and contextually these Sadducees clearly fit this type of normativity since they are clearly trying to give such "a trick question" here in verse 28, when they say, "Therefore in the resurrection whose wife shall she be of the seven?" etc. .

Therefore *Reading 2* is incongruous both with Matthean Greek and also the wider context of this passage; whereas *Reading 1* is harmonious with both.

The origins of the variant (*Reading 2*) are speculative, although it appears to have originated with Origen.

Was the variant an accidental alteration?   As a scribe read, "*Saddoukaioi* (Sadduccees) *oi* (which) *legontes* (say)," after first writing, "*Saddoukaioi*," did his eye jump by ellipsis from the final "*oi*" of "*Saddoukaioi*" to the following "*oi* (which)," and then keep writing; thus inadvertently omitting "*oi* (which)"?

Was the variant a deliberate alteration?   It likely origins with Origen increases

this likelihood, though by no means makes it certain. Origen is simultaneously one of the greatest theologians and one of the greatest heretics of the pre-Nicene Church. In his works I have read both brilliant insights from Origen that few men would be intellectually capable of attaining to, and horrendous heresies that few men would be capable of originating. His writings contain a mix of orthodox and unorthodox views, and seem subject to some level of erratic fluctuation. For whilst on the one hand, there are certain very "bouncy" intellectual minds that move around between ideas in a way that intellectually inter-mediate or intellectually inferior persons would WRONGLY think of as "erratic" because they simply do not understand them; on the other hand, there is a thread of unifying consistency in the minds of such persons clearly lacking in Origen. Thus on the one hand, St. Jerome fairly describes Origen's denial of a *bodily* resurrection as "poison[122]." But on the other hand, where Origen's views do not conflict with orthodoxy, Jerome is happy to cite and where appropriate refer favourably to them[123], as indeed am I. That is because only the Bible is infallible, and we must use other writings in a critical manner, i.e., if they contain useful material, not "throwing the baby out with the bathwater." Indeed, this methodology is endorsed with regard to the Apocrypha in Article 6 of the Anglican 39 Articles.

The matters in hand at Matt. 22:23 touch on the question of the resurrection, which Origen denied in violation of the first part of Article 12 of the *Apostles' Creed*, "I believe in … the resurrection of the body." The wider stylistic considerations of this passage have been already noted with regard to how it does not make contextual sense if first they come, "saying that there is no resurrection" (variant, *Reading 2*), and then "Asked him" (Matt. 22:23) a question about what happens "in the resurrection" (Matt. 22:28), designed, so they hoped, *to trip him up*. Did Origen therefore deliberately introduce *Reading 2* so as to be able to stroke the ego of his minions by pointing out this incongruity and saying something like, "We're smart enough to see this! You see, Christ didn't, and you'd have to be a little bit daft to believe in a bodily resurrection"? If so, this was a great blasphemy that Origen perpetrated against our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, whom he further sought to demean in his graded Trinity which denied the Divine equality of the Son (John 5:18; Philp. 2:6; I John 5:7,8).

A deliberate of accidental change by Origen? Let us hope the latter, for if it were the former, the damage that Origen did in this life, and his punishments in hell, would both be correspondingly increased. But whatever the *raison d'être* of its origins, we can be sure that *Reading 2* was an alteration of the Received Text preserved for us in *Reading 1* and found in our King James Bibles.

The TR's reading (*Reading 1*) has the support of about half the Greek manuscripts in the Byzantine textual tradition; and in the Latin textual tradition it has the further

---

[122]   Wace, H. & Schaff, P. (Eds), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, James Parker & Co., Oxford and Christian Literature Co., New York, USA, 1895, Vol. 6, St. Jerome: Letters & Select Works, 1893, p. 436 (Pamachius 25) cf. e.g., pp. 428,432-6.

[123]   *Ibid.*, p. 485 (Jerome to Damasus, 383 A.D.).

impressive support of both St. Jerome's Vulgate and most old Latin Versions. It is clearly favoured by textual analysis as the reading which conforms to Matthean Greek. By contrast, the variant (*Reading 2*) also has the support of about half the Greek manuscripts in the Byzantine textual tradition, together with a few ancient Greek writers; but has weak support in the Latin; and is clearly not a sustainable Matthean reading when put under the scrutiny of textual analysis. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 22:23 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 22:23, "which say" (*Reading 1*), is found in (the independent) Codex 0107 (7th century, Matt. 22-23 & Mark 4-5, St. Petersburg, Russia), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), 579 (13th century, mixed text); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian "2" Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (*c*. 500).

However, the variant, "saying" (*Reading 2*), is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex 0138 (13th century, Matt. 21:24-24:15); is the most probable reading of (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain; and is the most probable reading of (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain. It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) Version; Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century); Georgian "1" Version (5th century); and Slavic Version (9th century).

At Matt. 22:23, the erroneous variant (*Reading 2*) entered the NU Text *et al*.

But with a clear stylistic tension between "saying that there is no resurrection" (variant, *Reading 2*), followed later by the Sadducees who "Asked him" (Matt. 22:23) a

question about what happens "in the resurrection" (Matt. 22:28), clearly intended *to trip Christ up*, *supra*; coupled with such "wider support" for the TR's reading (*Reading 1*) in about half of the Byzantine texts, the Latin, the "Caesarean" (Armenian Version), some Syriac (Harclean), Coptic (Sahidic), and other versions; there has been a reluctance by most neo-Alexandrian translators to follow this reading. The matter is of some particular interest because when neo-Alexandrians use their non-Alexandrian text pincer arm, they more commonly do so as a "one-off," with one neo-Alexandrian doing so at one verse, and another at another verse (see my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 21:24a, *supra*). It is thus truly unusual that here at Matt. 22:23 we find about three-quarters or about 75% of the neo-Alexandrian Versions considered in this commentary, unite in the usage of the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm in opposition to both the Alexandrian and neo-Alexandrian texts. Perhaps we might subtitle this saga, "The day the neo-Alexandrian translators said 'No' to their neo-Alexandrian text masters."

The American Standard Version followed the TR's reading (*Reading 1*) in the main text as, "Sadducees, they that say that there is no resurrection" (ASV), but with a footnote saying of the variant (*Reading 2*), "Many ancient authorities read 'saying'" (ASV ftn.). The TR's reading (*Reading 1*) is also followed with no such footnote in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NIV, REB, Moffatt, and the Roman Catholic's JB & NJB

However, the variant (*Reading 2*) is followed in the NRSV, TEV, NEB, and TCNT. E.g., in a loose rendering, the Twentieth Century New Testament reads, "Sadducees came up to Jesus, maintaining (*legontes*) that there is no resurrection;" or in the even looser rendering of the Today's English Version at Matt. 22:23 this reads, "That same day some Sadducees came to Jesus and claimed (*legontes*) that people will not rise from death" (TEV). Or in a more literal rendering, the New Revised Standard Version reads, "Sadducees came to him, saying there is no resurrection" (NRSV); although a NRSV footnote adds, "Other ancient authorities read 'who say that there is no resurrection'."

In adopting the variant (*Reading 2*), the 1993 NU Text Committee said this reading "is almost certain." In elucidation on this ridiculous neo-Alexandrian claim, Bruce Metzger said the TR's *Reading 1* should not be followed "since" if the NU Text Committee did, "this would be the only place where Matthew has provided an explanation of this sort concerning Jewish affairs," and so "the reading without the article" i.e., *Reading 2*, "is to be preferred." He also claims "that copyists added the article by assimilation to the parallel passages (Mk 12:18; Lk 20:27)" (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 2nd ed., 1994, p. 48). This issue of whether or not St. Matthew provides such "an explanation of this sort concerning Jewish affairs" is not relevant, since sometimes what Christ says in the Gospel is "a one-off," e.g., some of what Christ says in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5-7) is not repeated elsewhere. The more pertinent issue is the composition of the Greek here, and which reading does or does not conform to Matthean Greek. As noted above, the reportive style of *Reading 1* does conform to Matthean Greek, whereas the address style of *Reading 1* does not.

As to this oft neo-Alexandrian misused notion of "assimilation to the parallel passages," in the first place it should also be noted that there are some differences between these passages *in the Greek* (although *in the Latin* at both Matt. 22:23 and Mark 12:18 the Vulgate reads, "*qui*" / "who" "*dicunt*" / "say").   The TR's reading at Matt. 22:23 (*Reading 1*) is, "*oi* (masculine plural nominative, definite article, from *o*, 'the [ones]' = 'who' or 'which') *legontes* (masculine plural nominative, active present participle, from *leg<u>o</u>*, 'saying' = 'say');" whereas Mark 12:18 reads "*otines* (masculine plural nominative pronoun, from *ostis* / *hostis*, 'whoever' = 'who' or 'which') *legousin* (indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *leg<u>o</u>*, 'they say' = 'say');" and Luke 20:27 reads, "*oi* ('the [ones]' = 'who' or 'which') *antilegontes* (masculine plural nominative, active present participle, from *antileg<u>o</u>*, 'speaking against' = 'deny that')."   But in the second place, at the end of the day this reference by Metzger to "parallel passages" is a contextual red-herring.   The relevant issue is the one already isolated, namely, how do these two readings fair relative to Matthean Greek.   *Only if it can be first shown that one does not*, does the possible issue of that one being potentially an "assimilation to the parallel passages" become relevant.   In typical neo-Alexandrian fashion, Metzger here "puts the cart before the horse."

Bearing in mind that Metzger (d. 2007) is one of the neo-Alexandrian "big wigs," I hope that these considerations, in conjunction which my comments with regard to why the TR's reading is *Reading 1*, *supra*, helps the reader better understand why I think so poorly of the neo-Alexandrians and their general claims to be capable of serious textual analysis, even if occasionally they manage to say something of value in this area; and even if, on this occasion most of the neo-Alexandrian versions have gotten the right reading for partly the right and partly the wrong reasons.   Like others who have in general hijacked the universities and colleges, (to say nothing of the media, courts, and legislatures,) the overall much higher numbers of these intellectually inter-mediate persons means that they can readily replicate their power structures, and filtering matters through their erroneous paradigms, "mark down" and "keep out" of such positions their intellectual, spiritual, and moral, betters and superiors.   Alas, these type of problems are much wider than simply these neo-Alexandrians.   *Alas, such is the present condition of our once glorious white, patriarchal, Protestant, Christian, Western World!*

"For, behold, the Lord of hosts, doth take away … the stay and the staff … .   The mighty man, and the man of war, the judge, and the prophet, and the prudent, and the ancient, the captain of fifty, and the honourable man, and the counsellor, and the cunning artificer, and the eloquent orator.   And I will give children to be their princes. And babes shall rule over them.   And the people shall be oppressed …: the child shall behave himself proudly against the ancient, and the base against the honourable … ."   They are "ruined, and … fallen: because their tongue and their doings are against the Lord, to provoke the eyes of his glory.   The shew of their countenance doth witness against them; and they declare their sin as Sodom, they hide it not … .   As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them.   O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths" (Isa. 3:1-5,8,9,12).

Matt. 22:27 "also" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, *prima facie* the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron here follows the TR's reading with "*et* (also)."   However, the Sangallensis Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex and the Vulgate also reads Latin, "*et* (also)," at Mark 12:22 and Luke 20:32.   Therefore no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, the Arabic Diatessaron also *prima facie* follows the TR's reading in Ciasca's Latin translation of "*et* (also)."   But similar factors of repetition in Matt. 22:27; Mark 12:22; and Luke 20:32; mean that no reference is made to Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 22:27 the TR's Greek, "*kai* (also)," in the words, "And last of all the woman died also (*kai*)" (AV), are supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) and K 017 (9th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.).   It is also found as Latin, "*et* (also)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is further followed in the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, a variant which omits "also (Greek *kai*; Latin, *et*)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and U 030 (9th century); and Minuscule 2 (12th century).   The omission is also found in old Latin Version e (4th / 5th century), as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is thus correct.   The origins of the variant are speculative.

Was the variant an accidental omission?   E.g., here at Matt. 22:27, *Codex Freerianus* (W 032) has the optional "*n*" (nu) on the end of the previous word, "*apethane* ('she died' = 'died,' AV)."   Did a scribe working with a manuscript in which "*apethane*" was followed by a one letter abbreviation for "*kai*" which had faded, simply conclude that "the optional 'n' must have faded," and so "reconstruct" this as "*apethanen*"? Alternatively did "*kai*" written out in full come at the end of a line, and was this simply lost due to a more normative undetected paper fade?

Alternatively, it should be remembered that words can sometimes be lost.   E.g., here Matt. 22:27, in Lectionary 2378 the scribe wrote "*de* (And)" at the end of the left-hand column of a page, then at the top of the right-hand column of this page, "*apethanen*

(died)."   But in the transition from the bottom of column 1 to the top of column 2, he somehow lost in his mind the intervening word "*pant<u>on</u> (of all),*" which thus dropped out. Given that a scribe could so lose a word in the change from one column to the next, did a scribe come to the end of one line with the word, "*apethanen* (died)," then either going up to the next column in a two column page, or in a one columned manuscript turning the page to start a new one columned page, likewise forget to write "*kai* (also)" as he moved up to this next column, and just kept writing with "*<u>e</u>* (the) *gun<u>e</u>* (woman)"?

Was the variant a deliberate omission?   Before the Fall, man had a sinless human nature and original righteousness, for "God made man upright" (Eccl. 7:29, NKJV); but ever since the fall of man's progenitor, Adam, man has had a fallen sinful human nature (Ps. 51:5; Rom. 5:12; 7), and human nature has not changed; Christ except, who had the sinless human nature of Adam before the Fall (II Cor. 5:21; Heb. 4:15; I Peter 1:19), and overcame where the first Adam failed.   Thus bearing in mind that human nature has not changed since Adam's fall, did a prunist scribe consider that this "*kai* (also)" was "unnecessary wordage" for "the more advanced and direct speaking type of people living in these modern times" of the ancient Greco-Roman world?   Did he accordingly prune away "this fuddy-duddy long-winded language of yesteryear" as "a stylistic improvement"?

A deliberate of accidental omission?   We do not know.   But we do know that this was a change to the text of Scripture here preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

The *Textus Receptus* reading has strong support in both the Greek and Latin textual traditions, including St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate.   It also has the support of the church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom.   By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek and Latin, and no good textual argument to commend it.   On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 22:27 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 22:27, "also," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex 0138 (13th century, Matt. 21:24-24:15).   It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.   It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; some manuscripts of the Egyptian

Coptic Bohairic Version; and the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century).

However, the variant omitting "also," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); Minuscule 565 (9th century, independent); and the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The erroneous variant entered the NU Text *et al*. Hence omitting "also" at Matt. 22:27 the ASV simply reads, "And after them all, the woman died." This incorrect omission is also found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

The correct reading is found in the old Latin Papists' Clementine Vulgate as Latin, "*et* (also);" and in their Douay-Rheims which reads at Matt. 22:27, "And last of all the woman died also (*et*)" (Douay-Rheims). But the new neo-Alexandrian Papists omit the "also" in their RSV "Catholic" edition, Jerusalem, and New Jerusalem Bibles.

With a cunning that bespeaks of the type of Jesuitry we have come to associate with Papists such as Cardinal Martini; when in 1962 to 1965 the old "false prophet" of Romish "ecumenical" councils opened his mouth (Matt. 24:24; Rev. 13:11-13; 16:13; 19:20; 20:10), he said, "the" Roman "Church" "honors … the Latin translations, especially that which is called the Vulgate." But then added, "the" Roman "Church," "sees to it that suitable and correct translations are made …, especially from the original texts;" and "if … these translations are made in a joint effort with the separated brethren," meaning all non-Romanists who profess and call and themselves Christian e.g., Eastern Orthodox and Protestants, "they may be used by all Christians;" and such was the Revised Standard Version in its Roman "Catholic Edition." But the false prophet continued, saying that "under the watchful eye of the" Roman Church's "magisterium," "appropriate techniques" "should" be used for "explaining" Scripture; and to this end, "editions of … Scripture" should be "provided with suitable notes;" and such were the Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles[124].

Now when the old false prophet says, "the" Roman "Church," "sees to it that suitable and correct translations are made …, especially from the original texts;" this is a

[124] Flannery, A. (Ed.), *Vatican Council II, The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, Costello, New York, USA, 1977, "Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, Vatican II, *Dei Verbum*, 18 Nov., 1965," sections 22 (pp. 762-3); 23 (p. 763); & 25, (p. 765).

reference to the type of thing "the" Roman "Church," "sees to" with the presence of Cardinal Martini on the NU Text Committee. But in doing so, that the Roman Church would here agree to the removal of the TR's "also" at Matt. 22:27, while saying she "honors … the Latin translations, especially that which is called the Vulgate," which contains this reading from the TR, reminds us of her deviousness. Moreover, when the old false prophet here referred to "correct translations … made …from the original texts," this in practice meant *neo-Alexandrian* translations from *neo-Alexandrian* texts, which of course, are thus "translations" from anything but "original texts." In the Book of Revelation, St. John calls these Romish "ecumenical" councils such as the Council of Trent or the Vatican II Council, the "false prophet;" and referring to the Papal Antichrist of Rev. 13:1-9, St. Paul says the Roman Pope works "with all deceivableness" (II Thess. 2:10). *Good Christian reader, be on your guard, "because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour"* (I Peter 5:8).

Matt. 22:30b "of God" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter: Greek. Swanson says the original reading of the Byzantine text-type's E 07 is that of the variant; although none of my other textual apparatus also say this. E.g., the UBS 4th revised edition considers the original reading of E 07 is that of the TR. Therefore no reference is made to E 07, *infra*.

The Second Matter: More Greek. The majority Byzantine Text (e.g., Lectionary 2378) lacks the definite article, Greek, "*oi* (the)," before "*aggeloi* (angels)," and with no good textual argument against it, this is the correct reading. A variant adds this definite article. But there is no difference in meaning, and this is one of the many minor variants I am not generally discussing in this commentary. Hence unlike e.g., the UBS 4th revised edition (1993), for my purposes, I make no distinction between these two readings, *infra*.

The Third Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron reads, "*angeli* (the angels) *Dei* (of God)." Given that the Vulgate reads just "*angeli* (angels)" at Mark 12:25 and "*angelis* (angels)" at Luke 20:36, this Vulgate Codex must be following the Vulgate here at Matt. 22:30b. Hence I show the Sangallensis Diatessaron following the TR with Latin *Reading 1*, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, the Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries) reads in Ciasca's Latin translation (Latin 19th century), "*angeli* (angels)," and is more generally based on Luke 20:36. Since the "*angeli* (angels)" could have come from Mark 12:25 and / or Luke 20:36, no reference is made to Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

The Fourth Matter (Migne on Gregory). The fact that Latin, "*Dei* (of God)," exists in Matt. 22:30b but not Mark 12:25 and Luke 20:36, means Migne is certainly correct to attribute three references in Bishop Gregory's writings to Matt. 22:30b (Migne

76:958; 79:76,1419).   But his attribution of another reference (Migne 76:1030) to "Matth. xxii,30" may be questioned.   This fourth reading of Gregory is identical to that at Mark 12:25 of the Vulgate, other than the fact that the Vulgate's Mark 12:25 "*sunt* ('they are,' present tense[125])" and "*caelis* ('heavens' = 'heaven,' plural[126]);" becomes as at the Vulgate's Matt. 22:30b, "*erunt* ('they shall be,' future tense[127])" and "*caelo* ('heaven,' singular[128])," respectively.

Under the circumstances, it certainly seems possible that Gregory was making a citation after first consulting, and then undertaking some kind of assimilation, of both Matt. 22:30 and Mark 12:25.   With no clear indicator that he was here seeking to specifically cite just St. Matthew's Gospel to the exclusion of St. Mark's Gospel, I shall make no reference to this uncertain citation (Migne 76:1030), *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 22:30b, the TR's *Greek Reading 1a*, "*aggeloi* ('[the] angels[129]') *tou* (-) Theou* (of God)," i.e., "the angels of God" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codex W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Lectionary 2378 (11th century).   It is further the most probable reading of the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254), although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain.

A similar reading to the TR's with the same meaning as that of the TR, *Greek Reading 1b*, omits the "*tou* (of the)" which is redundant in English translation, and so reads simply, "*aggeloi* ('[the] angels') *Theou* (of God)," i.e., "the angels of God." *Reading 1b* is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D., abbreviating this to "*Thu*" with a bar over the "*u*").   It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Chrysostom (d. 407) and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

The TR is also supported as *Reading 1* i.e., a Latin translation based on *Greek Reading 1a* and / or *Greek Reading 1b*.   This is found as Latin, "*angeli* (the angels) *Dei* (of God)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions aur (7th

---

[125]   Indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *sum-esse*.

[126]   Neuter plural ablative noun, from *caelum*.

[127]   Indicative active future, 3rd person plural verb, from *sum-esse*.

[128]   Neuter singular ablative noun, from *caelum*.

[129]   By a common convention usually transliterated from "αγγελοι" as "*angeloi*" rather than my "*aggeloi*," as in Greek, double gamma (gg) is pronounced "ng."

century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D., with spelling variant of "*angueli*") and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; the ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, a variant reading is Greek, "*aggeloi* ('[the] angels')," i.e., "the angels." This is found as Latin, "*angeli* (the angels)" in old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), and c (12th / 13th century).   It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Methodius (d. *c.* 250 or *c.* 257 or *c.* 311); and ancient church Latin writers, Tertullian (d. after 220), Zeno (d. 4th century), Ambrose (d. 397), Chromatius (d. 407), and Augustine (d. 430).

There is no good textual argument against the TR's reading which must thus stand.   The origins of the variant and *Greek Reading 1b* are conjectural.

Was the variant an accidental omission?   Was the "*tou* (-) *Theou* (of God)," whose Greek letters, "του θεου" may have been abbreviated as in W 032 and Lectionary 2378 as "του θυ" (with a bar over the "θυ"), lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was the variant a deliberate omission?   Did an assimilationist scribe here prune away the *tou* (-) *Theou* (of God)," in order to "standardize" this reading with Mark 12:25 and / or Luke 20:36?

