

Matt. 26:3 “and the scribes” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron which is a Vulgate Codex reads the same as the Latin Vulgate at Matt. 26:3, “*principes* (‘the principal’ = ‘the chief’) *sacerdotum* (of priests) *et* (and) *seniores* (the elders) *populi* (of the people).” This is quite different to the Vulgate at Mark 14:1 which reads, “*summi* (‘the highest’ = ‘the summit’ = ‘the chief’) *sacerdotes* (priests) *et* (and) *scribae* (the scribes),” and so I think we can fairly say that the Sangallensis Diatessaron (Sangallensis Diatessaron chapter CLIII) is here following *Variant 2, infra*.

Outside the close class of sources, Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron shows the Matt. 26:3 reading in Ciasca’s Latin at Latin-Arabic Diatessaron chapter 44; and the Mark 14:1 reading earlier in Ciasca’s Latin at Latin-Arabic Diatessaron chapter 41. There thus seems to be a clear distinction in the mind of the Diatessaron formatter(s) that these references are distinctive, and hence on this occasion I consider the presence of Latin, “*et* (and) *scribae* (the scribes),” at Latin-Arabic Diatessaron chapter 44 warrants me showing this Diatessaron following the TR’s reading, *infra*. This then raises the issue, What if I am wrong with regard to the Diatessaron formatter(s) of the Arabic Diatessaron making a clear distinction in their text between Matt. 26:3 and Mark 14:1? It does not ultimately matter. The Arabic Diatessaron is outside the closed class of sources, and so like other manuscripts outside the closed class of sources, it has no impact whatsoever on the determination of the NT text.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:3 the TR’s Greek, “*kai* (and) *oi* (the) *grammateis* (scribes)” (AV), in the wider words, “the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders of the people” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), Pi 041 (9th century), and Gamma 036 (10th 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 found as Latin, “*et* (and) *scribae* (the scribes),” in old Latin Versions ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), r1 (7th century) and c (12th / 13th century). It is further found in the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); and the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation.

Variant 1 reading, “*kai* (and) *oi* (the) *Pharisaioi* (Pharisees),” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53).

Variant 2 omitting Greek, “*kai* (and) *oi* (the) *grammateis* (scribes),” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-

28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25). It is further omitted in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century for earliest Vulgate Codices in the Gospels), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th 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 in the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430); and the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation.

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

Was *Variant 1* an accidental alteration? Did a manuscript that originally read, “*kai* (and) *oi* (the) *grammateis* (scribes),” as a consequence of a paper fade / loss, come to look something like, “*kai oi ::::a:::*”? Possibly influenced by “Pharisees (*oi Pharisaioi*)” after “the (*oi*) chief priests (*archieis*)” in Matt. 21:45; 27:62; did a scribe then “reconstruct” this here at Matt. 26:3 as “*kai* (and) *oi* (the) *Pharisaioi* (Pharisees)”?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate alteration? Did a scribe consider the reference to “*oi* (the) *Pharisaioi* (Pharisees)” at Matt. 27:62, “contextually required their introduction here” at Matt. 26:3? Did he thus deliberately change the text as “a stylistic improvement”? If so, he was surely wrong to do so since there is clearly a sufficient sequential brake between these two verses to rebut such a claim, as Matt. 26:2 deals with the immediate events of Christ's death, whereas “much water has passed under the bridge” by the time “the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate” at Matt. 27:62. To the rejoinder, “Isn't that too obvious?,” it should be remembered that *by definition* those who wilfully seek to tamper with God's Word are blinded by their arrogance, as they engage in their textual criticism of God's unerring Word.

Was *Variant 2* an accidental alteration? The wider immediate context reads, “*archieis* (chief priests) *kai* (and) *oi* (the) *grammateis* (scribes) *kai* (and) *oi* (the) *presbuteroi* (or *presbyteroi* = ‘elders’)” etc. . After writing, “*archieis* (chief priests),” did a scribe's eye jump by ellipsis from the “*eis*” endings followed by “*kai oi*” of “*archieis kai oi*” to “*grammateis kai oi*”, and then copy down this second “*kai oi*” followed by “*presbuteroi*”, thus accidentally omitting “*kai* (and) *oi* (the) *grammateis* (scribes)”?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate alteration? Did a scribe, influenced by the usage of the terminology of “*ton* (the) *archieion* (chief priests) *kai* (and) *presbuteron* (elders) *tou* (of the) *laou* (people)” at Matt. 26:47, with “*oi* (the) *archieis* (chief priests) *kai* (and) *oi* (-) *presbuteroi*” at Matt. 26:59a (cf. commentary at Matt. 26:59a, *infra*) and / or Matt. 27:1; think it “a stylistic improvement” to “standardize” Matt. 26:3 to similar terminology? Did he thus deliberately prune away the words, “*kai* (and) *oi* (the) *grammateis* (scribes)” so as to make Matt. 26:3 conform precisely with Matt. 26:59 and / or Matt. 27:1?