Did the variant originate as a deliberate omission from Tertullian?   Tertullian became a Montanist heretic.   This heresy, revived in historically modern times with the Pentecostals and Charismatics, involves "ecstatic visions in the Spirit" i.e., "prophesying;" as well as "babble in a jargon" when the Montanists "began to rave in a kind of ecstatic trance[130]."   This heresy is e.g., contrary to the Biblical teaching that "the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets," and that "God is not the author of confusion" "in all the churches of the saints" (I Cor. 14:32,33).   It is further contrary to the Reformation teaching of "Scripture alone" or *sola Scriptura*, found in the Reformation catch-cry: *Faith alone, Grace Alone, Scripture Alone*, and manifested in the Latin of the Reformation Motto: *sola fide*, *sola gratia*, *sola Scriptura*.

Did Tertullian have "an ecstatic vision in the Spirit" in which he considered "God told him" to prune away the text of Scripture here at Matt. 22:30b?   Unfortunately, when dealing with the Montanists, these type of bizarre and crazy things are always possible.

---

[130]   Tertullian, *De amina*, 9, c. 210; Eusebius, HEV 16:7; both in Bettenson, H., *Documents of the Christian Church*, 1943, 2nd edition, 1963, Oxford University, UK, 1977 (sometimes referred to in these commentaries as "Bettenson's *Documents*"), pp. 77-8.

Was the variant a combination of accidental and deliberate omission by two successive scribes?   Did a first scribe work with a manuscript in which the "*tou* (-) *Theou* (of God),*" whose Greek letters, "του θεου" were abbreviated as in W 032 and Lectionary 2378 as "του θυ" (with a bar over the "θυ")?   Did a first scribe write "*tou* (-)" and then accidentally omit "*Theou* (of God)" by ellipsis?   Did a second scribe, perceiving that the "*tou* (-)" in isolation was an error, decide after comparing this reading at Matt. 22:30b with Mark 12:25 and / or Luke 20:36 that "the correct reading" was simply, "*aggeloi* ('[the] angels')," and that the "*tou* (-)" therefore "must have been the error of some day-dreaming scribe"?   Did the second scribe then deliberately prune away the "*tou* (-)," thus producing the variant?

Did knowledge of, or the fear of, such a "double-trouble error" resulting in the variant, act as the catalyst for a scribe to deliberately remove the "*tou* (-)" before the "*Theou* (of God)" of the TR's *Greek Reading 1a*, thus producing *Greek Reading 1b* as "a pre-emptive measure" against such "double-trouble"?   Or was the "*tou* (-)" before the "*Theou* (of God)" of the TR's *Greek Reading 1a*, accidentally lost in an undetected paper fade that thus produced *Greek Reading 1b*?

Were these accidental omissions, deliberate omissions, or some combination thereof?   The dark ages of unrecorded textual transmission history leave us uncertain. But we can be certain that these were changes to the original reading of the *Textus Receptus*.

The TR's *Greek Reading 1a* has rock solid support in the Greek from ancient times as the representative Byzantine reading.   In the same meaning *Greek Reading 1b*, it has the support of the church doctor, St. Chrysostom; and in the same meaning Latin *Reading 1*, it has the support of the church doctors, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, and St. Gregory.   By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek with just one ancient church writer; though some stronger support in the Latin.   Weighing up these considerations, and bearing in mind the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 22:30b an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 22:30b, *Greek Reading 1a*, "*aggeloi* ('angels') *tou* (-) *Theou* (of God)," i.e., "the angels of God," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex 0161 (8th century, Matt. 22:7-46), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), (the mixed text type) Codex 0138 (13th century, Matt. 21:24-24:15).   It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent) and 579 (13th century, mixed text).

Greek Reading 1b, "*aggeloi* ('angels') *Theou* (of God)," i.e., "the angels of God," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century).   It

is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 1243 (11th century, independent outside of the General Epistles), 157 (12th century, independent), and 1071 (12th century, independent); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.

Reading 1 is a non-Latin translation ultimately based on *Greek Reading 1a* and / or *Greek Reading 1b*.   It is found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (*c.* 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500); and a manuscript of the Slavic Version.

However, the variant, "the angels," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is further found in (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent) and 205 (15th century, independent in the Gospels & Revelation); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*.   It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century).

With the two major Alexandrian texts split down the middle at Matt. 22:30b, Tischendorf opted for his normative solution of following his beloved Codex Sinaiticus, and thus adopted *Greek Reading 1b* in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72).   Just as predictably, Westcott & Hort opted for their normative solution and followed their very "neutral" beloved Codex Vaticanus, and thus adopted the variant in Westcott-Hort (1881).   Bearing in mind that Codex Vaticanus here has the shorter reading, and on normative neo-Alexandrian logic "the shorter reading is the better reading," the other neo-Alexandrians rushed in to follow Westcott & Hort, so that the variant was also adopted by Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

Von Soden's main text (1913), like Tischendorf, here follows the correct reading of Codex Sinaiticus.   Moffatt's translation is primarily based on von Soden's very bad main text; and among neo-Alexandrian Bible translators, it seems that only Moffatt, who in fact is only a semi neo-Alexandrian, was concerned at the lower level of "external" support for the variant reading of Codex Vaticanus, and the possibility of assimilation of Matt. 22:30b with Mark 12:25 and / or Luke 20:36.   Thus for the wrong reasons, like Tischendorf and von Soden, Moffatt here followed the Codex Sinaiticus reading and hence got the right reading, "the angels of God" (Moffatt Bible).

But all the neo-Alexandrian Proper translations followed the shorter reading of Codex Vaticanus.   However, a split emerged between them as to whether or not the reader should be told of the TR's reading which is followed by Codex Sinaiticus.   Hence the erroneous variant is found at Matt. 22:30b in the ASV as "angels," with a footnote saying, "Many ancient authorities add 'of God'" (ASV ftn.).   This type of ASV format with a footnote referring to the TR's reading found in Codex Sinaiticus was also followed in the NASB (1st ed.), RSV, and NRSV.   By contrast, the incorrect variant is also found without any footnote reference to the TR's reading of Codex Sinaiticus in the NASB (2nd & 3rd ed.), ESV, NIV, TEV, TCNT, NEB, REB, and Papists' JB & NJB.

To the extent that the old Latin Papists of the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims read "the angels of God" (Douay-Rheims) at Matt. 22:30b, we see that they were more accurate at this point than are the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of the JB and NJB.

According to the United Bible Society's 4th revised edition (1993) textual apparatus, the neo-Alexandrian NU Text Committee considered the reading of the variant at Matt. 22:30b "is almost certain."

In fact, the Neo-Byzantine *Textus Receptus* reading (*Greek Reading 1a*) has no good textual argument against it, and enjoys the support of the representative Greek Byzantine text (*Greek Reading 1a*), together with the church doctors, St. Chrysostom (*Greek Reading 1b*), St. Jerome, St. Augustine, and St. Gregory (Latin *Reading 1*).   *The proposition is about as silly as it gets*, that this reading of the TR should be set aside for a variant reading that probably originated with a heretic who had "ecstatic visions," and who possibly came up with the idea of this variant after he reckoned, "God me told to do it while I was having new revelations of the Spirit," which he received while looking like a zombie, in some kind of blank eyed, mesmerized, hypnotic trance, and which in fact was a state induced by devils.   Therefore we should not be surprised that the neo-Alexandrians have fallen over themselves in their rush to embrace this erroneous variant. "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools" (Rom. 1:22).

Matt. 22:32 "God is not the God of the dead" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter (Diatessaron formatting).   The Latin Vulgate reads at Matt. 22:32, "*Non* (not) *est* (he is) *Deus* (the God) *mortuorum* (of the dead) *sed* (but) *viventium* (of the living);" at Mark 12:27, "*Non* (not) *est* (he is) *Deus* (the God) *mortuorum* (of the dead) *sed* (but) *vivorum* (of the living);" and at Luke 20:38, "*Deus* (the God) *autem* (for) *non* (not) *est* (he is) *mortuorum* (of the dead) *sed* (but) *vivorum* (of the living)."   While for Luke 20:38 one should add before "he," the word "for (*autem*)," all three Vulgate readings may be rendered, "He is not the God of the dead but of the living."

The reading of the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is the same as that of the Vulgate's Mark 12:27; although contextually this Diatessaron here shows surrounding influence from the other Gospels.   As a consequence of Diatessaron formatting, one

could not confidently say where this reading was coming from, even though in the first instance it seems to be based on the Vulgate's Mark 12:27. Therefore no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

I also remind the reader that where I make no reference either in preliminary discussion or the readings, *infra*, to one of the two Diatessarons featured in the Gospels of these textual commentaries, it means that there is no reading given for that part of the verse being considered. E.g., outside the closed class of sources, Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron is not mentioned, *infra*, because there is no reading in the Arabic Diatessaron. The fact that inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron has this reading, whereas outside the closed class of sources the Arabic Diatessaron lacks this reading, also reminds us that different Diatessaron compilers sometimes made different Gospel selections. Thus while the original idea of such Diatessaron formatting comes from Tatian's Diatessaron, this does not mean that subsequent Diatessarons follow Tatian's precise readings, the exact details of which have been long lost. Rather, different Diatessarons follow the broad idea of Tatian, which was to assimilate and conflate the four Gospels readings into one continuous reading account.

The Second Matter. Inside the closed class of sources, old Latin g1 (8th / 9th century) and outside the closed class of sources, Minuscule 157 (12th century, independent); both have "God (Greek, *Theos*; Latin, *Deus*)," inserted before "living," i.e., "He is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living." This poses the following questions. Did g1 and / or 157 start as the *Variant 1a* (Greek) and *Variant 1* (Latin), to which this "God" was a later addition? Or did g1 and / or 157 start with the TR's reading, in which a scribe considered it "a stylistic improvement" to transfer one of the TR's reference to "God" to this later point?

The lack of certainty in the answer to these questions, plus the limitations on variants considered in this textual commentary, means that no reference will be made to g1 or 157, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 22:32, the TR's Greek, "*ouk* ('not, word 1) *estin* ('he is' = 'is,' word 2) *o* ('-,' word 3) *Theos* ('God,' word 4) *Theos* ('[the] God,' word 5) *nekron* ('of [the] dead,' word 6)," i.e., "God is not the God of the dead" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codex Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); Minuscules 1006 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Revelation), 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels), 2 (12th century), 180 (12th century, Byzantine other than in Acts), 1010 (12th century); 597 (13th century), and 1292 (13th century, Byzantine outside of the General Epistles); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers of the Didache (2nd century), Origen (d. 254), and Apostolic Constitutions (3rd / 4th century).

However, *Variant 1a*, omits word 4 (or 5) and so reads, Greek, "*ouk* ('not, word 1) *estin* ('he is,' word 2) *o* ('-,' word 3) *Theos* ('[the] God,' word 5) *nekron* ('of [the]

dead,' word 6)," i.e., "He is not the God of the dead."   This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionaries 205 (10th century) and 184 (1319 A.D.).

Variant 1b, omits words 3 and 4 (or 3 and 5) and so reads, Greek, "ouk ('not, word 1) estin ('he is,' word 2) Theos ('[the] God,' word 5) nekron ('of [the] dead,' word 6)," i.e., "He is not the God of the dead."   This is a minority Byzantine reading found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and Lectionaries 514 (10th century), 76 (12th century), and 1016 (12th century).   It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

Variant 1 i.e., a translation based on the Greek of Variant 1a and / or Variant 1b. This is found as Latin, "Non (not) est (he is) Deus (the God) mortuorum (of the dead)," i.e., "He is not the God of the dead," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; and the ancient church Greek writers of the Didache (2nd century) in a Latin translation; as well as the ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367), Chromatius (d. 407), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is thus correct.   The origins of the variant are speculative.

The fact that the Greek Didache here follows the TR's reading at Matt. 22:32 whereas the Latin translation of the Didache follows the variant, reminds us that changes to the text may occur at the hand of scribal translators.   Given that the Greek reading of Origen follows the TR whereas a Latin translation of Origen follows the variant, raises the following question.   Did a Latin scribe change Origen's Greek TR reading to that of the variant, or did Origen use both readings?   If the latter, Origen was probably the originator of the variant.

Was Variant 1a an accidental omission?   Did a scribe with a manuscript reading, "o ('-,' word 3) Theos ('God,' word 4) Theos ('[the] God,' word 5) nekron ('of [the] dead,' word 6)," first write words 3 and 4 "o Theos"?   Did his eye then jump by ellipsis from the first "Theos" (word 4) to the second "Theos" (word 5), and did he then just keep writing from "nekron" (word 6), thus inadvertently omitting word 5?   Abbreviating "Theos" which in Greek letters is, "θεος," to "θc" with a bar on top, Lectionary 2378 abbreviates this as "οθcθc" (TR) and W 032 reads "θc" (Variant 1b).   Would such ellipsis be even more likely if a scribe was using a Lectionary 2378 or 1968 type abbreviated manuscript?   Notably, in Lectionary 1968 the normative continuous script is not followed as there is a stylistic paper space of about 3 letter spaces between these two abbreviations i.e., "οθc   θc" (Lectionary 1968).   Was this stylistic paper space designed to help prevent either a copyist scribe or a reader of this Lectionary from making such an

ellipsis error?

Was *Variant 1a* a deliberate omission? Did a scribe, looking too rapidly at this as he was copying it out, think the "*Theos Theos*" was "a mistake of the previous scribe" and simply omit the second "*Theos*" without looking at it very carefully? Alternatively, was this a deliberate pruning away of the second "*Theos*" (word 5) as "a stylistic improvement" to "make a more succinct text"? Alternatively, was this a deliberate pruning away of the second "*Theos*" (word 5) as an assimilation to Mark 12:27 and Luke 20:38 in order to produce "a standard" Gospel text?

Was *Variant 1b* an accidental omission? Was the "*o*" before "*Theos* (God)" lost in an undetected paper fade? Was *Variant 1b* a deliberate omission? Was the "*o*" before "*Theos* (God)" removed by a prunist scribe on the basis of "redundancy" in order to create "a more succinct text"?

Which came first, *Variant 1a* or *Variant 1b*? In a manuscript line carrying the *Variant 1a* error, was *Variant 1b* an additional alteration? Or did *Variant 1b's* omission of the "*o*" first occur in a manuscript line, with the error of *Variant 1a* then occurring in the *Variant 1b* manuscript line independently of the same error in the *Variant 1a* reading? Or did a prunist scribe with *Variant 1b's* omission of the "*o*" i.e., with a "*Theos Theos*" reading, also have access to a *Variant 1a* manuscript, and because it appealed to his prunist proclivities, further modify the manuscript to our present *Variant 1b* reading?

Our lack of knowledge of exactly *how* changes of the Received Text occurred, does not alter the basic fact that we know *what* changes of the *Textus Receptus* occurred.

The TR's reading has rock solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading, attested to from ancient times in the Didache (2nd century) and Apostolic Constitutions (3rd / 4th century). But it has no support in the Latin. By contrast, the variant in either its *Variant 1a* or *Variant 1b* forms has relatively weak support in the Greek. However, *Variant 1* has overwhelmingly strong support in the Latin. Weighing up these considerations, and bearing in mind the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 22:32 a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 22:32, "God is not the God of the dead," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century, here adding "*de*" / "for" before the "*o Theos*" / "God"), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex 0138 (13th century, Matt. 21:24-24:15). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (11th

century, independent outside of the General Epistles), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts* which here add "*de* (for)" before the "*o* (-) *Theos* (God)," and which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.   It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Armenian Version (5th century); and Georgian "1" Version (5th century).

Variant 1a, which omits word 4 (or 5) ("*Theos*" / "God") i.e., "He is not the God of the dead," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century).   It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 205 (15th century, independent in the Gospels & Revelation); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*.   It is also found in the Georgian "2" Version (5th century); and Slavic Version (9th century).

Variant 1b, which omits words 3 ("*o*" / "the") and 4 (or 5) ("*Theos*" / "God") i.e., "He is not the God of the dead," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).

Variant 1 i.e., a translation based on *Variant 1a* and / or *Variant 1b*, is found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Palestinian (*c.* 6th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500).

At Matt. 22:32, the unity of both *Variants 1a & 1b* attracted the neo-Alexandrians like flies to a dunghill.   But "the sticky" question of what to do with the disagreement between Codices Vaticanus (*Variant 1a*) and Sinaiticus (*Variant 1b*) was not so easily resolved.   "I know," exclaimed Tischendorf, "I'll follow my beloved Codex Sinaiticus," and so *Variant 1a* entered Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72).   "No, no," said Westcott and Hort, "if we're to have a 'neutral text,' we must put the '*o*' in square brackets;" and so Westcott-Hort (1881) reads, "[*o*] *Theos*" thus allowing either *Variant 1a* or *Variant 1b*. Other neo-Alexandrians exclaimed in succession, "I like the Westcott-Hort solution here," and so "the Westcott-Hort solution" is also found in Nestle's 21st edition (1952), the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

The erroneous variant was adopted by the American Standard Version at Matt. 22:32 with a strange twist that it carried over from the Revised Version.   Showing the ASV's italics this reads, "God is not *the God* of the dead" (ASV).   While this is a possible way to construct the Greek, it seems to be a somewhat strained rendering, albeit

one later followed in the New American Standard Bible's 1st edition (1971). More naturally as a translation of the incorrect variant, at Matt. 22:32 the New American Standard Version's 2nd edition (1977) and 3rd edition (1995) reads, "He is not the God of the dead" (NASB, 3rd ed.). The NASB's 2nd & 3rd editions type of rendering is also found in the RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV. However the TEV here reverses the stylistic unit as part of its "dynamic equivalent," thus rendering Matt. 22:32 as, "He is the God of the living, not of the dead" (TEV). The TEV thus changes the Biblical emphasis, and so further perverts the Word of God.

Though the NASB's 3rd edition type of rendering was followed in the New English Bible's 1st (1961) and 2nd (1970) editions; it successor in the Revised English Bible (1989) adopted the TR's reading here. Seemingly, the likelihood of ellipsis on the double "*Theos*," when coupled with such "diverse witnesses" as e.g., the Syriac (Harclean); "Caesarean" Text (Armenian); and Byzantine Text, at least on this occasion, swayed the REB Committee. They were not entirely alone in this decision. The Papists' Jerusalem Bible (1966) also had this reading. But the new neo-Alexandrian Papists then went in the opposite direction to the REB and followed the NEB, in that the Papists' New Jerusalem Bible (1985) changed to the NASB's 3rd edition's type of rendering. Thus the new neo-Alexandrian Papists came to agree with the old Latin Papists since at Matt. 22:32, in harmony with the Clementine Vulgate, the Douay-Rheims Version reads, "He is not the God of the dead."

Does all this seem a little bit confusing and erratic on the part of neo-Alexandrian translators? Well there's still one more saga to this story. Did I hear someone say in a Scottish accent, "What about the disgrace of the *Church of Scotland*, James Moffatt?" Moffatt here was somewhat unusual in that he not only followed *Variant 1b*, but contrary to the natural translation of this, claimed the lack of the definite article of this reading at Matt. 22:32 justified his rendering of, "He is not a God of dead people but of living" (Moffatt Bible). Moffatt's rendering, "He is … a God … of living" (Moffatt Bible), would allow, though does not require, polytheism. Polytheism is prohibited in the First Commandment of the Holy Decalogue, "I am the Lord thy God," "Thou shalt have no other gods before me" (Exod. 20:2,3). Was the *possible* polytheism of, "He is … a God … of living" (Moffatt Bible), an inadvertent and unintended consequence by Moffatt? Or did he do this deliberately as some kind of religiously liberal concession to a universalist type of "inter-faith" view supporting all and any religious "faith," whether Christian (Trinitarian monotheism), infidel (non-Trinitarian monotheism), or heathen (various gods)? With Moffatt, one can never be sure about such things. So what of the mad Scotsman, James Moffatt? … Well, … let's just say he was "as mad as a cut snake."

Matt. 22:35a "a lawyer" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. A number of minor textual variants are not discussed in this commentary. E.g., here at Matt. 22:35a, a minority Byzantine reading adds "*tis* (certain)" and so reads, "*nomikos* (a lawyer) *tis* (certain)." This reading is found in e.g.,

Codices E 07 and F 09, and Lectionaries 2378 and 1968; and its origins seem to reflect an assimilation with Luke 10:25.   But since for my purposes the focus of discussion is on the variant which omits "*nomikos* (a lawyer)," I show Lectionaries 2378 and 1968 as following that part of the TR's reading that I am here concerned with, *infra*.

    The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting).   Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex.   The Vulgate's reading at Mark 12:28 is "*unus* (one) *de* (of) *scribis* (scribes)," and at Luke 10:25 is, "*quidam* (a certain) *legis* (of the law) *peritus* (expert)."   This is different to the Vulgate's reading at Matt. 22:35a, "*legis* (of the law) *doctor* (a doctor)," which being found also in the Sangallensis Diatessaron, I show as supporting the TR's reading, *infra*.

    Outside the closed class of sources, Ciasca's 19th century Latin translation of the 12th-14th centuries Arabic Diatessaron reads, "*et* (and) *unus* (one) *ex* ('out of' = 'of') *Sribis* (the scribes), *legis* (of the law) *doctor* (a doctor)."   This is clearly a Diatessaron formatting conflation of Mark 12:28 with Matt. 22:35a and / or Luke 10:25.   Therefore no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

    Principal Textual Discussion.

    At Matt. 22:35a, the TR's Greek, "*nomikos* (a lawyer)," in the wider words, (showing the AV's italics,) "Then one of them, *which was* a lawyer, asked *him a question*" etc. (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and O 023 (6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings).   It is also supported as Latin, "*legis* (of the law) *doctor* (a doctor)," i.e., "a doctor of the law," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.) and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is also found as Latin, "*iuris* (/ *juris*, 'of the law') *peritus* (expert)," i.e., "expert of the law," in old Latin Version d (5th century).   It is further found in the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writers, Tertullian (d. after 220), Hilary (d. 367), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430).

    However, a variant omitting Greek, "*nomikos* (a lawyer)" or Latin, "*legis* (of the law) *doctor* (a doctor)," and thus reading, "Then one of them, asked *him a question*" etc., is found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254), in both the Greek and also a Latin translation.   The omission is also found in old Latin Version e (4th / 5th century).

    There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text which thus must stand.   The origins of the variant are conjectural.

    Was this an accidental omission?   We know that words could sometimes be

accidentally omitted e.g., in W 032 at Matt. 24:2 the scribe inserted "*ode* (here)" in between lines after he realized he had omitted it. Or in Lectionary 2378, at Matt. 22:27, the scribe wrote "*de* (And)" at the end of the left-hand column of a page, then at the top of the right-hand column of this page, "*apethanen* (died)." But in the transition from the bottom of column 1 to the top of column 2, he somehow lost in his mind the intervening word "*panton* (of all)," which thus dropped out. Did a similar omission happen here at Matt. 22:35a, perhaps either as a scribe moved from one column to the next in a two columned page manuscript, or in a one columned manuscript he turned the page to start a new one columned page?

Significantly, in Lectionary 1968, in the first reading (p. 69a) there is a gap of about 2 letter spaces before the "*nomikos* (a lawyer)," and about one letter space after it; and in the second reading (p. 146a) there is a one letter space, followed by a dot, and another one letter space before the word, and likewise after the word a letter space, a dot, a letter and a letter space before the next word, i.e., *in a continuous script manuscript*, amidst the words, "*auton* (them) *nomikos* (a lawyer) *peirazon* (tempting)," we read, "*auton · nomikos · peirazon*". In both instances this is most unusual for this *continuous script manuscript*, and it naturally begs the question, "Why such a concern to make sure the "*nomikos* (a lawyer)," here stands out? Looking at the wider immediate passage at Matt. 22:35, the implication of Lectionary 1968, more pronounced in its second reading, although clearly present in its first reading, is that Lectionary readers tripping over in their minds from the "*n*" of "*auton*" to the "*n*" of "*nomikos*," and looking forward from the "*on*" ending of "*auton*" to the "*on*" ending of "*peirazon*," found that as their minds quickly went through this process they could "trip over" the "*nomikos*" and simply read out, "*auton peirazon*" without thinking about what they were doing. If it was found from experience that Lectionary readers could this, then clearly so could copyists, and so the possible scenario given above for the accidental loss of the "*nomikos* (a lawyer)" here at Matt. 22:35a is thus strengthened by the witness of Lectionary 1968.

Was this a deliberate omission? Did a misguided scribe think that because St. Matthew says, "*nomikos* (a lawyer)" (Matt. 22:35a) and St. Mark says, "*eis* (one) *ton* (of the) *grammateon* (scribes)" (Mark 12:28), that there was some kind of "Bible blunder" here? Did he then prune away "*nomikos* (a lawyer)" at Matt. 22:35a in order "to harmonize" these two Gospel accounts?

A deliberate of accidental omission? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that this was an omission from the *Textus Receptus* preserved for us here in the representative Byzantine Text.

The TR's reading has rock solid support in both the Greek and Latin textual traditions. It also enjoys the support of such learnèd church fathers as St. Hilary, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine. By contrast, the variant has very weak support in both the Greek and Latin. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 22:35a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 22:35a, "a lawyer," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the mixed text type) Codex 0161 (8th century, Matt. 22:7-46), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century), and Codex 0138 (13th century, Matt. 21:24-24:15). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (11th century, independent outside of the General Epistles), 157 (12th century, independent), and 1071 (12th century, independent), 579 (13th century, mixed text); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (*c.* 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions, together with a Greek marginal qualification for the Harclean Version; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Georgian "1" Version (5th century); Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500); and Slavic Version (9th century).

However, the variant which omits "a lawyer," is found in Minuscule 205 (15th century, independent in the Gospels & Revelation); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Version; Armenian Version (5th century); and Georgian "2" Version (5th century).

In harmony with normative neo-Alexandrian principles, following the two main Alexandrian Texts and various "external support," for the wrong reasons, the correct reading of the TR was adopted in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952).

However, the NU Text Committee decided to exercise the neo-Alexandrian School's non-Alexandrian text pincer arm. As I have noticed elsewhere, neo-Alexandrians generally disagree with each other as to when this should be done. (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at e.g., Matt. 21:24a.) Thus "*nomikos* (a lawyer)," was put in square brackets and made entirely optional in the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions; as well as the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

With the NU Text Committee here at Matt. 22:35a, we thus see an example of

neo-Alexandrians who operate with a normative Alexandrian Text based pincer arm, and occasionally with a non-Alexandrian text pincer arm, looking to exercise their non-Alexandrian Text arm. "After all," the NU Text Committee might have said in favour of the variant, "does not the omission have the support of Origen?"

The NU Text Committee followed the TR's reading somewhat reluctantly, placing it in square brackets i.e., making its usage or non-usage entirely optional and saying that the NU Text "Committee had difficulty in deciding which variant to place in the text." In elucidation on this, Metzger says, "Despite what seems to be an overwhelming preponderance of evidence supporting the word *nomikos*, its absence from Family 1" *et al*, "takes on additional significance when it is observed that apart from this passage, Matthew nowhere else uses the word. It is not unlikely, therefore, that copyists have introduced the word here from the parallel passage in Lk 10.25. At the same time, in view of the widespread testimony supporting its presence in the text, the Committee was reluctant to omit the word altogether, preferring to retain it enclosed within square brackets" (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 2nd ed., 1994, pp. 48-9).

If this argument were to be taken seriously, what would one be meant to do with the fact that St. Paul also only uses *nomikos* once (Titus 3:13)? It would e.g., mean that if some negligent scribe had accidentally removed it, or some heretical scribe had deliberately removed it, then on the basis that its usage is a "one-off" in the Pauline corpus, that therefore it would, at the very least, have to be placed in square brackets. I shall return to this analogy with Titus 3:13, *infra*.

More immediately, it is certainly true that St. Luke uses *nomikos* more widely than does St. Matthew, using a plural form of *nomikos* for "lawyers" in Luke 7:30; 11:45,46,52; 14:3. But it should also be borne in mind that the Greek, "*nomikos* (a lawyer)" is derived from the Greek, "*nomos* (law)," found throughout St. Matthew's Gospel (Matt. 5:17,18; 7:12; 11:13; 12:5). E.g., this matching and associated word is used in the immediate context of this passage when the lawyer asks in the next verse, "Master, which is the great commandment (*nomo*[131]) in the law?" (Matt. 22:36). And in reply, Jesus refers to "the law (*nomos*[132]) and the prophets" (Matt. 22:40). I.e., this is a "lawyer" (Matt. 22:35a) of the Mosaical Law of the Pentateuch (Matt. 22:36,40). Thus when the matching usage of "*nomos* (law)" and "*nomikos* (a lawyer)" is recognized, *a nexus is contextually present between Matt. 22:35a (nomikos) and the wider passage with Matt. 22:36,40 (nomos), and so this rather poor argument of Metzger's and the NU Text Committee collapses in on itself like a house of cards when a breath of fresh air blows into a stuffy room from an open window!*

And what of the matter of Titus 3:13 left in abeyance, *supra*? Of course, the same would be true of any such criticism of St. Paul's usage in Titus 3:13. E.g., St. Paul uses *nomos* for "law" throughout the Book of Galatians (for instance, Gal. 2:16,19,21;

---

[131] Masculine singular dative noun, from *nomos*.

[132] Masculine singular nominative noun, from *nomos*.

3:2,5,10) and elsewhere; and he also has a general knowledge of the secular "law" (Greek, *krino*) (I Cor. 6:1,6).   Hence he might reasonably use the terminology of "Zenas the lawyer" (Titus 3:13).   To what on the NU Text logic of Matt. 22:35a might seem to be "a most vexed question," namely, "Why did St. Paul only use the terminology of *nomikos* once?"   The simple answer must surely be, "He only ever found it necessary to refer to a 'lawyer' once."

Though most of the neo-Alexandrian Versions considered in this textual commentary followed the neo-Alexandrian normativity which is to include this reading, some of them were swayed to here use the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm.   Thus on the one hand, staying inside neo-Alexandrian normativity, at Matt. 22:35a the TR's reading which is followed in the two leading Alexandrian texts and has what the neo-Alexandrians call wide "external support" beyond this, is correctly found in the ASV (which lacks the AV's usage of italics for "him a question" to show it is added), as "And one of them, a lawyer, asked him a question" etc. (ASV).   This correct reading, followed for incorrect neo-Alexandrian reasons, is also found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, TEV, TCNT (whose rendering, "a Student of the Law" is quite loose), and Moffatt (whose rendering, "a jurist" lacks sufficient precision as this might describe either an academic lawyer or a practicing lawyer, and context requires the latter).

However, the omission which invokes the neo-Alexandrian's usage of the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm, is found in the *New English Bible* (1st ed. 1961 & 2nd ed. 1970) and its successor, the *Revised English Bible* (1989); as well as the Papists' *Jerusalem Bible* (1966) and its successor, the *New Jerusalem Bible* (1985).

To the extent that the old Latin Papists of the Clementine and Douay-Rheims here supported the TR's reading, "And one of them, a doctor of the law, asked him," etc. (Douay-Rheims); we here see a departure from the correct reading here at Matt. 22:35a by the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of the post-Vatican II Council era.

On the one hand, it is difficult to pull neo-Alexandrians away from their own normativity.   Thus e.g., although the NRSV has been called, "Metzger's baby[133]," it looks like the NRSV Committee overruled Metzger here at Matt. 22:35a by including this reading, and not so much as giving a footnote reference to the variant.   This meant that Metzger was "squealing like a baby" here at Matt. 22:35a, even though paradoxically, "Metzger's baby" was smiling.   But on the other hand, we cannot ignore the false claims of Metzger and the NU Text Committee here at Matt. 22:35a, *supra*, and the fact that this

---

[133]   Khoo, J., "Bruce Metzger & the curse of Textual Criticism," *Faith & Freedom*, April 2007, [Para Hills, South Australia; now relocated to P.O. Box 1117, Innaloo City, W.A., 6918, Australia,] pp. 1 & 4 at p. 4.   This article is more widely discussed at "*Determining the representative Byzantine Text," Preface, Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), of these textual commentaries.   The article is also reproduced in *The Burning Bush*, Theological Journal of the Far Eastern Bible College, (9A Gilstead Rd, Singapore, 309063; website: www.febc.edu.sg ,) January 2009, Volume 15, Number 1, (ISSN 0219-5984), pp. 41-45, this quote at p. 44.

omission has been adopted by the NEB, REB, and Romanist's JB and NJB. The "pull" of neo-Alexandrian normativity means that it seems unlikely on these trends that this variant will attract a majority support from neo-Alexandrian versions in the future. However, one can never be entirely certain when predicting suchlike since it is possible that some future factor among neo-Alexandrians might change their concept of what from their anti-supernaturalist paradigm is "plausible" or "probable" to a sufficient degree for them to more generally treat this variant as "a serious" possibility. E.g., if some very ancient papyri from 3rd century Alexandria or earlier were to one day turn up that all followed the variant, this may well sway more of them. But at the very least, it seems that some neo-Alexandrians, both at the textual and translation levels, will probably continue to support the variant here at Matt. 22:35a. Though whatever the future may bring for neo-Alexandrians here at Matt. 22:35a is presently uncertain, it is clear that at least to date, the variant has gotten the support of a noticeable minority of them.

And what if, to develop the possibility I mention above, some ancient manuscript, even from New Testament times were to turn up following the variant? I for one would be unmoved. That is because even in New Testament times there were "many, which corrupt the Word of God" (II Cor. 2:17). The text which God has preserved over time, and through time, is the text which God inspired. "The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever" (Isa. 40:8). "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you" (Matt. 17:20).

Matt. 22:35b "and saying" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex. At Matt. 22:35b and Mark 12:28 the Latin Vulgate lacks "*et* (and) *dicens* (saying)," whereas at Luke 10:25 the Vulgate has these words. These words are also present in the Sangallensis Diatessaron. But it cannot be reasonably determined from this Diatessaron what the reading at Matt. 22:35b is, and so no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, similar issues apply to the reading of Latin "*dicens* (saying)," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century). Thus no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

The Second Matter. Woodhouse's *Latin Dictionary* (1913) gives just one listing for "temp …, tempt …, v[erb]. tent," which is then placed on the next page at "tento." So likewise Stelten's *Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Latin* (1995) says, "tempt – see also tent-," and gives the listing as "tempto (tento)."

These different spelling forms appear in the Latin readings we are looking at for this reading. Thus the old Latin Versions use "*temptans* (tempting)," the Vulgate uses "*temtans*" (a syncopated form of "*temptans*"), and the Clementine uses "*tentans*."

Despite the spelling differences, these are actually all the same basic word form, i.e., a masculine singular nominative, active present participle, from *tempto / tento*. *Tempto / tento*, means to *test* or *try*.

But an issue is raised with the form found in the Clementine. While the Clementine's "*tentans* (tempting) *eum* (him)," is a manifestation of the basic form found in the Vulgate and old Latin Versions, the spelling here adopted is not found in these Latin manuscripts. While it is possible that some Latin manuscripts that I am not aware of e.g., some Vulgate Codices, use this spelling found in the Clementine, at least at this point in time I do not know of any from the textual apparatuses I use, or limited selection of Latin manuscripts I have.

This is important because I take this opportunity to remind the reader that the Clementine Vulgate is used in these textual commentaries because it is a most useful version for showing *the manifestation* of various Latin readings, and further shows the work of the post-Trent Council (1545-63) and pre-Vatican II Council (1962-5) Roman Catholic Latin School. But its value does not go beyond this, and so if one cannot show one of more Latin manuscripts that the Clementine is manifesting, then its value ceases. (Cf. my comments in Volume 2 at Matt. 15:14a, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," "The Second Matter.") Therefore I make no reference to the Clementine for the purposes of it manifesting Latin readings inside the closed class of sources, *infra*; although some reference is made to it outside the closed class of sources, *infra*.

The Third Matter. In the TR's reading, the Greek "*leg<u>on</u>* (saying)," is present tense[134]; and this is translated in most old Latin Versions following the TR with Latin, *dicens* (saying)," which also is present tense[135]. But in old Latin d the relevant construction is a future verb with a present participle i.e., "*dicet* (<u>future</u> tense verb[136]) *dicens* ('saying,' <u>present tense</u> participle[137])."

The present participle is contemporaneous with the action of the verb of its clause whether that verb is present, past, or future tense[138]. Here that is a future tense. But in Ecclesiastical Latin, a future tense may contextually have the meaning of a present tense. This is seen in the Hebraic poetical stylistic parallelism of the Vulgate's and Clementine's Psalm 5:12 (Latin, Ps. 5:13), (even though the meaning of the Hebrew is different to that of the Latin at Ps. 5:12). This reads in the Douay-Rheims, "For <u>thou wilt bless</u> (*benedices*, indicative active <u>future</u>, 2nd person singular verb, from *benedico*)

---

[134]   Masculine singular nominative, active <u>present participle</u>, from *lego*.

[135]   Masculine singular nominative, active <u>present participle</u>, from *dico*.

[136]   Indicative active <u>future</u>, 3rd person singular verb, from *dico*.

[137]   Masculine singular nominative, active <u>present participle</u>, from *dico*.

[138]   Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, p. 149.

the just, O Lord, <u>thou hast crowned</u> (*coronasti*, indicative active <u>perfect</u>, 2nd person singular verb, from *corono*) us, as with a shield of thy good will;" but this might be better rendered with the contextual <u>present tense meaning</u> as, "For <u>thou dost bless</u> the just, O Lord" etc. .   Or the Vulgate's and Clementine's Psalm 8:3 (Latin, Ps. 8:4), which reads in the Douay-Rheims, "For <u>I will behold</u> (*videbo*, indicative active <u>future</u>, 1st person singular, from *video*) thy heavens;" but this might be better rendered with the contextual <u>present tense meaning</u> as, "For when <u>I behold</u> thy heavens"[139].

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 22:35b the TR's Greek, "*peiraz<u>o</u>n* (tempting) *auton* (him), *kai* (and) *leg<u>on</u>* (saying)," i.e., "tempting him, and saying" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings).   It is also supported as Latin, "*temptans* (tempting) *eum* (him) *et* (and) *dicens* (saying)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), and c (12th / 13th century); and as Latin, "*temptans* (tempting) *eum* (him) *et* (and) *dicet* (-) *dicens* ('saying,' <u>present tense meaning</u>, *supra*)," i.e., "tempting him and saying," in old Latin Version d (5th century).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, a variant which upon reconstruction of the Greek omits, "*kai* (and) *leg<u>on</u>* (saying)," and so reads simply, "*peiraz<u>o</u>n* (tempting) *auton* (him)" i.e., "tempting him," is found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254), in a Latin translation. It is also found in the Latin as simply, "*temtans* (tempting) *eum* (him)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century); or "*temptans* (tempting) *eum* (him)," in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.).

There is no textual problem with the representative Byzantine reading which is thus correct.   The origins of the variant are speculative.

Was this an accidental omission?   We know from W 032 that short words were sometimes accidentally omitted and then the scribe added them back in when he realized his mistake.   E.g., at Luke 12:30 (p. 259), after "*ta* (the) *ethn<u>e</u>* (nations)," he first omitted, "*tou* (of the) *kosmou* (world)," and wrote, "*epiz<u>e</u>tei* (seek after)," and then realizing his mistake, put a mark in between the last letter of "*ethn<u>e</u>*" and first letter of "*epiz<u>e</u>tei*" above the line that looks something like "./.", and then making the same "./." mark in the right-hand side column, wrote the words, "*tou kosmou*" so a reader would know where to add them back in.   W 032 also shows at Matt. 15:36 (p. 57) that "*kai* (and)" was sometimes abbreviated to one letter space, as a "K" with a squiggle looking

---

[139]   See Albert Blaise's *A Handbook of Christian Latin: Style, Morphology, & Syntax*, French edition, 1955; translated by Grant Roti, 1993, Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C., USA & Brepols, Belgium, 1994, p. 80, section 218.

something like a "3" (but that is more compressed in the top part than a "3" and more elongated in the bottom part than a "3,") coming off the bottom of it.

Especially, although not necessarily, if the "*kai* (and)" was first abbreviated to a one letter space symbol that looked something like "Ҝ", did a scribe so accidentally omit "*kai* (and) *leg<u>on</u>* (saying)" at Matt. 22:35b? But lacking the adroitness of the W 032 scribe at Luke 12:30, did he fail to recognize his mistake, and so not add it back in at Matt. 22:35b?

Alternatively, in Lectionary 1968 the symbol "+" is used for stylistic breaks, stereotypically at the end of unnumbered "verse" divisions which frequently correlate with our modern verse divisions first formally numbered by Stephanus). Here at Matt. 22:35b we find such a section marker before the start of Matt. 22:36 i.e., we find that the key words, "*kai* (and) *leg<u>on</u>* (saying), *Didaskale* (Master)," are written in continuous script as, "*kaileg<u>on</u> + Didaskale*". In some manuscripts, such as W 032, a stylistic paper space is left at the end of such unnumbered verse divisions. Was such a feature in a manuscript used by a scribe? Did this mean that a paper fade of "*kai* (and) *leg<u>on</u>* (saying)" went unnoticed because he thought it was part of a stylistic paper space ending verse 35?

Was this a deliberate omission? The probable origins of this variant with Origen increases the likelihood of this possibility. Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, the seeking "a shorter and more concise form," assimilate this reading to Mark 12:28?

A deliberate or accidental omission? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that this was an omission from the TR's reading preserved for us here in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR's reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading dating from ancient times, and good support in the Latin with about half the old Latin versions also dating from ancient times. It further enjoys the support of the ancient church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople. By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek, resting upon a Latin translation of Origen; although beyond this it has good support in the Latin. Weighing up these considerations, and taking into account the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 22:35b an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 22:35b, "tempting him, and saying," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the independent) Codex 0107 (7th century, Matt. 22-23 & Mark 4-5), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex 0138 (13th

century, Matt. 21:24-24:15).   It is additionally the most probable reading of (the mixed text type) Codex 0161 (8th century, Matt. 22:7-46), although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain. It is also found in Minuscule 579 (13th century, mixed text); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.   It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century), some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; Armenian Version (5th century); and Anglo-Saxon Version (8th to 10th centuries).

However, the variant, omitting "and saying," and so reading simply, "tempting him," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century).   It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); as well as Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 892 (9th century, mixed text type).   It is also found in the Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century); Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century), some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al*.   Hence at Matt. 22:35b the *American Standard Version* reads simply, "trying him" (ASV); with "trying" (ASV) as opposed to "tempting" (AV), presumably being a "trying" example of "the general intention of the American Revisers to eliminate obsolete, obscure, and misleading terms" "in the Authorized Version" (ASV Preface).   The erroneous omission found in the variant is also found at Matt. 22:35b in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

The *Book of the Chronicles of the Received Text* here records that the old Latin Papists of the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims came at Matt. 22:35b with blood on their swords, exclaiming, "Rape, pillage, plunge, and destroy the Received Text," for which reason the omission occurs in the Douay-Rheims.   Following the Vatican II Council, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists were heard to say with sickly smiling faces to the old Latin Papists, "About that omission you guys made at Matt. 22:35b … .   We like the way ya' did that! That 'rape, pillage, plunge' 'the Received Text' business, … that's our sentiment too! We've decide we're gonna' sock the Protestant's Received Text right where you guys did; by keeping your pruned down reading here in our Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles!"   And as they all rubbed their hands in glee, there came from them, like "the crackling" sound "of thorns under a pot," "the laughter of" "fools" (Eccl. 7:5,6).

Matt. 22:37a "Jesus said" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Remarks.

The issue of textual "trademarks" is more commonly discussed in this textual commentary in Appendix 1.   But since in this instance the issue touches on wider textual issues, the matter will be dealt with at "Principal Textual Discussion," *infra*.

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter: Greek.   Reading 1a is the majority Byzantine text reading. Green's Textual Apparatus (1986) says 95-100% of all manuscripts support it.   This slightly overstates the actual position.   Von Soden says the two components (words) of this reading both have the support of his K group of about 1,000 manuscripts, or more precisely, *c.* 860 K group *Gospel* manuscripts, of which more than *c.* 90% are Byzantine text.   Allowing for a 10% error bar (which Pierpont failed to factor in to his calculations in Green's Textual Apparatus), means that *Reading 1a* has the support of more than 90% but less than 100% of all Byzantine manuscripts.   However, von Soden's most useful and valuable system of comprehensive Codex and Minuscule manuscript collations is not sufficiently accurate for us to known precisely where in this range it falls.