Were these deliberate or accidental changes, or was one deliberate and the other accidental? We do not know. We cannot now know. But we can know that both were alterations to the original autographs preserved for us in the apographs of the Received Text here found in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR's support has rock solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading over time, and through time, dating from ancient times as attested to by St. Chrysostom, against which there is no good textual argument. This ancient testimony of St. Chrysostom is further supported by half a dozen old Latin Versions, two of which are also from ancient times, and three of which are from early mediaeval times. By contrast, *Variant 1* has weak support in the Greek and no support in the Latin; and *Variant 2* has weak support in the Greek but 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 this occasion I consider that the Latin support dating from both ancient times and early mediaeval times, is enough to *just bring* the representative Byzantine reading "over the line" of a high level "B" in the range of 71-74%, and into the range of a 75-76% "A;" and the additional support from ancient times in the Greek from the church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom, the "golden-mouthed" preacher who was sometime afore Archbishop of Constantinople¹, then catapults this low level "A" into more starry heights than any such low level "A." Thus on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 26:3 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 26:3, "and the scribes," in the wider words, "the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders of the people," etc., is found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century, with the same reading in English, omitting the "oi" / "the," before "*grammateis*" / "scribes"). It is also found in Minuscules 157 (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; the Armenian Version (5th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

It is also found in the similar reading of "the chief priests, the elders, and the scribes of the people," found in Minuscule 1071 (12th century, independent). This variant looks like a scribe first omitted "*grammateis* (scribes)" by ellipsis (see "Was *Variant 2* an accidental alteration?," *supra*), but then realizing his mistake, quickly added it back in after "*oi* (the) *presbuteroi* (elders)," on the basis that he considered, "it still meant the same thing."

However, the variant which omits "and the scribes," and so reads simply, "the chief priests and elders of the people," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts,

¹ Greek *chrysostomos* (golden-mouthed) is from *chruseos* (golden) and *stoma* (mouth).

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 (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and 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), and 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*; 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 Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century); the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

At Matt. 26:3 the erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. Hence the ASV reads, “the chief priests, and the elders of the people” etc. . So too the incorrect variant is found at Matt. 26:3 in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

In older times, we neo-Byzantines of the *Textus Receptus* defended the TR’s reading of Matt. 26:3 against the old Latin Papists of the post *Council of Trent* (1545-63) and pre-*Vatican II Council* (1962-5) times, for it is found in both the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version. Hence the Latin based Douay-Rheims reads at Matt. 26:3, “the chief priests and the ancients of the people” etc. . In contemporary times, we neo-Byzantines of the *Textus Receptus* now defend the TR’s reading of Matt. 26:3 against the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post *Vatican II Council* times, for the variant is also found in the Papist’s Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB. In the words of King Solomon, “there is no new thing under the sun” (Eccl. 1:9).

Matt. 26:8 “his disciples” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The text-type manuscript classifications I generally follow for Codices and Minuscules are those found in Kurt Aland’s *The Text of the New Testament* (1989). Although (per update 2015, Vol. 5 on Mark 1-3, Corrigenda, Appendix 6,) upon review of the selection of readings I have seen from St. Matthew’s Gospel and the early part of St. Mark’s Gospel, I have come to disagree with Aland’s assessment that Minuscule 69 (15th century) is “an independent text” “in Paul, but” “purely or predominantly Byzantine” “elsewhere².” Rather, I have come to the conclusion that in those parts of

² Kurt Aland *et unum*, *The Text of the New Testament*, An Introduction to the Critical Editions & to the Theory & Practice of Modern Textual Criticism, translated by E.F. Rhodes, 2nd ed., Eerdmans, Michigan, USA, 1989, pp. 106 & 129.