The Second Matter: Latin.   In comparative analysis of the translation of the Greek to Latin in St. Matthew's Gospel, the Greek indicative active imperfect, "*ephe*" meaning "he said" (found in *Reading 1a*, *infra*), commonly becomes the Latin indicative active present, "*ait*" meaning "he says" but rendered in English as "he said," in e.g., the Vulgate at Matt. 4:7; 8:8; 13:28, *et al*.   However, it may sometimes also become the Latin indicative active present, "*dicit*" meaning "he says" but rendered "he said" in English as in Matt. 27:11; or by the indicative active perfect, "*dixit*" meaning "he said," in e.g., the Vulgate at Matt. 17:26.

By contrast, the Greek indicative active aorist "*eipen*" meaning, "he said" (found in *Reading 1b*, *infra*), becomes the Latin, indicative active perfect, "*dixit*" meaning, "he said," in e.g., the Vulgate at Matt. 8:13; 14:16; 19:18,23 *et al*.

The dichotomy made by both Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) which considers that one can subdivide the Latin readings here at Matt. 22:37a into those which follow Greek *Reading 1a*, "*ephe*," with Latin, "*ait*" (e.g., Vulgate), or "*dicit* (old Latin d);" as opposed to that Latin reading which follows Greek *Reading 1b* with Latin, "*dixit*" (old Latin q); is thus within generally normative bounds.   It contrasts with Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) which largely combines *Readings 1a & 1b* under a common heading, and which allows for a more general interpretation of old Latin q supporting one or both of these readings.

On the one hand, I agree with Tischendorf that this looks like the normative dichotomy.   But on the other hand, at Matt. 17:26 only old Latin e, d, & f, maintain this normativity and render Greek "*ephe*" with Latin, "*ait*."   By contrast, at Matt. 17:26 the Vulgate and most old Latin Versions render "*ephe*" with "*dixit*," and old Latin q and g1 render "*ephe*" with "*dicit*."   This departure from the normativity at Matt. 17:26 acts to

"put the cat among the canaries" with regard to the issue of whether or not here at Matt. 22:37a we can join Tischendorf in confidently saying that, in harmony with the general normativity of St. Matthew's Gospel, old Latin q's "*dixit*" is really translating the Greek "*eipen*" of *Reading 1b*; or whether in fact, like the Vulgate at Matt. 17:26, old Latin q's "*dixit*" might in fact be rendering the "*ephe*" of *Reading 1a*.

A complicating factor is that Tischendorf shows Origen as following *Reading 2*, which omits word 1, Greek, "*Iesous* ('Jesus,' word 1)," of *Reading 1a*, and which so simply reads, "*ephe* ('he said,' word 2a)." This is a reconstruction of the Greek. But upon consultation of the Latin translation, we find that Origen reads Latin, "*dixit* (he said)[140]." Tischendorf does not deal with this contradiction of saying *at the same verse* he considers Latin "*dixit*" in old Latin q is rendering Greek "*eipen*;" but Latin "*dixit*" in Origen is rendering Greek "*ephe*." *Caveat lector!*[141]

On the one hand, I think one must be careful and cautious on these matters because I do not think Greek to Latin translation was *necessarily always so precise or so consistent* as to be able to definitely deduce from the Latin declension, just exactly what the Greek declension was. But on the other hand, I think we must guard against "making a mountain out of a mole-hill," with exceptions like Matt. 17:26 so colouring our perceptions, that we lose sight of the big picture of what the normative Greek to Latin translation was. Under normal circumstances this issue does not much matter and I would be unlikely to raise it. I would simply tend to follow the normative rendering and so like Tischendorf, consider that Greek "*eipen*" is rendered by Latin "*dixit*." But since here at Matt. 22:37a the issue does matter, and indeed lies at the very heart of distinguishing between *Readings 1a & 1b*, and also which one of these is being pruned down in Origen's *Reading 2*, I think the matter must be placed under a higher level of scrutiny than it normally would be.

Weighing up these competing considerations, I shall take the position that *it is not possible to know beyond a reasonable shadow of a doubt what the meaning of "dixit" is in old Latin q here at Matt. 22:37a.* However, on the balance of probabilities, the principles of normative Greek to Latin translation in St. Matthew's Gospel require the conclusion that *the probable meaning* of the Latin, "*dixit*" here at Matt. 22:37a is that of the Greek *Reading 1b's* "*eipen*." My position on old Latin q here at Matt. 22:37a is thus quite close to that of Tischendorf, though more qualified than his position is; and my position is also more precise and more qualified than Nestle-Aland's position is.

Applying this same logic to *Reading 2a*, I shall again take the position that *it is not possible to know beyond a reasonable shadow of a doubt what the meaning of "dixit" is in Origen here at Matt. 22:37a.* However, on the balance of probabilities, the principles of normative Greek to Latin translation in St. Matthew's Gospel require the

---

[140]   Origen in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1862 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 13 (Parts 1 & 2), p. 1599 (Latin translation of Greek).

[141]   A Latin saying meaning, "Let the reader beware!"

conclusion that *the probable meaning* of the Latin, "*dixit*" here at Matt. 22:37a is that of the Greek *Reading 2a's "eipen."* My position on Origen here is thus quite different to Tischendorf's and more precise than Nestle-Aland's. However, it is consistent with, and consistently qualified in the same way as is, my position on old Latin q.

Alas Greek to Latin translation, or Latin to Greek translation, like Greek or Latin translation to English, is not always a precise art. *Nil desperandum!*[142] *Contendam!*[143]

Principal Textual Discussion.

Reading 1 has the same basic meaning in its two forms, i.e., *Reading 1a* and *Reading 1b*.

At Matt. 22:37a, *Reading 1a*, Greek, "*Iesous* ('Jesus,' word 1) *ephe* ('he said,' word 2a, indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *phemi*)," i.e., "Jesus said," is the majority Byzantine text reading. It is supported by e.g., Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); E 07 (8th century), G 011 (9th century), Gamma 036 (10th century); and Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and (thrice abbreviating "*IHCOYC*" / "Jesus" as "*IC*" with a line on top,) Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings). It is also supported as Latin, "*Ait* ('he says' = 'he said,' word 2a, indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *aio*) ... *Iesus* ('Jesus,' word 1)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D., with word 1 spelling variant, "*ih*" i.e., "*Ihesus*") and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported as Latin, "*dicit* ('he says' = 'he said,' word 2a, indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *dico*) ... *Iesus* ('Jesus,' word 1)," in old Latin Version d (5th century).

Reading 1b, found in Scrivener's Text, Greek, "*Iesous* ('Jesus,' word 1) *eipen* ('he said,' word 2b, indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *eipon*)," i.e., "Jesus said," is a minority Byzantine reading found in e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53, abbreviating "*IHCOYC*" / "Jesus" as "*IC*" with a line on top), Minuscule 2 (12th century). This is also the probable meaning of Latin, "*dixit* ('he said,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *dico*)," in the "*Iesus* ('Jesus,' word 1) … *dixit* ('he said,' word 2b)," of old Latin Version q (6th / 7th century). It is also found in the Greek New Testament editions of e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633).

Reading 2a, is a variant which omits word 1, Greek, "*Iesous* ('Jesus,' word 1)," of

---

[142] Latin, "No despairing!" i.e., "Never despair!"

[143] Latin, "I shall strive."

Reading 1b, and which so probably reads simply Greek, "*eipen* ('he said,' word 2b)." This is a reconstruction of the Greek from the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation, which reads Latin, "*dixit* ('he said,' word 2b)," *supra*.

With regard to the issue of *Reading 1* which includes word 1, "Jesus (Greek, *Ie̲sous*; Latin, *Iesus*)," and *Reading 2* which lacks word 1, there is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must thus stand. The origins of the *Reading 2a* variant's omission are conjectural.

Was the *Reading 2a* variant an accidental omission? In *Codex Freerianus* (W 032) the "*IHCOYC*" / "Jesus" is written as "*IC*" with a bar on top. Was a similar two letter abbreviation lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was the *Reading 2a* variant a deliberate omission? Did a scribe omit the "Jesus (Greek, *Ie̲sous*; Latin, *Iesus*)," in order to make "a more succinct text," which by assimilation harmonized with Luke 10:26? Was this an earlier Greek scribe, if so, probably Origen; or was this a later Latin scribe translating Origen's work?

With regard to the issue of *Readings 1a & 1b*.

Reading 1a, Greek, "('Jesus,' word 1) *ephe̲* ('he said,' word 2a)," i.e., "Jesus said," conforms to Matthean Greek. In general terms, we cannot doubt that St. Matthew uses the terminology of "*ephe̲* (he said)" (Matt. 8:4; 13:28; 21:27; 25:21,23; 26:61; 27:23; & 27:65). In more specific terms of similarity to *Reading 1a* of Matt. 22:37a, we find the Matthean terminology of, "*ephe̲* (he said) *auto̲* (unto him) *o* (-) *Ie̲sous* (Jesus)," i.e., "Jesus said unto him" or "Jesus saith unto him" (Matt. 4:7; 19:21; 17:26; 26:34). And in identical terms to *Reading 1a* of Matt. 22:37a which more widely reads, "*o* (-) *de* ('and,' here regarded by the AV translators as redundant in English translation) *Ie̲sous* ('Jesus,' word 1) *ephe̲* ('he said,' word 2a) *auto̲* (unto him)," this same Matthean terminology is found at Matt. 27:11 as, "*o* (-) *de* (and) *Ie̲sous* ('Jesus,' word 1) *ephe̲* ('he said,' word 2a) *auto̲* (unto him)" i.e., "And Jesus said unto him" (AV). *Therefore any attempt to deny that the representative Byzantine reading of Matt. 22:37a is Matthean Greek, would simultaneously require a similar conclusion for Matt. 27:11, which is also the majority Byzantine text reading and also has no good textual argument against it!*

Reading 1b, found in Scrivener's Text, Greek, "*Ie̲sous* ('Jesus,' word 1) *eipen* ('he said,' word 2b, indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *eipon*)," i.e., "Jesus said," also conforms to Matthean Greek. In general terms, we cannot doubt that St. Matthew uses the terminology of "*Ie̲sous* ('Jesus,' word 1) *eipen* ('he said')," (e.g., Matt. 8:13; 11:4,25; 14:16; 15:16,28; 16:6,8,17,24; 17:7,11,17, *et al*). And in identical terms to *Reading 1b* of Matt. 22:37a which more widely reads, "*o* (-) *de* (and) *Ie̲sous* ('Jesus,' word 1) *eipen* ('he said,' word 2b) *auto̲* (unto him)," this same Matthean terminology is found at Matt. 26:50 as, "*o* (-) *de* (and) *Ie̲sous* (Jesus) *eipen* ('he said,' word 2b) *auto̲* (unto him)," i.e., "And Jesus said unto him" (AV).

Therefore, it appears that here at Matt. 22:37a, Erasmus (d. 1536) selected the

minority Byzantine reading of *Reading 1b* as "a textual trademark." I.e., together with a combination of other such "textual trademarks" *which make no difference to the meaning of the text*, one can determine "whose text" it is in the sense of who was the textual compiler. This particular "textual trademark" was thereafter followed by such 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantines as Stephanus, Beza, and Elzevir, in part as a way of honouring Erasmus, and in part as an established way of using a different combination of "textual trademarks" in order to distinguish their own texts. As I state in Appendix 1 of this and other volumes of these textual commentaries, I too honour the name of Eramsus; but in doing so, I do not support this concept of "textual trademarks." My position is unequivocal. *Let the representative Byzantine Text stand! Reading 1a is the true reading of the Textus Receptus! Let Scrivener's Text be amended accordingly!*

The TR's *Reading 1a* has strong support in the Greek as the representative reading, dating either from, or near ancient times, depending on the unknown exact date of Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It also has strong support in the Latin as the majority Latin reading favoured by both St. Jerome's Vulgate and most old Latin versions, and thus dates from ancient times in the Latin. By contrast, *Reading 1b* has fairly weak support in both the Greek and Latin, and no good textual argument to commend it (unless, unlike myself, one believes in the propriety of such "textual trademarks"). Likewise, the variant of *Reading 2a* has weak support as a reconstruction of the Greek from a Latin translation of Origen, and once again no good textual argument to recommend it. Weighing up these factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading of *Reading 1a* at Matt. 22:37a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 22:37a, *Reading 1a*, Greek, "*Iesous* ('Jesus,' word 1) *ephe* ('he said,' word 2a)" i.e., "Jesus said," is found in (the independent) Codex 0107 (7th century, Matt. 22-23 & Mark 4-5), (the mixed text type) Codex 0161 (8th century, Matt. 22:7-46), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex 0138 (13th century, Matt. 21:24-24:15). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; and the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century). A similar reading, "*ephe* ('he said,' word 2a) … *Iesous* ('Jesus,' word 1)," is also found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).

Reading 1b, Greek, "*Iesous* ('Jesus,' word 1) *eipen* ('he said,' word 2b)," i.e., "Jesus said," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain

Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in the Armenian Version (5th century); and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The variant, *Reading 2* is found as *Reading 2b*, which omits word 1, Greek, "*Iesous* ('Jesus,' word 1)," of *Reading 1a*, and which so simply reads, "*ephe* ('he said,' word 2a)," i.e., "he said." Its possible reasons of omission follows the same lines as *Reading 2a*, *supra*. *Reading 2b* is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); as well as Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 892 (9th century, mixed text type). *Reading 2* is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.

Reading 1a in the NT texts. The correct reading of the true *Textus Receptus* of the King James Version is found at Matt. 22:37a in the majority texts of Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005).

Reading 1b in the NT texts. *Reading 1b* was followed by neo-Byzantines of the 16th and 17th centuries, *supra*. E.g., in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624), Elzevir lists six of his possible eight Gospel manuscripts in favour of *Reading 1a* (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum; P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8); although he still follows *Reading 1b* in his Greek New Testament text of 1633.

Thus *Reading 1b* was greatly favoured by my neo-Byzantine predecessors of the 16th and 17th centuries, who in general terms I acknowledge as my betters and superiors in neo-Byzantine textual analysis. But I disagree with them on the issue of "textual trademarks," in which minority readings with synonymous readings to that of the TR are substituted in various combinations so as to identify this or that text, without in any way affecting what the translation would be in English or any other language.

To the extent that the AV translators used texts that contained *Reading 1b* such as Beza's 1598 edition, but also had access to Greek manuscripts that used *Reading 1a*, it is not possible to conclusively show one way or the other which of these two readings they preferred, and why. Nevertheless, on the neo-Byzantine principles that I have adopted in this textual commentary, here at Matt. 22:37a the correct reading of the true *Textus Receptus* of the King James Version is that of *Reading 1a*.

Reading 2b in the NT texts. The erroneous variant, *Reading 2b*, was adopted here at Matt. 22:37a by the NU Text *et al*.

Reading 1 in neo-Alexandrian Versions. Though *Reading 2b* has the support of the two leading Alexandrian texts, some neo-Alexandrian translators were reluctant to

follow it. From the neo-Alexandrian paradigm, it has very little "external support." By contrast, *Reading 1* has "wide external support" with a form of it in the Western Text's D 05; and it is also found in the Byzantine text, Latin text, "Caesarean" Text (*Reading 1a*, Family 1; and *Reading 1b*, Family 13 and Armenian Version), together with e.g., a couple of Syriac Versions. The neo-Alexandrian desire to use the non-Alexandrian Text pincer arm here at Matt. 22:37a was thus seemingly quite strong among some neo-Alexandrian translators, who would also have been attracted to the idea of a Gospel assimilation between Matt. 22:37a and Luke 10:26 explaining the origins of the *Reading 2b* variant. (See commentary at Matt. 21:24a, *supra*.)

Thus partly for the wrong reasons and partly for the right reasons, *Reading 1* is found in the NIV, TEV, and Roman Catholic JB & NJB. E.g., it is rendered at Matt. 22:37a in the New International Version as "Jesus replied" (NIV). What of the obvious objection, "The NIV, TEV, JB, and NJB are such loose and liberal translations, how do you know *for sure* that they were here following *Reading 1*, rather than simply adding in Christ's name as one of their dynamic equivalents?" My reply is, "We cannot know *for sure*, and nor can their readers."

Reading 2b in neo-Alexandrian Versions. This omission is found at Matt. 22:37a in the ASV as, "he said unto him." This incorrect reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, and NRSV.

It might be remarked that the AV translators here considered that the "*de* ('and')" at the start of Matt. 22:37a was redundant in English translation, a view also found in Tyndale (1526 & 1534), Cranmer (1534), and the Geneva Bible (1557 & 1560). By contrast, we find that the ASV translators include the "And" here at the start of Matt. 22:37a. While I consider the King James Version of 1611 is the best available English translation, and the one we should be generally using, I do not regard it as word perfect. It must be remembered that Divine Inspiration (II Tim. 3:16) stops at the point of the Biblical autographs; and for the New Testament, Divine Preservation (I Peter 1:25) stops at the point of the apographs found in the Greek and Latin manuscripts and church writers (and among the church writers the ancient are the most important and the early mediaeval are the second most important).

On the one hand, there is a good argument in favour of the translation of the "*de* (and)" here at the very start of Matt. 22:37a as in the ASV, on the basis of literal accuracy. If so, it might be said to resemble the multiple usage of "And" in e.g., Genesis 1. But on the other hand, it must be remembered that the AV is not just a literal translation, but also a literary masterpiece. In this context, there is a stylistic argument relevant not present in Genesis 1 where this multiple usage of "And" simply divides different sentences in a sequential manner. That stylistic factor is the usage of "And" in Matt. 23:29 in a disjunctive manner as a demarcation point between the summary of the first four of the Ten Commandment (Exodus 20:1-11) in verse 37, and the summary of the last six of the Ten Commandments (Exodus 20:12-17) in verse 39[144].

---

[144] That the Decalogue may be so summarized is evident from comparative

It is notable that through verses 37 and 38 "and" is used conjunctively.   I.e., in summary of the first four precepts of the Decalogue, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, <u>and</u> with all thy soul, <u>and</u> with all thy mind.   This is the first <u>and</u> great commandment."   Hence if one has started the lead in sentence before this with, "<u>And</u> Jesus said unto him," when one then hears in verse 39, "<u>And</u> the second," one is likely at this point to think this is a further conjunctive usage of "And," until one hears more of the sentence, "<u>And</u> the second is like it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."   The result?   Unnecessary confusion in people's minds in the public reading of God's Word.

If however, one has not started verse 37 with such a conjunctive usage of "<u>And</u> Jesus said unto him;" but rather, rendered it as, "Jesus said unto him;" then the combination of the slight pause after the full stop of "first and great commandment" (verse 38), followed by "<u>And </u>the second is like it," much more quickly registers in the listeners ear as a disjunctive usage of "And" here, which distinguishes these two commandments of Deut. 6:5 and Lev. 19:18[145].   The result?   Clarity in people's minds in the public reading of God's Word.

Here at Matt. 22:37a, the American Standard Version though technically more literal with its rendering of "And," at the point of English translation is like a "trumpet" that gives "an uncertain sound."   Let us thank God for our King James Versions, which here at Matt. 22:37a are as a "trumpet" which gives a most certain "sound" (I Cor. 14:8).   Let us thank God for the CLARITY of our King James Versions, which greatly surpasses such modern versions, and which indeed is the clearest of all English translations!

Matt. 22:38 "the first and great commandment" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's *Reading 1a*, Greek, "*pr<u>o</u>t<u>e</u>* ('the first,' word 1, <u>feminine singular nominative</u> adjective, from *pr<u>o</u>tos*) *kai* ('and,' word 2) *megal<u>e</u>* ('great,' word 3, <u>feminine singular nominative</u> adjective, from *megas*) *entol<u>e</u>* (commandment)," i.e., "the first and great commandment" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53; *Reading 1b*, adding word A, "*<u>e</u>* / "the," <u>feminine singular nominative</u>, definite article from *<u>e</u>* before both words 1 & 3) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century; *Reading 1c*, adding word A, "*<u>e</u>* / "the," before

---

analysis of Luke 10:25-17 and Luke 18:18-20.   This type of nexus is also found in the Catechism of the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662).

[145]   In a different context, Deut. 6:5 might be used to summarize all of the Ten Commandments, as indeed occurs in Judaism where Deut. 6:9 is sometimes used as a justification to put up a small copy of the Decalogue on the front-door frame of a Jew's residence.   So too, in a different context, Lev. 19:18 might be used to summarize all of the Ten Commandments, e.g., if we love our neighbour we will want him to worship God (first commandment), not commit idolatry (second commandment), etc., as indeed occurs in the usage of Lev. 19:18 at Rom. 13:9

word 1); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings). It is also supported as Latin, "*primum* ('the first,' word 1) *et* ('and,' word 2) *magnum* ('great,' word 3) *mandatum* (commandment)," in old Latin Version d (5th century); and as Latin, "*primum* ('the first,' word 1) *et* ('and,' word 2) *maximum* ('great,' word 3) *mandatum* (commandment)," in old Latin Versions f (6th century) and q (6th / 7th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Basil the Great (d. 379; *Reading 1c*, adding word A, "*e* / "the," before word 1); and the early mediaeval church writer, Pseudo-Chrysostom in a Latin work (6th century).

However, a variant, *Reading 2a*, Greek, "*e* ('the,' added word A) *megale* ('great,' word 3) *kai* ('and,' word 2) *prote* ('the first,' word 1) *entole* (commandment)," i.e., "the great and first commandment," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 924 (12th century). It is also found as Latin, "*maximum* ('great,' word 3) *et* ('and,' word 2) *primum* ('the first,' word 1) *mandatum* (commandment)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further found as Latin, "*magnum* ('great,' word 3) *et* ('and,' word 2) *primum* ('the first,' word 1) *mandatum* (commandment)," in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century) and h (5th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; and the ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367) and Augustine (d. 430).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is thus correct. The origins of the variants are speculative.

In Greek, an adjective may function as a noun, and if so, it will generally, although not always, have a definite article[146]. Thus the addition of the matching (feminine singular nominative) definite article, "*e* ('the,' added word A)," whether to the TR's "*prote* ('the first,' word 1)" and "*megale* ('great,' word 3)" in W 032 (*Reading 1b*), or to the TR's "*prote* ('the first,' word 1)" in Sigma 042 (*Reading 1c*); and also to the variant's "*megale* ('great,' word 3)" (*Reading 2a*); looks like a typical scribal "stylistic improvement" to "tidy up the Greek."

Did *Variant 2* come about at the hand of Origen, or was it altered by the hand of the Latin scribe who translated Origen from the Greek to the Latin?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental alteration? We know from W 032 that a scribe could sometimes miss a short word and upon realizing his error, add it back in. E.g., after accidentally omitting "*umon* ('of you' = 'your,' AV)," at Luke 10:11 in W 032 (p. 245), he then added it back in by writing it above the line in between lines, above the

---

146 Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 294-5; Young's *Greek*, p. 82.

point where it had been omitted.   At other times, the scribe of W 032 uses a side-margin note with a marker showing where the omission should go e.g., "*tou* (of the) *kosmou* (world)," at Luke 12:30 (p. 259) (discussed at Matt. 22:35b, *supra*).

Did a scribe likewise first accidentally omit, "*pr<u>o</u>te* ('the first,' word 1) *kai* ('and,' word 2)" and write "*megal<u>e</u>* ('great,' word 3)," and then realizing his error, decide "there was no real difference in meaning" if he then "added back in" the missing words after "*megal<u>e</u>* ('great,' word 3)" as "*kai* ('and,' word 2) *pr<u>o</u>te* ('the first,' word 1)"?   If so, he was doubly negligent to have done so; and he should have either used a side-margin note showing where it should go, or written it above the missing point in between lines; both of which techniques are successfully used in W 032 for such matters.

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate alteration?   Because the lawyer first asked, "which is the great (*megal<u>e</u>*) commandment?" (Matt. 22:36); did a scribe think it a "stylistic improvement" to first have Jesus reply the words "This is the great (*megal<u>e</u>*, word 3)" before the later words "first (*pr<u>o</u>te*, word 1) commandment" (Matt. 22:38)?   Did he also think it a "further stylistic improvement" because then after "first commandment" (Matt. 22:38) comes "the second" (Matt. 22:39)?

Was this a deliberate or accidental alteration?   We cannot be sure.   But we can be sure that it was an alteration to the Received Text here preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR's *Reading 1a* has rock solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading dating from ancient times; and it also has the support of a few old Latin versions, also dating in the Latin from ancient times.   As *Reading 1c*, it further enjoys the support of the church father and doctor, St. Basil the Great, Bishop of Caesarea in Asia Minor (370-379), and orthodox defender of the Holy Trinity.   By contrast, the variant *Reading 2a* has weak support in the Greek, but strong support in the Latin.   Bearing in mind that *Reading 1a* has some notable Latin support that dates from ancient times, together with overwhelmingly strong support in the Greek, and the superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 22:38 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 22:38, *Reading 1a*, Greek, "*pr<u>o</u>te* ('the first,' word 1) *kai* ('and,' word 2) *megal<u>e</u>* ('great,' word 3) *entol<u>e</u>* (commandment)," i.e., "the first and great commandment," is found in Minuscules 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text).

Reading 1c, Greek, "*<u>e</u>* ('the,' added word A) *pr<u>o</u>te* ('the first,' word 1) *kai* ('and,' word 2) *megal<u>e</u>* ('great,' word 3) *entol<u>e</u>* (commandment)," i.e., "the first and great

commandment," is found in (the independent) Codex 0107 (7th century, Matt. 22-23 & Mark 4-5), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and Minuscule 565 (9th century, independent).

Reading 1 (whether drawn from *Reading 1a, 1b, or 1c*) is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version and Armenian Version (5th century).

Reading 2a, Greek, "*e* ('the,' added word A) *megale* ('great,' word 3) *kai* ('and,' word 2) *prote* ('the first,' word 1) *entole* (commandment)," i.e., "the great and first commandment," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century).   It is further found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century); and Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 700 (11th century, independent).   It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 1 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)*, Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere) and 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude); and the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent).

Reading 2b, Greek, "*megale* ('great,' word 3) *kai* ('and,' word 2) *prote* ('the first,' word 1) *entole* (commandment)," i.e., "the great and first commandment," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).

Reading 2c, Greek, "*e* ('the,' added word A) *megale* ('great,' word 3) *kai* ('and,' word 2) *e* ('the,' added word B) *prote* ('the first,' word 1) *entole* (commandment)," i.e., "the great and first commandment," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century).

Reading 2 (whether drawn from *Reading 2a, 2b, or 2c*) is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).   It is translated from the Arabic as Latin, "*maximum* ('great,' word 3) *et* ('and,' word 2) *primum* ('the first,' word 1) *mandatum* (commandment)," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

On the one hand, there was some minimal neo-Alexandrian support for the TR's reading here in the *New International Version*.   The neo-Alexandrians have both an Alexandrian Text based pincer arm, commonly used, and a non-Alexandrian text pincer arm, rarely used.   Exercising the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm, it is possible to argue from the neo-Alexandrian paradigm that there is "wide support" in the Syriac (Harclean), "Caesarean" text (Armenian Version), Byzantine text, Latin text, Codex Delta 037, Minuscule 565, and Pseudo-Chrysostom.   *Possibly* a textual argument may be added to this, such as the one found at, "Was *Variant 2* a deliberate alteration?," *supra*.   Hence for partly the right reasons and partly the wrong reasons, at Matt. 22:38 the NIV correctly follows the TR's *Reading 1* with, "This is the first and greatest commandment" (NIV).

But on the other hand, when this non-Alexandrian text pincer arm is used by those of the Neo-Alexandrian School, as it is here by the NIV, as per usual it is "a one-off" by one group of neo-Alexandrians, and the other neo-Alexandrians disagree with them (see my comments at Matt. 21:24a). Thus at Matt. 22:38, the incorrect *Reading 2a* was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence the American Standard Version reads, "This is the great and first commandment" (ASV); or Moffatt reads, "This is the greatest and chief command" (Moffatt Bible). So too, at Matt. 22:38 the erroneous *Reading 2a* is found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NIV, and TEV.

The presence of the erroneous *Reading 2a* at Matt. 22:38 is hailed by neo-Alexandrians as some kind of "new improvement" on the reading of the *Textus Receptus*; as though the Word of God had been "broken" (John 10:35) at 1 Peter 1:25, "the Word of the Lord endureth forever," and God had not faithfully preserved his Word over time, and through time. This *Reading 2a* is found in such neo-Alexandrian Versions as the Papists' Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles. Actually, it is an old point of defence by those of the Neo-Byzantine School, for a battle was historically fought here against the old Latin Papists who unnaturally elevated the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, over its rightful lord and master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. Having engaged in such unnatural acts, we find that *Reading 2a* appears in the old Latin Papists' Clementine and Douay-Rheims Versions, the latter of which reads, "This is the greatest and the first commandment" (Douay-Rheims). "The English of the Douay-Rheims doesn't flow well," I hear you say. Well, … let's just say that in addition to forgetting about the Greek, to some extent, the old Latin Papists also forgot about the English. What about the new neo-Alexandrian Papists? Well, … let's just say that the JB and NJB here have completely and exactly regurgitated the old reading of the Douay-Rheims.

> **Matt. 22:39** "*is* like unto it" (TR & AV) with reference to
> **Mark 12:31** "*is* like, *namely* this" (TR & AV).

Matt. 22:39: Component 1 {A}; & Component 2 {B}.

Preliminary Remarks & Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Those of us who in God's goodness have been privileged to study standard seminary Greek at a tertiary College (as I did), a seminary, or a university; or perhaps in God's goodness have picked it up by being self-taught in private study, as did the Reverend Mr. John Brown of Haddington in Scotland, a Presbyterian Minister and author of Brown's *Study Bible* of 1778, (also known as *The Self-Interpreting Bible*,) who formally studied some Latin, but more generally was self-taught in the Biblical languages of Hebrew, Latin, and Greek[147]; may not realize *just how good we had it!*

---

[147] Beeke, J., & Pederson, R., "The Life and Writings of John Brown of Haddington," pp. e to x, at pp. f, g, & n; in *The Systematic Theology of John Brown of Haddington*, 1782, Reprint 2002, Introduced by Joel Beeke & Randall Pederson, Reformation Heritage Books, 2919 Leonard St., N.E. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 49525,

We used type-set Greek New Testaments, with e.g., non-continuous script (i.e., words spaced out) and iota subscripts to show a dative.   Whether one looks at e.g., Scrivener's neo-Byzantine text (1894 & 1902) published by the Trinitarian Bible Society, or e.g., the United Bible Society's neo-Alexandrian 3rd edition text (1975), *everything in it is clear and easy to read.*   But those of who have since studied handwritten Greek manuscripts, as I have with only a limited number of manuscripts, e.g., W 032, and Lectionaries 2378 and 1968, realize that they contain a host of added difficulties, with e.g., continuous script, various abbreviations, varying standards of handwriting clarity, and no iota subscripts to show when there is a dative.   Here at Matt. 22:39 and Mark 12:31 we find that "as the big bird (jet plane)" of the NT text "comes in to land," "the rubber hits the road hard" on one such issue, "bouncing us up and down a little bit on the tarmac before finally stabilizing," to wit, the issue of the absence of the iota subscript indicating a dative.

The dative form of "*aute* (αυτη, 'unto it')" is distinguished in standard seminary Greek by placing a small iota (ι) under the eta (η).   While the (I and K group) von Soden based Hodges & Farstad (1985) text shows "*homoia* (like) *aute* (unto it)" as the majority reading and therefore the majority Byzantine text reading; the (K group) von Soden based Robinson & Pierpont (2005) text shows "the Byzantine Textform … significantly divided" (p. xviii) between "*homoia* (like) *aute* (unto it)" and "*homoia* (like) *aute* (this)."

Both Tischendorf and Swanson refer to a small number of Greek manuscripts where an iota subscript has been added at Matt. 22:39, thus making it clear that the relevant scribe followed either *Greek Readings 1a or 1b*, *infra*.   Of course things like breathings, accents, and iota subscripts are not generally found in the Greek manuscripts, even though these are commonly added in texts such as Scrivener's (1894 & 1902), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005); although they were not so added in the first edition of Robinson & Pierpont (1991).   Direct consultation of von Soden accordingly yields no dichotomy of the type found in Robinson & Pierpont (2005), and so Robinson & Pierpont evidently drew their conclusion as a deduction of what they regard as two equally likely possibilities.   So too, Nestle-Aland (1993) says "the witness of the Majority text" here "is divided in fairly equal strength between … readings."   These are a similar type of non-committal conclusions to that of Westcott & Hort (1881),

USA (www.heritagebooks.org , ISBN 1 892777 66 5).   My 19th century edition of Brown's *Study Bible* came from an Evangelical Anglican clergyman, the Reverend Mr. Reynolds, Rector of St. Bede's Drummoyne (Sydney).   My matrilineal grandparents were Sunday School teachers at his church in the early 1900s; and the Bible went from Mr. and Mrs. Reynolds to Miss Shermon (sister of Mrs. Reynolds); to by matrilineal Grandmother (Alma Davis); to her daughter, my aunt (Winifred Moffitt nee Davis); to her son, my cousin, David Moffitt; to his aunt, my mother (Betty McGrath nee Davis) in the 1990s; who gave it to me in 2000.   This AV Study Bible has some added notes by Dr. Henry Cooke of Ireland (d. 1868) and Dr. Josiah Porter (d. 1889).

discussed outside the closed class of sources, *infra*.

But with the dative reading also open to two possible interpretations, unravelling the matter possesses an even greater complexity. *Que sera sera*[148].

(Cf. my comments on standard seminary Greek at Matt. 23:37b, Appendix 3.)

The Second Matter. At "Principal Textual Discussion," *Preliminary Issue 2* discusses the Matthean and Marcan usage of Greek, "*homoia* (like)." Those familiar with the great Trinitarian debates will recognize this word from the *Basil verses Basil debate.* Semi-Arian heretics under Basil of Ancyra (Galatia, modern Ankara, Turkey) (d. 362), mischievously claimed the Son was only "of like substance" (*homoiousios* = *homoios* / like + *ousia* / substance) with the Father. By contrast, the orthodox like St. Basil the Great (d. 379), Bishop of Caesarea (Cappadocia, modern Turkey) from 370 to 379, rightly maintained that as touching upon his Divinity, the Son was the "same substance" (*homoousios* = *homos* / same + *ousia* / substance) with the Father (John 10:30; I John 5:7,8).

The Biblical orthodox teaching is that since the Second Person has *always* been the First Person's Son, he is "not made, nor created, but begotten" (*Athanasian Creed*); for "the only-begotten Son of God" is "begotten of his Father before all worlds" (*Nicene Creed*) i.e., begotten *from eternity*" (Micah 5:2; John 1:1,14, 3:16-18; 1 John 4:9)[149]. Responding to the heretical Arius's claims in *c.* 321 A.D. that "before he [Christ] was begotten or created," "he did not exist;" the general *Council of Nicea* (325) rightly maintained that the Son is "one substance" or "being" (*homoousion*) "with the Father," "and those that say 'there was [a time] when he was not,' and 'before he was begotten he was not,' or those that allege that the Son of God is 'of another substance'," or "'created'" the "church anathematizes.[150]"

The orthodox view, which was later stated at the *Council of Chalcedon* (451), is that the Son is "of one substance with the Father as regards his Godhead, and at the same time of one substance with us as regards his manhood; like us in all respects, apart from sin.[151]" Being "one substance" is sometimes called being "consubstantial," so that the

---

[148] "What will be, will be." From the Latin tongues of Spanish and / or French; as derived from the Latin language of Italian, *Che sara sara.*

[149] The Latin derived terminology of the Nicene & Athanasian Creeds found in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), "before all worlds," means "before all eternity" i.e., "eternally" or "from eternity." See Preface of Commentaries, Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), "Byzantine Text Bonus for Commentary: Two Sydney University Greek Lectionaries!," Section, * B), subsection 2), Case Study 4.

[150] Bettenson's *Documents*, pp. 25,39. Cf. Berkhof's *Systematic Theology*, pp. 93-4.

[151] Bettenson's *Documents*, p. 51.

Son is *consubstantial* (or "one substance") with the Father in Divinity; and *consubstantial* (or "one substance") with us in humanity, *except that he was without sin*[152].

The Third Matter.   Though this Volume 3 of the Textual Commentaries is on St. Matthew's Gospel chapter 21 to 25, I shall in this instance also deal with some textual analysis elements of Mark 12:31 since this is a related matter.   However I shall leave the greater detail on manuscripts with regard to Mark 12:31 to the relevant Volume on St. Mark Gospel; while referring the reader back to here for relevant textual analysis. In that Volume, for Mark 12:31 I shall make a three-fold distinction between the reading of the Greek in the majority Byzantine text (Component 1), the interpretation of this as (what in the Matt. 22:39 break-up is designated as) either *Greek Reading 1b* or *Greek Reading 1c* (Component 2), and then the internal choice of these two possibilities as (what in the Matt. 22:39 break-up is designated as) *Greek Reading 1c* (Component 3).

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 22:39, *Reading 1* is "*homoia* ('like,' feminine singular nominative adjective, from *'omois / homois*) *aut<u>e</u>.*"   This is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings).

Through reference to Greek manuscripts, which lack seminary Greek practices of showing the dative by iota subscripts etc., depending on how the "*aut<u>e</u>*" is read, the meaning of *Reading 1* varies.

Greek Reading 1a is, Greek, "*homoia* (like) *aut<u>e</u>* ('unto it,' feminine singular <u>dative</u>, <u>personal pronoun</u>, from *autos-<u>e</u>-o*)," i.e., "like unto it" in the wider words, (showing "is" in italics as added,) "and the second *is* like unto it" (AV & TR).   This is also supported by *Latin Reading 1a* which is found as Latin, "*simile* (like) *illi* ('unto it,' neuter singular <u>dative</u>, demonstrative pronoun, from *ille-a-ud*)," i.e., (showing "is" in italics as added,) "*is* like unto it," in old Latin Version e (4th / 5th century)[153].

---

[152]   With respect to Christ's Divinity, being the "same substance" or "one substance" *also* means being the "same being" or "one being" with the Father and Holy Spirit, since there is only one Supreme *Being* (singular); whereas with respect to Christ's humanity, being "one substance" or the "same substance" with mankind does not also mean this, since there are many human *beings* (plural), not just one human *being* (singular).

[153]   In Latin, the demonstrative pronoun *ille-a-ud* generally means, "this" / "these," or "that" / "those."   However, depending on context, it may occasionally equate the personal pronouns, "he," "she," "it," or "they" (Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, pp. 55-56).   This is surely the most likely meaning of *ille-a-ud* here at Matt. 22:39 for old Latin e.   Notably, at Mark 12:31, both the Vulgate and Clementine use these same Latin words together with "*est*," i.e., "*simile* (like) *est* ('it is' = 'is') *illi* (unto it)," and this is rendered in the Douay-Rheims (1582) as, "is like to it."   I think this the more probable rendering

Greek Reading 1b may be reconstructed from *Latin Reading 1d*. This is Greek, "*homoia* (like) *aute* ('unto this,' feminine singular <u>dative</u>, <u>demonstrative pronoun</u>, from *outos-e-o*)," i.e., "*is* like unto this," in the wider words implying "*estin* ('it is' = 'is')," here shown in italics as added, "And the second *is* like unto this."

Greek Readings 1a and / or 1b, i.e., "*homoia* ('like,' feminine singular nominative adjective, from *'omois / homois*) *aute*," with the iota subscript under the eta / *e* / η, indicating a dative as in standard seminary Greek, is found in Scrivener's Text (1894 & 1902). This reading is supported by Codex Omega 045 (9th century, Athos, Greece), and Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century). This reading is manifested in the Greek *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550).

Greek Reading 1c may be reconstructed from *Latin Readings 1d*. This is Greek "*homoia* (like) *aute* ('this,' feminine singular <u>nominative</u>, <u>demonstrative pronoun</u>, from *outos-e-o*)," i.e., "*is* like, *namely* this," in the wider words implying both "*aute* ('unto it,' feminine singular dative, personal pronoun, from *autos-e-o*)" and "*estin* ('it is' = 'is')," here shown in italics as added, "And the second like *unto it is* this," or "And the second *is* like, *namely* this."

Latin Reading 1d is the basis for the reconstructed Greek *Readings 1b & 1c*. *Latin Reading 1d* has two forms (Forms A & B). *Latin Reading 1d* (Form A) is found as Latin, "*simile* (like) *est* ('it is' = 'is') *huic* ('unto this')," i.e., "is like unto this" in the wider words, "And the second is like unto this," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.) and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). *Latin Reading 1d* (Form B) is found as Latin, "*simile* (like) *huic* (unto this)," i.e., (showing "is" in italics as added,) "*is* like unto this," in old Latin Version d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), and h (5th century).

In considering the contrast between the rendering of TR's Greek, "*homoia* ('like,' feminine singular nominative adjective, from *omois / homois*) *aute* ('unto it,' feminine singular dative, personal pronoun, from *autos-e-o*)," i.e., "like unto it" (*Greek Reading 1a*), in the wider words, (showing added word in italics,) "and the second *is* like unto it" (*Greek Reading 1a*) at Matt. 22:39; with the reading in Mark 12:31 in the TR's Greek,

---

of the Latin at Mark 12:31 than Wycliffe's (1380) translation, "And the second is like to this." However, at Mark 12:31, unlike the Vulgate and old Latin Versions b, d, l, which read, "*illi* (unto it)," old Latin Versions e, ff2, i, q, aur, ff1, & c read, "*huic* (unto this)." This raises the question, To what extent, if any, was Wycliffe guided by such old Latin Versions using "*huic* (unto this)" at Mark 12:31?

"*homoia* ('like,' feminine singular nominative adjective, from *omois / homois*) *aute* ('this,' feminine singular nominative, demonstrative pronoun, from *outos-e-o*)," i.e., "like … this," in the wider words, (showing added words in italics,) "And the second *is* like, *namely* this" (AV); we first need to cover three broad issues.   In contrast and comparison of Matthean Greek at Matt. 22:39 and Marcan Greek at Mark 12:31, we must first consider the usage of *autos-e-o* and *outos-e-o* more widely in St. Matthew's and St. Mark's Gospels; secondly, the usage of "*homoia*" in St. Matthew's and St. Mark's Gospels; and thirdly the usage of "*kai*" and "*de*" in St. Matthew's and St. Mark's Gospels.   Only when these three preliminaries have first been fully dealt with, can we properly consider what is the correct Greek text at Matt. 22:39 and Mark 12:31.

Preliminary Issue 1: the Matthean and Marcan usage of *autos-e-o* and *outos-e-o*.

Matt. 22:39 reads, "*deutera* (the second) *de* (And) *homoia* (like) *aute*;" and Mark 12:31 reads, "*kai* (and) *deutera* (the second) *homoia* (like) *aute*."

Looking more widely at Matthean Greek, when St. Matthew uses the dative form of the personal pronoun *autos-e-o*, it is immediately connected with a 3rd person singular (or other) verb.   E.g., "appeared (*ephane*, indicative passive aorist, <u>3rd person singular verb</u>, from *phaino*) unto him (*auto*, masculine singular <u>dative</u> personal pronoun from *autos-e-o*)" (Matt. 1:20); or "give (*doto*, imperative active aorist, <u>3rd person singular verb</u>, from *didomi*) her (*aute*, 'unto her' = 'her,' AV, feminine singular <u>dative</u>, personal pronoun, from *autos-e-o*) a writing of divorcement" (Matt. 5:31); or "who in it (*aute*, feminine singular <u>dative</u>, personal pronoun, from *autos-e-o*) is (*esti*, 'he is' = 'is,' AV, indicative active present, <u>3rd person singular verb</u>, from *eimi*) worthy" (Matt. 10:11); or "and there shall no sign be given (*dothesetai*, 'it shall be given' = 'be given,' AV, indicative passive future, <u>3rd person singular verb</u>, from *didomi*) it (*aute*, feminine singular <u>dative</u>, personal pronoun, from *autos-e-o*)" (Matt. 12:39).   (Such examples could be multiplied.)

By contrast, when St. Matthew uses the person pronoun *outos-e-o*, he generally connects it immediately with a noun, or an implied noun flowing from the demonstrative pronoun.   Concerning the former usage with a noun, we read e.g., "and the fame (*pheme*, feminine singular nominative <u>noun</u>, from *pheme*) hereof (*aute*, 'of this' = 'hereof,' AV feminine singular nominative, demonstrative pronoun, from '*outos-e-o* / *houtos-e-o*) went abroad" (Matt. 9:26); or "This (*outos*, masculine singular nominative, demonstrative pronoun, from *outos-e-o*) people (*o* / 'the,' redundant in translation, + *laos*, masculine singular nominative <u>noun</u>, from *laos*) draweth nigh unto me with their mouth" (Matt. 15:8); or "if ye shall say unto this (*touto*, neuter singular dative, demonstrative pronoun, from *outos-e-o*) mountain (*to* / 'the,' redundant in translation, + *orei*, neuter singular dative <u>noun</u>, from *opos*)" (Matt. 21:21).   Concerning both the former usage with a noun and the latter usage with an implied noun (man), we read e.g., "Whence hath this (*touto*, masculine singular dative, demonstrative pronoun, from *outos-e-o*) [man] this (*aute*, feminine singular <u>dative</u>, personal pronoun, from *autos-e-o*) wisdom (*e* / 'the,' redundant in translation, + feminine singular nominative <u>noun</u>, from *sophia*)?" (Matt. 13:54). (Such examples could be multiplied.)

The general trend of these two elements of Matthean Greek are subject to rare and unusual exceptions.   For example, in Matt. 21:42 we find that St. Matthew says, "*Kuriou* ('the Lord,' masculine singular genitive <u>noun</u>, from *Kurios*) *egeneto* ('he hath done,' indicative middle aorist, <u>3rd person singular verb</u>, from *ginomai*) *aut<u>e</u>* ('this,' feminine singular <u>nominative</u>, demonstrative pronoun, from *outos-<u>e</u>-o*)," i.e., noun + 3rd person singular verb + *outos-<u>e</u>-o*.   This nominative usage of *outos-<u>e</u>-o* is thus comparable to *Greek Reading 1c*.

Looking more widely at St. Mark's Gospel, we find a similar usage pattern to that of St. Matthew's Gospel.   E.g., in terms of the similar Marcan usage of a dative form of the personal pronoun *autos-<u>e</u>-o* which is immediately connected with a 3rd person singular (or other) verb, we read at Mark 5:33, "*<u>e</u>* (the) … *gun<u>e</u>* (woman) …*prosepesen* ('fell down,' indicative active aorist, <u>3rd person singular verb</u>, from *prospipt<u>o</u>*) *aut<u>o</u>* ('unto him' = 'before him,' AV, masculine singular <u>dative</u> personal pronoun from *autos-<u>e</u>-o*)."   (Cf. Mark 5:41,43; 6:23; 7:27,29; 11:13,14).

Marcan Greek is also similar to Matthean Greek with respect to the usage of the person pronoun *outos-<u>e</u>-o*, connected immediately with a noun.   E.g., at Mark 8:12, "Why doth this (*aut<u>e</u>*, feminine singular <u>nominative</u>, demonstrative pronoun, from *outos-<u>e</u>-o*) generation (*<u>e</u>* / 'the' + *genea*, 'generation,' feminine singular nominative <u>noun</u>, from *genea*) seek after a sign?"   (Cf. Mark 12:16,31,43; 13:30.)   Similar to the Lucan Greek of Luke 21:4 is the Marcan Greek of Mark 12:44, "*aut<u>e</u>* ('she,' feminine singular <u>nominative</u>, demonstrative pronoun, from *outos-<u>e</u>-o*) *de* (but) *ek* (out) *t<u>e</u>s* (the) *ustere<u>o</u>s* ('want,' feminine singular genitive <u>noun</u>, from *'uster<u>e</u>sis* / *huster<u>e</u>sis*)" i.e., "but she out of her want" (AV).

In this context, to see this general normativity amidst other differences of Matthean and Marcan style, let us compare Matt. 26:6-11 with Mark 14:3-7.

"*Eis ti* (Why) *<u>e</u>* (the) *ap<u>o</u>leia* ('waste,' feminine singular nominative <u>noun</u>, from *ap<u>o</u>leia*) *aut<u>e</u>* ('this,' feminine singular <u>nominative</u>, demonstrative pronoun, from *outos-<u>e</u>-o*) ; (?)" i.e., "To what purpose *is* this waste?" (Matt. 26:8, AV).	"*Eis ti* (Why) *<u>e</u>* (the) *ap<u>o</u>leia* ('waste,' feminine singular nominative <u>noun</u>, from *ap<u>o</u>leia*) *aut<u>e</u>* ('this,' feminine singular <u>nominative</u>, demonstrative pronoun, from *outos-<u>e</u>-o*) ; (?)" i.e., "Why … this waste?" (Mark 14:4, AV).
[No equivalent Matthean comment.] Matt. 26:9-10, AV.	"*Kai* (And) *enebrim<u>o</u>nto* ('they murmured against,' indicative middle imperfect, <u>3rd person plural verb</u>, from *embrimaomai*) *aut<u>e</u>* ('her,' feminine singular <u>dative</u>, personal pronoun, from *autos-<u>e</u>-o*)," i.e., "And they murmured against her" (Mark 14:5, AV).
[No equivalent Matthean record of this	"*o* (-) *de* (And) *I<u>e</u>sous* (Jesus) *eipen* ('he

element of Christ's words, though later elements are present.] Matt. 26:10, AV.	said' = 'said'), *Aphete* ("Let … alone,' imperative active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *aphiemi*) *auten* ('her,' feminine singular <u>dative</u>, personal pronoun, from *autos-e-o*)," i.e., "And Jesus said, Let her alone" (Mark 14:6, AV).
"*kai* (-) *o* (that) *epoiesen* ('hath done,' indicative active aorist, <u>3rd person singular verb</u>, from *poieo*) *aute* ('this [woman],' feminine singular <u>nominative</u>, demonstrative pronoun, from *outos-e-o*)," i.e., "that this woman hath done" (Matt. 26:13, AV).	"*kai* (also) *o* (that) *epoiesen* ('hath done,' indicative active aorist, <u>3rd person singular verb</u>, from *poieo*) *aute* ('this,' feminine singular <u>nominative</u>, demonstrative pronoun, from *outos-e-o*)," i.e., "*this* also that she hath done" (Mark 14:9, AV).

What in Matthean Greek is the rare and unusual exception of Matt. 21:42 and comparable to *Greek Reading 1c*, *supra*, is also found in this same form at Mark 12:11 i.e., noun + (3rd person singular) verb + *outos-e-o*.

Amidst the differences of the Matthean Greek at Matt. 9:18 and Marcan Greek at Mark 5:23; we find the construction at Matt. 9:18 of noun + (2nd person singular) verb + singular accusative *autos-e-o*; and at Mark 5:23 of noun + (2nd person singular) verb + singular dative *autos-e-o*.

At Matt. 9:18 we read, "*epithes* ('lay thou' = 'lay,' subjunctive active aorist, <u>2nd person singular verb</u>, from *epitithemi*) *ten* (the) *cheira* ('hand,' feminine singular accusative <u>noun</u>, from *cheir*) *sou* (of thee) *ep'* (upon) *auten* ('her,' feminine singular accusative, personal pronoun, from *autos-e-o*)," i.e., "lay thy hand upon her."	At Mark 5:23 we read, "*epithes* ('lay thou' = 'lay,' subjunctive active aorist, <u>2nd person singular verb</u>, from *epitithemi*) *aute* ('on her,' feminine singular <u>dative</u>, personal pronoun, from *autos-e-o*) *tas* (the) *cheiras* ('hands [of thee],' feminine plural accusative <u>noun</u>, from *cheir*)," i.e., "lay [thy] hands on her."

For our purposes here at Matt. 22:39 and Mark 12:31, the ramifications of this are twofold. Firstly, on this *Preliminary Issue 1*, i.e., the Matthean and Marcan usage of *autos-e-o* and *outos-e-o*; it is clear that the similarity of Matthean Greek and Marcan Greek is overwhelmingly strong notwithstanding other stylistic differences between these two Gospel writers. Secondly, in addition to a normative implied verb (*estin*, 'it is' = 'is'); under the established exceptions of Matt. 21:42; Mark 12:11 i.e., noun + (3rd person singular) verb + *outos-e-o*, for both Matthean and Marcan Greek it is possible to render Matt. 22:39 and / or Mark 12:31 with a demonstrative pronoun acting in the place of a noun i.e., "*homoia* (like) *aute* (this [one])," i.e., "*homoia* (like) *aute* ('unto this,'

feminine singular <u>dative</u>, <u>demonstrative pronoun</u>, from *outos-e-o*)," i.e., "And the second *is* like unto this" (*Greek Reading 1b*); or "And the second *is* like (*homoia* feminine singular nominative adjective, from *omois*), *namely* this (*aute*, feminine singular <u>nominative</u>, <u>demonstrative pronoun</u>, from *outos-e-o*)" or "And the second like *unto it is* this" (*Greek Reading 1c*).   However, one would need *a good textual reason* for doing so. That is because, *looking purely at this first preliminary issue*, it is clear that *prima facie* the more expected and more probable reading at Matt. 22:39 and / or Mark 12:31 is, "*homoia* (like) *aute* ('unto it,' feminine singular dative, personal pronoun, from *autos-e-o*)," i.e., "And the second *is* like unto it."

The reason for this is that whichever of the two ways one renders the "*aute*" at Matt. 22:39 and Mark 12:31, it is necessary to add an implied "*estin* (or *esti*, 'he is' = 'is,' indicative active present, <u>3rd person singular verb</u>, from *eimi*)."   I.e., if as a personal pronoun, one would render this as "*homoia* (like) *aute* ('unto it,' feminine singular dative, personal pronoun, from *autos-e-o*)," i.e., "like unto it" in the wider words implying "*estin* ('it is' = 'is')," here shown in italics as added, "And the second *is* like unto it" (*Greek Reading 1a*).   Or if as a demonstrative pronoun, one would render this as either, "*homoia* (like) *aute* ('unto this, feminine singular dative, demonstrative pronoun, from *outos-e-o*)," in the wider words implying "*estin* ('it is' = 'is')," here shown in italics as added, "And the second *is* like unto this" (Matt. 22:39, *Greek Reading 1b*); or as "*homoia* (like) *aute* ('this,' feminine singular nominative, demonstrative pronoun, from *outos-e-o*)," in the wider words implying both "*aute* ('unto it,' feminine singular dative, personal pronoun, from *autos-e-o*)" and "*estin* ('it is' = 'is')," here shown in italics as added, "And the second like *unto it is* this," or "And the second *is* like, *namely* this" (Matt. 22:39, *Greek Reading 1c*).

Thus on the one hand, because however one renders this *Greek Reading 1* it is clear that one must add an implied "*estin* ('he is' = 'is')," i.e., a 3rd person singular verb, it follows from this that under the general, though not absolute, rule of both Matthean and Marcan Greek, one would expect the *aute* to be a personal pronoun, i.e., "like unto it" (*Greek Reading 1a*).   But on the other hand, since under an exception to this general rule a possibility remains that Matt. 22:39 and / or Mark 12:31 might instead be better rendered as a demonstrative pronoun, i.e., *Greek Reading 1b and / or Greek Reading 1c*, let us further consider two more preliminary issues.

Preliminary Issue 2: the Matthean and Marcan usage of *homoia*.

Matt. 22:39 reads, "*deutera* (the second) *de* (And) *homoia* ('like,' feminine singular nominative adjective, from '*omoios / homoios*) *aute*;" and Mark 12:31 reads, "*kai* (and) *deutera* (the second) *homoia* (like) *aute*."

In St. Matthew's Gospel, '*omoios / homoios* is found as "*homoia* (like)" with "*estin* (or *esti*, 'it is' = 'is,' indicative active present, <u>3rd person singular verb</u>, from *eimi*)," and a noun, i.e., "*estin* (it is)" + "*homoia* (like)" + a noun, at Matt. 11:16 ("It is like unto children); 13:31 ("is like to a grain of mustard seed"), 33 ("is like unto leaven"), 44 ("is like unto treasure"), 45 ("is like unto a merchant man"), 47 ("is like unto a net").

Likewise, it is found as "*omoios* ('like unto,' masculine singular nominative adjective, from '*omoios* / *homoios*)," with "*estin* ('he is' = 'is')," and a noun, i.e., "*estin* (it is)" + "*homoia* (like)" + a noun, in Matt. 13:52 ("is like unto a man that is an householder").

Pronouns are used to stand in the place of nouns in a sentence. Therefore, the fact that in Matthean Greek, *homoios*, always occurs with the 3rd person singular verb, "*estin*," and a noun; coupled with the fact that "*estin*" must be implied in any rendering of Matt. 22:39, *supra*, means that its usage with "*aute*" as a pronoun, is very clearly Matthean Greek. Hence we can confidently conclude that the correct rendering of Matt. 22:39 is most likely, "*homoia* ('like,' feminine singular nominative adjective, from *homois*) *aute* ('unto it,' feminine singular <u>dative</u>, personal pronoun, from *autos-e-o*)," i.e., "like unto it," since this is firmly and decisively inside the normative syntax of Matthean Greek (*Greek Reading 1a*).

By contrast, the fact that in Marcan Greek, *homoios*, is only used at Mark 12:31 means that no such clear normativity exists in St. Mark's Gospel.

Thus on the one hand, one would need *an unusually compelling good textual reason* to overturn this normative syntax of Matthean Greek and render the "*aute*" at Matt. 22:39 as a demonstrative pronoun, from *outos-e-o* (*Greek Reading 1b and / or Greek Reading 1c*), rather than as a personal pronoun, from *autos-e-o* (*Greek Reading 1a*). But on the other hand, one would simply need *a usually good textual reason* to break with the normativity of Marcan Greek and render the "*aute*" at Matt. 12:31 as a demonstrative pronoun, from *outos-e-o* (*Greek Reading 1b and / or Greek Reading 1c*), rather than as a personal pronoun, from *autos-e-o* (*Greek Reading 1a*). In order to scrutinize any such possibility, let us further consider one more preliminary issue.

Preliminary Issue 3: the Matthean and Marcan usage of *kai* and *de*.

Matt. 22:39 reads, "*deutera* (the second) *de* ('And,' conjunction) *homoia* (like) *aute*;" and Mark 12:31 reads, "*kai* ('and,' conjunction) *deutera* (the second) *homoia* (like) *aute*."

In Matthean Greek, "*de* (but / and)" indicates a stronger stylistic break than "*kai* (and)," unless another contextual factor strengthens the "*kai* (and)" (see commentary at (cf. commentary at Matt. 21:7c; 22:7; 23:23b). The usage of the stronger conjunction, "*de* (and)" at Matt. 22:39 thus acts to set the words, "And the second is like unto it," more apart from the preceding words, "This is the first and great commandment" (Matt. 22:38). It is inconceivable that such a strong conjunction would be used here if it was then intended for the "*aute*" to be used as a demonstrative pronoun, from *outos-e-o*, since the stronger conjunction of "*de* (but / and)" is the very opposite of what would be needed to create an appropriate syntax here that would stress the similarity of these two with such a demonstrative pronoun i.e., rendering it as "*homoia* (like) *aute* ('unto this,' feminine singular <u>dative</u>, <u>demonstrative pronoun</u>, from *outos-e-o*)" (*Greek Reading 1b*), or "*homoia* (like) *aute* ('this,' feminine singular <u>nominative</u>, <u>demonstrative pronoun</u>, from *outos-e-o*)" (*Greek Reading 1c*). Therefore we can confidently conclude that the

correct rendering of Matt. 22:39 is, "*homoia* (like) *aut̲e̲* ('unto it,' feminine singular dative, personal pronoun, from *autos-e-o*)" (*Greek Reading 1a*), i.e., "like unto it" in the wider words, (showing "is" in italics as added,) "and the second *is* like unto it" (AV).

Marcan Greek shows strikingly similar properties to Matthean Greek in its usage of "*de*" and "*kai*." Like St. Matthew, St. Mark clearly uses the "*de*" for a stronger stylistic break (Mark 1:8,14,30,32; 2:6,10,19,20; 3:4; 4:11,15,29,34 twice; 5:11,33,34,36,40; 6:15 twice; 16:24,37,38,49; 7:6 twice,7,11,20,26,28,36; 8:5,9,28,29,32; 9:12,19,21,23,25,27,32,34,39,50; 10:3,4,6,13,14,18,20,22,24 twice, 26,31,32,36,37,38,39 twice, 40,43,48,50,51,52; 11:6,8,17,29; 12;7,15,16,17,26,44; 13:5,7,9,13,14,17,18,23,28,31,32; 14:1,4,6,7,11,20,21,29,31 twice, 38,44,46,47,52,55,61,62,63,64,68,70,71; 15:2,4,6,7,9,11,12,13,14 twice, 15,16,23,25,36,37,39,40,44,47; 16:6,9,12,16,17,20). This factor thus helps to clarify some less immediate clearer passages (such as the "*de*" at Mark 12:5; 13:15,37).

Thus e.g., at Mark 6:50, the Greek "*de*" which may be either reconstructed from the Greek, or introduced by a Latin scribe, in old Latin c's "*autem* (but)," is unnecessary because of the broader context and added stylistic breaker of "*euthe̲o̲s*" i.e., "*Kai* (And) *euthe̲o̲s* (immediately)" (TR & AV) Likewise at Mark 10:5 the Greek "*de*" which may be either reconstructed from the Greek, or introduced by a Latin scribe, in old Latin c's "*vero* (however)," is unnecessary in the Marcan Greek because of the broader context and "*apokritheis*" i.e., "*Kai* (And) *apokritheis* ('answering' = 'answered and,' AV)" (TR & AV).

By contrast, as in Matthean Greek, Marcan Greek generally uses the "*kai*" for a less pronounced break, unless a contextual factor unites with and clarifies the "*kai*," e.g., "*Kai* (And) *ex̲e̲lthe* (he went forth)" (Mark 2:13, TR & AV). Thus e.g., "*de*" (TR) is more naturally expected than "*kai*" (reconstructing this Greek form from the Latin "*et*" of the Vulgate) at Mark 1:16, because unlike Mark 1:12 where one has a clear division with "*Kai* (And) *euthe̲o̲s* (immediately)" (TR & AV), at Mark 1:16 there is simply either the "*de*" (TR) or "*kai*" (reconstructing this Greek form from the Latin "*et*" of the Vulgate); and there is quite a contextual focus change following the multiple usage of "*kai*" in Mark 1:15. Contextually, this makes the usage of "*kai*" (reconstructing this Greek form from the Latin "*et*" of the Vulgate) at Mark 1:16 look rather ridiculous.

Therefore, it must be asked why St. Mark uses the weaker conjunction, "*kai*" at Mark 12:31 i.e., "*kai* ('and,' conjunction) *deutera* (the second) *homoia* (like) *aut̲e̲*"? Its weakness here is particularly pronounced since it follows after a succession of "*kai*" usage. I.e., starting with a "*de*" section marker in Mark 12:29, "And (*kai*) Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord: and (*kai*) thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and (*kai*) with all thy soul, and (*kai*) with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. And (*Kai*) the second is like" etc. (Mark 12:29-31).

The immediate stylistic effect of using the "*Kai* (and)" at the start of Mark. 12:31 after this multiple usage of "*kai* (and);" is to quite strongly unite the initial words of Mark

12:31 in an interconnecting stylistic flow on from Mark 12:29,30. This naturally invites the conclusion that the most natural way to take the "*aute*" in Mark 12:31 is as a demonstrative pronoun, thus reading, either "*homoia* (like) *aute* ('unto this,' feminine singular <u>dative</u>, <u>demonstrative pronoun</u>, from *outos-e-o*)," i.e., "And the second *is* like unto this" (*Greek Reading 1b*); or "*kai* ('and,' conjunction) *deutera* (the second) *homoia* (like) *aute* ('this,' feminine singular nominative, demonstrative pronoun, from *outos-e-o*)" i.e., "And the second like *unto it is* this," or "And the second *is* like, *namely* this" (*Greek Reading 1c*).

But which of these two Greek readings, *Greek Reading 1b* or *Greek Reading 1c* is to be preferred at Mark 12:31? Since our all important exception to both the Matthean and Marcan general rule is Matt. 21:42 and Mark 12:11 respectively, and since this uses *outos-e-o* as a feminine singular nominative, we cannot doubt that *Greek Reading 1c* is within the normative parameters of both Matthean and Marcan Greek. Therefore, in "a tight call," I consider *Greek Reading 1c* is the preferred reading at Mark 12:11, i.e., "And the second *is* like, *namely* this" (AV).

The variant *Reading 1* forms here at Matt. 22:39 and Mark 12:31, have come about as different scribes have interpreted the meaning of the "*aute*" in these passages with different levels of skill.

Greek Readings 1a and / or 1b, i.e., "*homoia* ('like,' feminine singular nominative adjective, from *'omois / homois*) *aute*," with the iota subscript under the eta / *e* / η, indicating a dative as in standard seminary Greek, is found in the Greek *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550).

As *Greek Reading 1a* at Matt. 22:39, "*homoia* (like) *aute* ('unto it,' feminine singular <u>dative</u>, <u>personal pronoun</u>, from *autos-e-o*)," i.e., "like unto it" in "and the second *is* like unto it" (AV & TR); and at Mark 12:31, "*aute* (Mark 12:31, 'this,' feminine singular <u>nominative</u>, <u>demonstrative pronoun</u>, from *outos-e-o*)" (i.e., what is *Greek Reading 1c* at Matt. 22:39); this is echoed in the King James Version. Dedicated in 1611 to the Supreme Governor of the Church of England, and Defender of the Faith, King James I (Regnal Years: 1603-1625), this reads at Matt. 22:39 "And the second *is* like unto it" (*Greek Reading 1a*), and at Mark 12:31, "and the second *is* like, *namely* this" (what at Matt. 22:39 is *Greek Reading 1c*).

But some neo-Byzantine translators did not follow the same English translation as those neo-Byzantine past masters of the Authorized King James Version. Though *Greek Reading 1b* is still possible at Matt. 22:39 from the Greek NT text of e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550); those following this possible meaning evidently missed the subtleties of Matthean and Marcan Greek recognized by the AV translators. Hence we find some variation across a number of neo-Byzantine text translations. Tyndale (1526 & 1534) reads, "And there is another like unto this" (*Greek Reading 1b*) at Matt. 22:39, with "and the second is like unto this" at Mark 12:31 (what at Matt. 22:39 is *Greek Reading 1b*); *Cranmer's Bible* (1539) reads at Matt. 22:39, "And the second is like unto

it" (*Greek Reading 1a*) and at Mark 12:31, "and the second is like unto this" (what at Matt. 22:39 is *Greek Reading 1b*); and the *Geneva Bible* (1557 & 1560) reads at Matt. 22:39, "And the second is like unto this" (*Greek Reading 1b*), and at Mark 12:31, "and the second is like unto this" (what at Matt. 22:39 is *Greek Reading 1b*) (Geneva Bible, 1557) or "And the second is like, that is" (Mark 12:31) (Geneva Bible, 1560).

Thus while I would concur with *Cranmer's Bible* (1539) at Matt. 22:39; more generally, these versions thus look very much like those based on the Latin ones which follow *Latin Reading 1d* at Matt. 22:39. I.e., from the Latin, Wycliffe (1380) reads at Matt. 22:39, "The second is like to this" (rendering the Latin like *Greek Reading 1b*); or the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims (1582) reads at Matt. 22:39, "And the second is like to this" (rendering the Latin like *Greek Reading 1b*). (The Latin Vulgate for Mark 12:31 is not the same as for Matt. 22:39. See above footnote on old Latin Version e for Wycliffe & the Douay-Rheims at Mark 12:31.)

Thus the matter is one that neo-Byzantine translators have divided on. But I consider the textual evidence supports the reading of the AV here, i.e., *Greek Reading 1a*, as found in e.g., the Greek NT texts of Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550), both of which texts would *prima facie* allow for *Greek Readings 1a and / or 1b* at Matt. 22:39. Therefore, let us thank God for the matured wisdom that is here found in our Authorized King James Versions at Matt. 22:39 and Mark 12:31.

But lest some religiously liberal Bible critic should thereby claim that this means there is some "contradiction" between the Matthean and Marcan accounts, I would affirm that there surely is not. The concept of "parallel" gospel stories must be treated with some caution. Evidently, at least two Jews approached Jesus around the same time. They both put a similar question. It looks like the "lawyer" first put the question of Matt. 22:36, so that Matt. 22:34-40 first transpired. Then not long after, "one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together," again put a similar question, seemingly with the intent of then commending Jesus for his understanding of Scripture, and thus transpired the events of Mark 12:28-34. Then when the Holy Spirit of God verbally inspired both St. Matthew's Gospel and St. Mark's Gospel, he selected the accounts that best suited the vocabulary of the respective Gospel writers. This amazing fact also reminds us that at the point of Divine Inspiration, the Holy Ghost here worked with, and not against, these men's respective wills. We thus here see the same type of paradox we find with the issue of election (Eph. 1:4-7), in which God works with, and not against a man's will (enabling by God's grace, Ezek. 16:6; 36:23-27; Eph. 2:1,5), so that a man still chooses to exercise the "faith" (Hab. 2:4) that accepts God's "grace" of salvation, which is a "gift," and "not of works, lest any man should boast" (Eph. 2:8,9).

With regard to the system of rating textual readings A to E, the break-up I shall here use is somewhat different to normal. For Matt. 22:39 I shall make a two-fold distinction between the reading of the Greek in the majority Byzantine text (Component 1) and the interpretation of this as *Greek Reading 1a* (Component 2). (As stated in "Preliminary Remarks & Textual Discussion," "The Third Matter," *supra*, I shall defer a threefold rating on Mark 12:31 to the relevant Volume on St. Mark's Gospel.)

Firstly, *Component 1* at Matt. 22:39, i.e., the starting point of *Reading 1*, "*homoia* ('like,' feminine singular nominative adjective, from *'omois / homois*) *aut<u>e</u>.*" This has rock solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading dating from ancient times. Moreover, putting aside the issue of how they interpreted the "*homoia* (like) *aut<u>e</u>*," it is clear that the Latin textual tradition monolithically was coming from a Greek textual base which supports this *Reading 1*. Therefore, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give *Component 1* of the TR's reading i.e., *Reading 1* at Matt. 22:39 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Secondly, *Component 2* at Matt. 22:39, i.e., the adoption of the meaning of *Reading 1* as *Greek Reading 1a*, "*homoia* (like) *aut<u>e</u>* ('unto it,' feminine singular <u>dative</u>, <u>personal pronoun</u>, from *autos-<u>e</u>-o*)," i.e., "like unto it" in the wider words, "and the second *is* like unto it." On the one hand, under the general, though not absolute, rule of Matthean Greek, one would expect the *aut<u>e</u>* to be a personal pronoun, i.e., "like unto it" (*Preliminary Issue 1*, *supra*). Moreover, taking into account Matthean usage of *homoia*, we can confidently conclude that *Greek Reading 1a* is the most likely reading since this is firmly and decisively inside the normative syntax of Matthean Greek (*Preliminary Issue 2*, *supra*). Furthermore, in consideration of the Matthean usage of *kai* and *de*, "*de* (but / and)" is used for a stronger stylistic break than "*kai* (and)," unless another contextual factor strengthens the "*kai* (and);" and so the usage of "*de* (and)" at Matt. 22:39 acts to make the words, "And the second is like unto it," more stylistically detached from the preceding words. This fact, being so inconsistent with any appropriate syntax that would stress the similarity of these two elements with a demonstrative pronoun i.e., *Greek Reading 1b* or *Greek Reading 1c*, it follows that we can once again confidently conclude that the correct rendering of Matt. 22:39 is *Greek Reading 1a* (*Preliminary Issue 3*, *supra*). Additionally, this understanding of "*aut<u>e</u>* (unto it)" has ancient support in an old Latin Version, and so through reference to old Latin e, we here see the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, bowing humbly in submission to its lord and master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*.

But on the other hand, under an exception to the general rule of Matthean Greek, a theoretical possibility remains that Matt. 22:39 might instead be better rendered as a demonstrative pronoun, i.e., *Greek Reading 1b and / or Greek Reading 1c* (*Preliminary Issue 1*, *supra*). Moreover, with minimal exception, the majority Latin textual tradition, including the Vulgate, has *Latin Reading 1d*, and so in general the Latin follows Greek *Readings 1b and / or 1c*.

Taking into account these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 22:39 a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

I shall first consider some matters relevant to *Preliminary Issue 3*, *supra*; and then consider manuscripts with regard to *Component 1* and *Component 2*, *supra*.

Concerning *Preliminary Issue 3*: the Matthean and Marcan usage of *kai* and *de*.

The distinction between the stronger Marcan conjunction of Greek "*de*" and weaker conjunction of Greek "*kai*" has already been noted, *supra*. The stylistic overkill "*de*" appears at Mark 6:50 in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and hence Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the NU Text (1993). So too at Mark 7:24 the presence of "*ekeithen*," i.e., "*Kai* (And) *ekeithen* (from thence)" (TR) makes the added stylistic breaker of changing the "*Kai*" to "*De*" here in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, look rather silly; which is probably why the rather silly neo-Alexandrians followed it in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the NU Text (1993). Cf. Mark 6:22 where the reading of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus insert "*de*," and this is followed by Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952); but it so greatly interrupts the natural sequential flow of this verse, that even the contemporary NU Text (1993) decided not to follow it.

As already noted, at Mark 10:5 the Greek "*de*" is unnecessary in Marcan Greek because of the broader context and "*apokritheis*" i.e., "*Kai* (And) *apokritheis* ('answering' = 'answered and,' AV)," *supra*. Yet following the somewhat awkward looking two leading Alexandrian texts, Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, the "*de*" is added in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the NU Text (1993). So too at Mark 13:22, the "*de*" of Codex Sinaiticus, followed in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952), is an unwelcome intruder in the immediate flow on of Matt. 13:21; and this obvious "stick in the mud" was not followed in Westcott-Hort (1881) and the contemporary NU Text (1993), albeit more for the wrong reasons of a split Alexandrian text in which they "guessed the other way" and by a fluke, on this occasion happened to get it right. (We can safely make thus deduction on Westcott-Hort and the NU Text at Mark 13:22 because they get so many of the other ones wrong with respect to "*kai*" and "*de*" when the two main Alexandrian texts concur on an error.)

Moreover, it has also been observed that as in Matthean Greek, Marcan Greek generally uses the "*kai*" for a less pronounced break, unless a contextual factor unites with and clarifies the "*kai*." Thus "*de*" (TR) is more naturally expected than "*kai*" (reconstructing this Greek form from the Latin "*et*" of the Vulgate) at Mark 1:16, *supra*. But a bizarre "*kai*" is here substituted by "*de*" in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and hence it is also found in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the NU Text (1993)!

Concerning *Component 1*.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 22:39, *Reading 1*, Greek, "*homoia* ('like,' feminine singular nominative adjective, from *'omois* / *homois*)

aut<u>e</u>," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century).   It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (12th century, independent), and 1071 (12th century, independent); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent).

Concerning *Component 2.*

The correct *Greek Reading 1a* is, "*homoia* (like) *aut<u>e</u>* ('unto it,' feminine singular <u>dative</u>, <u>personal pronoun</u>, from *autos-<u>e</u>-o*)," i.e., "like unto it."   *Greek Reading 1b* is, "*homoia* (like) *aut<u>e</u>* ('unto this,' feminine singular <u>dative</u>, <u>demonstrative pronoun</u>, from *outos-<u>e</u>-o*)," i.e., "*is* like unto this."   In standard seminary Greek both of these readings would be written with an iota subscript under the eta / *<u>e</u>* / η indicating a dative. *Greek Reading 1c*, "*homoia* (like) *aut<u>e</u>* ('this,' feminine singular <u>nominative</u>, <u>demonstrative pronoun</u>, from *outos-<u>e</u>-o*)," i.e., "like *unto it is* this," or "*is* like, *namely* this."

Greek Readings 1a and / or 1b.   With the iota subscript under the eta / *<u>e</u>* / η indicating a dative as in standard seminary Greek, this reading is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 1 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)*, Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere) and 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude).

Greek Reading 2, "*homoi<u>os</u>* ('likewise,' an adverb)," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century).   Was this an accidental change?   Due to a paper loss / fade, did the original "*homoia aut<u>e</u>*" come to look something like, "*homoi::::*"?   Did a scribe then "reconstruct" this as "*homoi<u>os</u>*"?

Was *Greek Reading 2* a deliberate pruning away of the "*aut<u>e</u>*" and alteration of "*homoia* (like)" to "*homoi<u>os</u>* (likewise)"?   Bearing in mind that the more general evidence indicates that it was often hard to find good scribes in Alexandria; did a frustrating and fuming Alexandrian scribe who first concluded that the diverse possible meanings of "*aut<u>e</u>*" here involved matters that "were too complex and confusing," then decide to make this modification because it was "best to rack the problem off forever"?

At Matt. 22:39, *Greek Reading 1b*, "*homoia* (like) *aut<u>e</u>* (unto this)," entered Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) who shows it as a Greek dative with support from the Vulgate and old Latin Versions (i.e., *Latin Reading 1d* which is the basis for the reconstructed Greek *Readings 1b & 1c*); as it did Nestle's 21st edition (1952), which likewise shows it as a Greek dative with support from the Vulgate and old Latin Versions.

While   the   UBS   3rd   (1975)   and   3rd   corrected   (1983)   editions,   like   the

contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993), show Matt. 22:39 in the dative; their lack of qualification means one could interpret this as either *Greek Readings 1a and / or 1b*.

At Matt. 22:39, Westcott-Hort (1881) have in their main text, "*homoia* (like) *aute* (this)" (*Greek Reading 1c*). But in their side-margin, they give as alternatives, both "*homoios* (likewise)" for "*homoia* (like)," and the dative "*aute* (either, 'unto it,' *Greek Reading 1a*; or 'unto this,' *Greek Reading 1b*). Westcott & Hort have a very limited textual apparatus, and only give alternatives in side-notes that they regard in a serious way. That these semi-Romanist Puseyites would elevate the lone reading of Codex Vaticanus's "*homoios* (likewise)" (*Greek Reading 2*) to this status, is a sad comment on their misplaced confidence in their so called "neutral" Alexandrian text, as well a manifestation of their crazed obsession for Rome Vaticanus as their preferred text.

Westcott-Hort's text would allow for a translator to combine Rome Vaticanus's "*homoios* (likewise)," which Codex Vaticanus has standing alone (*Greek Reading 2*), with "*aute*." E.g., "And likewise a second *is* this." Such a Westcott-Hort based combination of Codex Vaticanus's "*homoios* (likewise)" with "*aute*," is a reading found in this final redaction in NO MANUSCRIPTS OF ANY KIND! *This is a religiously liberal form critic's "reconstruction" of a reading, that on all the available evidence, i.e., taking into account both textual analysis and manuscripts inside and outside the closed class of sources, NEVER EXISTED! It is a 19th century figment of the imagination in the day-dreams of Westcott & Hort!!*

The rendering of the Westcott-Hort based ASV at Matt. 22:39 follows the Westcott & Hort main text with *Greek Reading 1c*, "like *unto it is* this." Showing the Revised Version (RV) and American Standard Version (ASV) italics, "And a second like *unto it* is this" (RV & ASV). Why does the ASV put "unto it" in italics, but not "is"? The ASV is here very misleading and incorrect in this selective usage of italics.

The ASV's *Greek Reading 1c* was not followed by its "better son," the New American Standard Bible, which here at Matt. 22:39 follows the TR's *Greek Reading 1a* with, "The second is like it" (NASB). Why does the NASB 2nd edition (1977) and 3rd edition (1995) here gratuitously prune away the "And (*De*)"? Why do the NASB 1st edition (1960-1971), 2nd edition (1977), and 3rd edition (1995), all fail to use italics for the added "*estin* ('it is' = 'is' in italics, AV)" here? The same type of errors with the same correct reading of *Greek Reading 1a* is found in the ASV's "worse son," the RSV. One of these errors, to wit, the non-usage of italics, but not the other error, to wit, the gratuitous pruning away the "And (*De*)," is found with the same correct reading of *Greek Reading 1a* in both the ASV's "better grandson," the ESV; and the ASV's "worse son," the NRSV. And this same type of ESV and NRSV format is found in the NIV, which reads at Matt. 22:39, "And the second is like it" (NIV). The TEV decided to both "take away" (Rev. 22:19) from the Word of God by omitting the "And;" and also "add unto" (Rev. 22:18) the Word of God here at Matt. 22:39 with "most important commandment;" in their rendering, "The second most important commandment is like it" (TEV). So too *Greek Reading 1a* is followed in a loose and liberal rendering in the Papists' JB and NJB.

The contrast between the neo-Alexandrian ASV (*Greek Reading 1c*) and other neo-Alexandrian Versions (*Greek Reading 1a*), thus reminds us that where the two Alexandrian texts are split, the follies of one group of neo-Alexandrians, may not always be followed by another group of neo-Alexandrians. *Such are the fading and fleeting fancies of the Neo-Alexandrian School!* Furthermore, the issues raised by the American Standard Version's *Greek Reading 1c*, "And a second like *unto it* is this" (ASV), are not unknown to we neo-Byzantines from another source. The old Latin Papists, wielding in one hand the Clementine Vulgate, and in the other hand, the Douay-Rheims Version, used to also come at us here at Matt. 22:39, with the reading of the Douay-Rheims, "And the second is like to this" (*Latin Reading 1d*, which may be reconstructed from the Latin as either Greek *Readings 1b or 1c*).

Though the Neo-Alexandrian School predates Westcott & Hort, the Westcott-Hort text, together with the RV and ASV translators played a pivotal and unprecedented role in moving people away from the Received Text and Authorized Version. E.g., "The Preface" of the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) says, "such portions of holy Scripture, as are inserted into the liturgy; … are now ordered to be read according to the last Translation," i.e., the King James Version of 1611, which was thus made "the Authorized Version." The *Church of England's* history as an "AV only" church for about 200 years[154], was sadly and tragically brought to an end following a resolution to produce what became known as the Revised Version (RV) or English Revised Version (ERV) of 1881-1885. This bad resolution was initiated by Bishop Wilberforce (Bishop of Winchester), and amended by Bishop Ollivant (Bishop of Llandaff) in the Upper House of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, and was then passed by both Houses of the *Church of England* Convocation in 1870. *Thus the glories of God's Word were exchanged for a debased text which as discussed above, includes the day-dreams of religiously liberal form critics here at Matt. 22:39!*

As one who was hewn from an Anglican rock, I remember with favour the grand old days when the *Church of England* was the Protestant Fleet's flag ship. In those days, under a Reformed Anglican (*Church of England* and *Church of Ireland*) and Scottish Presbyterian (*Church of Scotland*) Protestant alliance, Bible based and Bible believing Protestantism was established in the Protestant Christian Church and State of what before 1801 were, The Three Kingdoms of England (including the Dominion of Wales), Ireland, and Scotland; from 1707 to 1800 the Kingdom of Great Britain (England and Scotland) and Kingdom of Ireland; and after 1801, The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland (becoming after the events of 1921/1922, The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland). God greatly blessed these lily-white Japhethite Protestants, building up under them the great British Empire, on which it was said in its hey-day, "the sun never sets." In those grand old days before the sad and sorry rise of the secular state, the Established Protestant Churches of the British Isles were, like the legislatures, most

---

[154] The 1662 prayer book still has some non-AV usage in the singing of the Psalms, and also Bible quotes in the pre-1611 Homilies in Article 35 of the Anglican 39 Articles. Hence I say in inverted commas, "AV only."

fair to behold. *Oh, thou wast once so fair!* Thus on numerous occasions I have stood in London, and looking at the Westminster Parliament declared similar words to these, *Oh, thou wast once so fair!*[155] But now, "From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores: they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment" (Isa. 1:6). Thus I am left to cry out in prayer, "Wilt thou be angry with us forever?" "Wilt thou not revive us again: that thy people may rejoice in thee?" (Ps. 85:5,6) "O Lord, revive thy work," "in wrath remember mercy" (Hab. 3:2).

Matt. 22:40 "On these two commandments hang
                    all the law and the prophets" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Of relevance to the Greek reading of the variant, when two subjects of a compound subject are joined by a conjunction (e.g., *kai* / "and"), the verb is put in the singular if one wants to put an emphasis on the first one mentioned. E.g., in John 2:2, "*eklethe* ('he was called,' indicative passive aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *kaleo*) *de* (and) *kai* (both) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus) *kai* (and) *oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples) *autou* (of him)." Thus "and both Jesus was called, and his disciples" (AV), emphasises that first and foremost *Jesus* was invited to the wedding, and as a secondary or derivative consequence of this, his disciples were invited[156]. In modern terms, this would be conceptualized as something like sending out an invitation to Jesus that said, "Jesus, you and any friends you wish to bring are invited to the wedding."

But in Latin the usage of a compound subject and singular verb has quite a different nuance. A compound subject with a singular verb may be used for a *singular idea*. Where there are multiple people in a compound subject, the singular verb simply follows *the prior person* (I do not say, "the first person," lest this be misunderstood to mean "I" or "we"); and there is a general, though not absolute tendency, to make the singular verb agree *with the noun nearest to it*. E.g., the sentence, "*Ego* (I) *et* (and) *Cicero* (Cicero) *meus* (my) *flagitabit* ('will require [it],' indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *flagito*)," i.e., "My Cicero and I will require it!"[157] Here in the Latin, *there is no sense* in which either the first noun (the pronoun, *ego* / "I") is being more emphasised, or the second noun (the proper noun, "Cicero") which is closest to the verb, is being more emphasised. *There is nothing of the Greek nuance in this Latin sentence, since the Greek and Latin nuance is quite different here.* (Cf. Commentary Volume 2 at Matt. 17:3, "The Fourth Matter.")

---

[155] I here take some poetical license, for my actual words were more in the vernacular, "Baby, you were once so fair!"

[156] Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 401-2.

[157] Allen's *Latin Grammar*, sections 217-219, pp. 153-154.

This matter becomes relevant because both Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) (Vulgate and old Latin Versions) and Von Soden (1913) (old Latin Versions) claim that the Latin supports the variant. A similar claim appears in Robert's & Donaldson's English translation of Tertullian's Latin[158]. *But they appear to have reached this conclusion by erroneously cross-applying the rules of Greek grammar on this matter to the Latin.* While the mistake is understandable in some ways because in general the Latin and Greek are such grammatically compatible tongues, they are nevertheless not identical.

The reading of the Vulgate, old Latin Versions, and Tertullian[159] at Matt. 22:40 is, "*lex* ('the law,' feminine <u>singular</u> nominative noun, from *lex*) *pendet* ('hang,' indicative active present, <u>3rd person singular verb</u>, from *pendeo*) *et* (and) *prophetae* ('the prophets,' masculine plural nominative noun, from *propheta*[160])," i.e., "hang … the law and the prophets." This Latin reading thus in no sense emphasises the first noun of the compound subject, "*lex* (the law)" over the second noun, "*prophetae* (the prophets)." The verb is in the singular because it is attracted to the nearest noun, "*lex* ('the law,' <u>singular</u> noun, from *lex*);" and it might also be argued that "the law and the prophets" here form a singular idea of Old Testament Scripture. Hence it would naturally be rendered the same as the TR e.g., the Douay-Rheims reads, "On these two commandments dependeth the whole law and the prophets." Therefore, if one wanted to bring to the Latin the type of emphasis one finds in the variant of the Greek at Matt. 22:40, one would need to add an adjective like "*princeps* ('first,' feminine <u>singular</u>

---

[158] Roberts, A. & Donaldson, J. (Editors), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, American Reprint of the Edinburgh Edition, by A.C. Coxe, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA, 1976, p. 103, rendering the Latin (see next footnote,) as, "on these two precepts the whole Law hangeth, and the prophets."

[159] Tertullian in: Migne (Latin Writers Series) (1844 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 2, p. 957 (*Book about Fasting / Liber de Jejunis*, 2:8) (Latin).

[160] As a first declension masculine noun the nominative singular form can be either "*propheta*" or "*prophetes*" (Woodhouse's *Latin Dictionary*, 1913); and as a third declension masculine noun the nominative singular form is "*prophetes*" (Stelten's *Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Latin*, 1995). The ancient form is as a first declension, *propheta*, *ae* (Maltby, R., *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, Francis Cairns, Leeds, UK, 1991, p. 501); whereas the form *prophetes* is Later Latin (Souter, A., *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 A.D.*, Oxford, UK, 1949, 1964, p. 328). Since the masculine plural nominative declension uses the *ae* suffix and the third declension does not, we can say that Matt. 22:40 is a first declension noun. While we can say that in earlier Latin texts such as the Vulgate that this is coming from *propheta*, *ae*, *prima facie* we cannot be sure if later old Latin Version are declining it from *propheta*, *ae*, or *prophetes*, *ae*. But at Matt. 13:57; 21:11 the masculine singular nominative form is found as "*propheta*" in the Vulgate and all old Latin Version (with variant spelling "*profeta*" at Matt. 13:57 in e, d, ff2, & q; and at Matt. 21:11 in e, d, & q); and so on this basis I conclude that at Matt. 22:40 all old Latin versions are declining this word from *propheta*, *ae*, not *prophetes*, *ae*.

nominative possessive adjective, from *princeps*)" to the noun, "*lex* (the law)," and connected adverb like "*item* (also)" i.e., "hangeth … first (*princeps*) the law (*lex*), and (*et*) also (*item*, adverb) the prophets."

The ramifications of this for our purposes at Matt. 22:40 are twofold. In the first place, I do not consider one can say that the Latin supports the Greek variant. In the second place, given the absence of any qualifying adjective like "*princeps* (first)" to the noun, "*lex* (the law)," I consider one can fairly say that the Latin in fact supports the Greek of the *Textus Receptus* reading. Hence I show the Latin supporting the TR, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 22:40, the TR's reads, "*kai* ('and,' word 1) *oi* ('the,' word 2) *prophetai* ('prophets,' word 3) *kremantai* ('they hang,' word 4a, indicative passive present, 3rd person <u>plural</u> verb, from *kremannumi*)," i.e., in the wider words, "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets" (AV). This reading is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codex W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, with a variant spelling of word 4a having a double "*m*" / mu as "*kremmantai*[161]") and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings). As discussed in the "Preliminary Textual Discussion," *supra*, it is also supported as Latin, "*lex* (the law) *pendet* (hang) *et* (and) *prophetae* (the prophets)," i.e., "hang … the law and the prophets," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century, with spelling variant, "*profetae*"), e (4th / 5th century, with spelling variant, "*profetae*"), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century, with spelling variant, "*profetae*"), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D., with spelling variant, "*profetae*") and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Clement of Rome (*c.* 150), Origen (d. 254), and Basil the Great (d. 379); and the ancient church Latin writer, Tertullian (d. after 220).

However, a variant in word order 4b,1,2,3, reads, Greek, "*krematai* ('it hangs' or 'it hangeth,' word 4b, indicative passive present, 3rd person <u>singular</u> verb, from *kremannumi*) *kai* ('and,' word 1, a conjunction) *oi* ('the,' word 2) *prophetai* ('prophets,' word 3)," i.e., (emphasizing "the law," *infra*,) "On these two commandments all the law hangeth, and the prophets." This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) and O 023 (6th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Basil the Great (d. 379).

---

[161] I.e., from *kremmannumi* (*kremannumi*), a *mi* verb, also called an "athematic" verb. To the best of my knowledge, this spelling variant has not been previously documented at Matt. 22:40.

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must thus stand. The origins of the variant are speculative.

The combination of both changing the word order from 1,2,3,4 (TR) to 4,1,2,3 (Variant); when coupled with the change of word 4 from the plural, "*kremantai* ('they hang,' word 4a)" (TR) to the singular, "*krematai* ('it hangeth,' word 4b)," means that on the balance of probabilities this was a deliberate textual change by a scribe.

When two subjects are joined by a conjunction in Greek, whether both in the singular, or one in the singular and one in the plural, the verb would normally be in the plural as occurs in the TR's reading. But when one wants to put an emphasis on the first one mentioned in a compound subject joined by a conjunction, such as here in the variant, the verb is put in the singular. Thus "*krematai* ('it hangeth,' <u>singular</u> verb)," acting on the compound subject, "*o* (the) *nomos* ('law,' masculine singular nominative noun, from *nomos*) *kai* (and) *oi* (the) *proph̲e̲tai* ('prophets,' masculine plural nominative noun, from *proph̲e̲tes*)," acts to emphasize the "the law" i.e., the Pentateuch. By contrast, a similar construction in the Latin lacks this connotation, *supra*.

In the ancient Greco-Roman world, Greek and Latin were the universal languages which complimented the local language of a region, e.g., in the southern part of the ancient Roman Province of Syria known as Palestine, the local tongue was Hebrew (Aramaic), and hence we read in Luke 23:38 of "a superscription … written … in letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew." Tertullian refers to this reading in the Latin; and Origen refers to this reading in both the Greek and Latin. It is possible that earlier Latin translations of Origen existed that we have now lost. Did a Greek scribe who thought highly of Tertullian and / or Origen, but who "needed to brush up on his Latin," and hence was unaware of this difference in nuance between the Greek and Latin, upon reading it in the Latin of Tertullian and / or Origen, misunderstand it by cross-applying the Greek nuance to the Latin, and then go about to "correct" the TR's Greek reading to the Greek form of the variant?

We Christians of the holy Protestant faith of Martin Luther, John Calvin, and Thomas Cranmer, do NOT believe in so called, "degrees of inspiration" i.e., in which one prophet or book of the Bible is somehow "more inspired" than another. This type of error takes various forms, being found in one form among religious liberals[162], in another form among Roman Catholics and Eastern Orthodox[163], in another form among cults[164],

---

[162] Henry, C.F.H. (Editor), *Revelation and the Bible*, Contemporary Evangelical Thought, 1958, Tyndale Press, London, British Edition 1959, p. 222; or J. Orr's *Revelation and Inspiration* (Eerdmans, Michigan, USA, 1952, pp. 171-5,180,215), referred to and critiqued in Cairns, A., *Apostles of Error*, Faith Free Presbyterian Church, Greenville, South Carolina, USA, 1989 and Let the Bible Speak, Ballymoney, Northern Ireland, UK, 1989, pp. 30-4,38.

[163] Contrary to the Biblical teaching of *Scripture alone*, both Roman Catholics and Eastern Orthodox regard as authoritative the so called "sixth ecumenical council" known as the *Third Council of Constantinople* in 681 A.D., which claimed that those who

and in yet another form among the infidel Mohammedans[165].   But contrary to all these,

---

sat in the first four councils were "God-inspired fathers" (Greek *Theopneuston pateron*). This is the same Greek word found in II Tim. 3:16 where we read "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God (Greek *Theopneustos*)."   I.e., they claimed that "ecumenical" councils have the prophetic gift.   (By contrast, Reformed Anglicans look with particular favour on the Trinitarian and creedal teachings of these first four general councils, and also the Trinitarian teachings of the fifth and sixth general councils, but do not regard them as being Divinely "inspired."   See Articles 6, 8, & 21 of the 39 Articles).   We thus find that while Roman Catholics and Eastern Orthodox say they believe in the inspiration of Scripture, they in practice regard this as *a lesser degree of inspiration* that must be interpreted through *tradition*.   E.g., the *tradition* of the seventh "ecumenical" council of Nicea (787), which contrary to God's Word (Exod. 20:4-6), condoned Mariolatry and other forms of idolatry.   This usage of Romish tradition (adopted by the semi-Romanist Eastern Orthodox), was the very type of thing Christ condemned in Matt. 15:3-9.

[164]   E.g., both Mormons and Seventh-day Adventists (SDAs) say that believe in both the Bible and a new "prophet," for Mormon, Joseph Smith, and for SDAs, Ellen White (Anthony Hoekema's *The Four Major Cults,* Eerdmans, Michigan, 1963, pp. 18-33, Mormons, & pp. 237-255, SDAs).   But in practice, Mormons put the emphasis on Joseph Smith, and regard his writings far more highly than the Bible, i.e., practicing a form of "degrees of inspiration" in which their prophet is regarded as more inspired than the Bible.   The SDAs theoretically go the other way.   They refer to their prophetess, Ellen White, as "The lesser light on the greater light" of the Bible (Breaden, F., *Instruction Manuel* for 60 Study Guides, Signs Publishing, Warburton, Victoria, Australia, 1987, Chart 62, for use with Study 45, pp. 183-4, an official SDA publication). I.e., the terminology of "The lesser light on the greater light" *in theory* means Ellen White is *less inspired* than the Bible; but in practice, SDAs may not disagree with her writings, and so *in practice* she is regarded as *more inspired* than the Bible.   For the Bible teaches the OT gift of prophecy returned only for the period in and around NT times (Dan. 9:24; Luke 11:49-51; Eph. 2:20).   E.g., we have "two witnesses" (Rev. 11:3,4; cf. Ps. 119:105), the OT and NT, NOT "three."   Thus "the book" of Rev. 22:18,19, though referring in the first instance to the Book of Revelation, in the second instance contextually also refers to what was then the completed revelation of the OT and NT.   See McGrath, G.B. (Myself), on "Seventh-day Adventists," *British Church Newspaper*, 26 March 2010, p. 11.

[165]   Mohammed says of "the Jews … and the Christians" respectively (Sura 5:74), "O people of the Book!   Ye have no ground to stand on, until ye observe the Law (Jews) and the Evangel (Christians)" i.e., he here makes some reference to the OT Pentateuch, "the Law," and the NT Gospels, "the Evangel."   But he then further adds, "and that which hath been sent down to you from the your Lord" (Sura 5:73) i.e., the Koran.   Thus in theory Mohammedans consider that the Koran complements Jewish OT and Christian NT Scriptures (Mohammed's *Koran*, translated from the Arabic by J.M. Rodwell, 1861, second edition, 1876, with an Introduction by G. Margoliouth, Everyman's Library, Dent, London, UK, 1909, reprint 1974, p. 494).   But in practice,

we Protestants maintain the *sola Scriptura* (Latin, "Scripture alone") teaching that, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, and correction, for instruction in righteousness." Hence while we uphold the Old Testament's first five books of Moses, commonly called the Pentateuch, we regard them as no more or no less inspired, than any other book of the Old and New Testaments. But by tradition, the Jews place a greater emphasis on the Pentateuch, also known corporately as "the Law," than they do the rest of the OT. Therefore, did a Greek scribe aware of this Jewish tradition, think it "a stylistic improvement" to deliberately create the emphasis on "the Law" found in the variant's reading, "On these two commandments all the law hangeth, and the prophets"?

The TR's reading has rock solid support in the Greek from ancient times. It is also the natural and normative reading of the Latin. It has further ancient support in the Greek from Clement of Rome and Origen. Though St. Basil refers to both readings, in general terms the variant has fairly weak support in the Greek, and no support in the Latin. Even if the Latin did support the variant (see "Preliminary Textual Discussion," *supra*), the strength of support for the TR's reading in the Greek textual tradition, and perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, would be enough to give the TR's reading a "B;" and its additional very ancient support from Clement of Rome coupled with its later ancient support by Basil the Great, would then be enough to give the reading an "A." Thus on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 22:40 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 22:40, "hang ('they hang,' *kremantai*, Greek plural) … the law and the prophets," i.e., "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets" (AV), is found in (the independent) Codex 0107 (7th century, Matt. 22-23 & Mark 4-5) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text); the *Family 1 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 1 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)*, Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere) and 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude); and the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent). It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions. It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin

---

they clearly regard the Koran as being *more inspired* and so *more reliable* than either the Bible's OT or NT. Numerous times I have defended the Bible against deceived Mohammedans who falsely said to me words like, "the Bible's been changed and has errors, but the Koran hasn't."

19th century) as Latin, "*lex* (the law) *pendet* (hang) *et* (and) *Prophetae* (the Prophets)," i.e., "hang … the law and the prophets."

However, the variant, "the law hangeth ('it hangeth,' *krematai*, Greek singular), and the prophets," i.e., "On these two commandments all the law hangeth, and the prophets," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century), and Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type). It is also found in Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

From such sources, the variant entered the NU Text *et al*. Therefore, at Matt. 22:40 the (English) *Revised Version* translators of 1881-1885 sought by a comma to make the distinction between this variant reading as opposed to that of the TR, i.e., "On these two commandments hangeth the whole law, and the prophets" (RV). But the later *American Standard Version* translators of 1901, wishing to make the point even more sharply, additionally moved the "hangeth" from before, to after, "the whole law," thus reading, "On these two commandments the whole law hangeth, and the prophets" (ASV).

The Roman Catholic translators of both the Jerusalem Bible (1966) and New Jerusalem Bible (1985) decided to render this Greek nuance of the variant at Matt. 22:40 on the same principles as the RV translators i.e., with a comma. On the one hand, I commend these Roman Catholic JB and NJB translators for their accuracy in picking up this Greek nuance in the variant. But on the other hand, I note the sad decline of accuracy in the JB and NJB at Matt. 22:40 relative to what was the more accurate rendering from the Douay-Rheims based on the Latin as found in the Clementine, "On these two commandments dependeth the whole law and the prophets" (Douay-Rheims).

Now when one comes to most of the neo-Alexandrian Versions, all based on neo-Alexandrian texts adopting the variant, a strange twist occurs. *Prima facie* they follow the TR's reading, rather than that of the variant. Thus e.g., based on the same Westcott-Hort text as the RV and ASV, the *Twentieth Century New Testament* translators of 1904 (Revised Edition) read at Matt. 22:40, "On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets" (TCNT). So too, this type of correct reading is found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, TEV, NEB, REB, and Moffatt Bible[166].

What does it all mean? It seems the subtleties of this Greek nuance are not always appreciated by the neo-Alexandrian translators following a neo-Alexandrian text.

---

[166] *Prima facie* one *might* think that from Moffatt's rendering of Matt. 22:40 as "Law and the prophets," that his use of a capital "L" for "Law," and a lower case "p" for "prophets," may be seeking to convey this nuance in some obtuse way. But wider inspection of Moffatt's Bible at e.g., Matt. 5:17; Luke 16:16, John 7:19, shows this is part of his normative style. A similar issue and resolution also exists for the NEB and TEV.

Thus lacking the attention to this detail of the RV and ASV translators, and on this occasion also the JB and NJB translators, generally the more loose and carefree neo-Alexandrian translators gaily passed over this nuance in their neo-Alexandrian texts, and hence paradoxically made the correct rendering as a consequence of their tardiness. … But then again, *truth is sometimes stranger than fiction!* … Though we rejoice that such neo-Alexandrian Versions "got it right" here at Matt. 22:40, we must damper our enthusiasm with the qualification that they only did so because they were such bumbling, stumbling, and slipshod buffoons. It was thus with great bravado, that e.g., "Metzger's boys" on the *New Revised Standard Version Committee* that he presided over, looking at a NU Text Greek text that read, "*krematai* ('it hangeth,' Greek singular)," rendered this *incorrectly* from their Greek text, but by a paradox *correctly* as found in the TR, "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets" (NRSV). *C'est la vie!*[167]

Matt. 22:44b "till I make thine enemies thy footstool" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex and has the same reading as the Vulgate at Matt. 22:44b, "*scabillum* (the footstool) *pedum* (of the feet) *tuorum* (of thee)," i.e., "thy footstool." The Vulgate has these same words at both Mark 12:36 and Luke 20:4, though with the more common spelling of the first word as "*scabellum*." On the one hand, it is possible to argue that the Sangallensis Diatessaron is here following Matt. 22:44b on the basis of its spelling of the first word as "*scabillum*;" but on the other hand, it is possible to argue that it was a reading influenced by, or adopted from, Mark 12:36 and Luke 20:43, in which the scribe simply selected the alternative spelling of this first word. Since context favours the former proposition as the more probable one; and the likelihood of what is this more probable reading is raised even higher by the fact that the spelling "*scabillum*," is the less common spelling; I show the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron following the Vulgate at Matt. 22:44b, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, the Arabic Diatessaron *prima facie* follows the variant. On the one hand, it is possible to argue that the Arabic Diatessaron might be following a corrupt form of Mark 12:36 and / or Luke 20:43 here, rather than a corrupt form of Matt. 22:44b. But on the other hand, Ciasca draws the conclusion that the general structure of Matt. 22:41-46 is being followed here; and I concur with him. What if the assessment of Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron is wrong at this point? For the purposes of the NT text, it does not matter. For the New Testament, only the Byzantine Greek and Latin that both had general accessibility over time and through time, are in the closed class of sources used to compose the NT Greek text. Like other manuscripts outside the closed class of sources, we neo-Byzantines do not use the Arabic to determine the New Testament text; which is just as well, for it is a tongue I do not know; and so I am grateful for Ciasca's Latin translation of it. Thus I show the Arabic Diatessaron following the variant, *infra*.

---

[167] From the Latin language of French, meaning, "That's life."

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 22:44b, the TR's Greek, "*e<u>o</u>s an* (till) *th<u>o</u>* ('I put' = 'I make,' AV) *tous* (the) *echthrous* (enemies) *sou* (of thee) *upopodion* ('the footstool,' neuter singular accusative noun, from *upopodion*) *t<u>on</u>* (of the) *pod<u>on</u>* (the feet) *sou* (of thee)," i.e., "till I make thine enemies thy footstool (*upopodion*)" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings). "Thy footstool" is further supported as Latin, "*scabillum* ('the footstool,' neuter singular accusative noun, from *scabillum*) *pedum* (of the feet) *tuorum* (of thee)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century) and the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century); and (with the alternative spelling of "*scabillum*" as "*scabellum*" from "*scabellum*,") in old Latin Versions a (4th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested (with the spelling "*scabellum*") in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported as Latin, "*scabellum* (the footstool) *pedibus* (at the feet) *tuis* (thy)," i.e., "thy footstool," in old Latin Version c (12th / 13th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; the ancient church Greek writer, Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); and the ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367).

However, a variant reads Greek, "*e<u>o</u>s an* (till) *th<u>o</u>* (I put) *tous* (the) *echthrous* (enemies) *sou* (of thee) *upokat<u>o</u>* (preposition + genitive = 'under') *t<u>on</u>* ('of the,' masculine plural <u>genitive</u> definite article from *o*) *pod<u>on</u>* ('the feet,' masculine plural <u>genitive</u> noun, from *pous*) *sou* (of thee)," i.e., "till I put thy enemies under (*upokat<u>o</u>*) thy feet." This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codices G 011 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), and Gamma 036 (10th century); and Minuscule 2 (12th century). It is further found as Latin, "*sub* (preposition + ablative = 'under') *pedibus* ('feet,' masculine plural <u>ablative</u> noun, from *pes*) *tuis* (thy)," i.e., "under thy feet," in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), h (5th century), and q (6th / 7th century); and as Latin, "*suptus* (possessive adverb, *supo* / 'strewn' + *tus* / 'from the') *pedes* (feet) *tuos* (thy)," i.e., "strewn from thy feet," in old Latin Version d (5th century). It is also found in the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is thus correct. The origins of the variant are conjectural.

Was this an accidental alteration? Due to a paper fade / loss, did the original "*upopodion* (the footstool)" come to look something like, "*upo::::::*"? Did a scribe then "reconstruct" this "from context" as "*upokat<u>o</u>* (under)"? Was he influenced in this "reconstruction" by some familiarity with the "*upokat<u>o</u>* (under)" of Heb. 2:8?

Was this a deliberate alteration? Did a scribe think it "a stylistic improvement" to alter the "*upopodion* (the footstool)" of Matt. 22:44b to "*upokat<u>o</u>* (under)"? If so, was

his motive connected with a desire to "strengthen the nexus" between Pss. 8:6 and 110:1 as found in Matt. 22:44b and Heb. 2:8?

A deliberate or accidental alteration?   We cannot be sure.   But we can be sure that this was an alteration to the *Textus Receptus* (TR) here preserved for us in the representative Byzantine reading.

The TR's reading has rock solid support in both the Greek and Latin textual traditions dating from ancient times, including St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate.   It also enjoys the support of the church fathers, St. Cyril in the Greek, and St. Hilary in the Latin.   By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek, though some stronger support in the Latin.   Taking these factors into account, and bearing in mind the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 22:44b an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 22:44b, "thy footstool (*upopodion*)," i.e., "till I make thine enemies thy footstool" (AV), is found in (the independent) Codex 0107 (7th century, Matt. 22-23 & Mark 4-5) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent), and 1071 (12th century, independent).   It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*.   It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant, "under (*upokato*) thy feet" i.e., "till I put thy enemies under thy feet," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) and 579 (13th century, mixed text); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.   It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); and Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.   It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century) as Latin, "*sub* (under) *pedibus* (feet) *tuis* (thy)," i.e., "under thy feet."

At Matt. 22:44b, the erroneous variant entered the NU Text *et al*. Hence the ASV reads, "Till I put thine enemies underneath thy feet." This incorrect reading is also found at Matt. 22:44b in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, TEV, TCNT, NEB, REB, and Moffatt.

The old Latin Papists of the post Trent and pre-Vatican II Councils, here following the Clementine at Matt. 22:44b correctly read in their Douay-Rheims Version, "until I make thy enemies thy footstool." But the new post-Vatican II Council neo-Alexandrian Papists of the *RSV Catholic Edition* (1965) and *Jerusalem Bible* (1966) disagreed, and excising their Alexandrian text pincer arm, followed the variant. But the neo-Alexandrian Papists of the *New Jerusalem Bible* (1985) were not so sure. After all, is there not "a wide support" among various text types with e.g., the Byzantine, Latin, "Caesarean" (Armenian Version), and Syriac (Harclean)? Does not "the queen of Minuscules," Minuscule 33 here follow the TR? And so it was, that exercising their non-Alexandrian text pincer arm, the translators of the *New Jerusalem Bible* did an about-face and adopted the correct reading here at Matt. 22:44b. But as is usually the case when one neo-Alexandrian version (or text) uses the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm of the Neo-Alexandrian School, none of the other neo-Alexandrians agreed. (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 21:24a.)