Matthew and Mark I have looked at, it is a mixed text type, and so like the other Family 13 Manuscripts, it is outside the closed class of sources in Matthew and the early parts of Mark (and as at 2015, I have not examined other parts of it with regard to the issue of text type). (This also raises the question, Are the statements found in Aland's *The Text of the New Testament* a typographical error in this work's publication? Or do they represent Aland's view that what I consider to be mixed text type in Matthew and the early parts of Mark are what Aland considers to be 'Byzantine' text type?).

Tischendorf (1869-72) shows Minuscule 69 (15th century, mixed text type in e.g., Matthew's Gospel) following the variant. Swanson (1995) shows Minuscule 69 (15th century, mixed text type in e.g., Matthew's Gospel) following the variant, but the Family 1 and other Family 13 manuscripts following the TR's reading; whereas Nestle-Aland (1993) show the Family 1 manuscripts following the TR and the Family 13 manuscripts following the variant. Under the circumstances, outside the closed class of sources I shall show the Family 1 manuscripts following the TR (Swanson, & Nestle-Aland). But I shall make no reference to the remaining Family 13 manuscripts outside the closed class of sources (and in harmony with my 2015 update general, though not absolute, policy, I shall make no reference to Minuscule 69 either).

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:8 the TR's Greek, "*oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples) *autou* (of him)," i.e., "his disciples" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and Pi 041 (9th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, twice in two different readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings). It is also supported as Latin, "*discipuli* (the disciples) *eius* (of him)," i.e., "his disciples," in old Latin Versions f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Basil the Great (d. 379) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation.

However, a variant omitting Greek "*autou* (of him)," and so reading simply, "*oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples)," i.e., "the disciples," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 48 (1055 A.D.). It is also found as Latin, "*discipuli* (the disciples)," 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), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th 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).

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

Was the variant an accidental omission? Coming at the end of a line, was the “*autou* (of him)” lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was the variant a deliberate omission? Did a prunist scribe consider that if “*oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples)” “was sufficient” at Matt. 26:17,19, “then it was sufficient here” at Matt. 26:8 “too”? Did he then arrogantly prune away the “*autou* (of him)” in order “to produce a more succinct text,” that was “more in keeping with the less wordy language of our modern times” in the ancient times in which he lived?

Was this a deliberate or accidental omission? Are all manuscripts lines of the variant necessarily related i.e., might the “*autou* (of him)” have been accidentally lost by a paper fade in the Greek manuscript line of Lectionary 48, but deliberately pruned away in the manuscript line that the Vulgate and other old Latin Versions got it from? Alas, so much is lost to us in the unrecorded dark ages of textual transmission history that we are just left guessing, albeit with what we hope and pray are reasonable and educated guesses. But one thing we do not have to guess about is this. The text of Scripture was here providentially preserved for us in the representative Byzantine reading. Let us thank God, that he undertakes to preserve his Word!

The TR’s reading has rock solid support in the Byzantine Greek textual tradition, over time, and through time, dating from ancient times. It has the further support of a few old Latin versions, two of which are from early mediaeval times; and enjoys the support of the ancient church fathers and doctors, St. Basil the Great of Caesarea and St. John Chrysostom of Constantinople. By contrast the variant has weak support in the Greek, although it has strong support in the Latin. Weighing up these factors, and bearing in mind the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, I consider that the Latin support which dates from early mediaeval times, when coupled with the additional support from ancient times in the Greek of the learned doctors, St. Basil the Great and St. John Chrysostom, rockets the rating of the TR’s reading into higher sky than simply a low level “A” in the range of 75-76%. Thus on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 26:8 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 26:8, “his disciples,” is found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and 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 579 (13th century, mixed text); as well as the *Family I Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is further found in all extant Syriac Versions; a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant which omits “his” and so reads simply, “the disciples,” 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) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as Minuscles 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), and 1071 (12th century, independent). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Armenian Version (5th century).

At Matt. 26:8 the erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence the ASV reads, “the disciples.” So too the incorrect variant is found at Matt. 26:8 in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

The old Latin Papists of pre-Vatican II Council times also followed the variant in their Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version, which at Matt. 26:8 reads, “the disciples (Latin, *discipuli*).” The new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post-Vatican II Council times, evidently impressed with the way their predecessors had here hacked away a word from the *Textus Receptus*, gaily joined in as these “hackers” also followed the variant in their Roman *Catholic RSV* (1965), *JB* (1966), and *NJB* (1985).

Matt. 26:9b “ointment” (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Outside the closed class of sources, Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron *prima facie* follows the variant. But the reading designated by Ciasca as “Matt. 26:9” is preceded by “Mark 14:4” and followed by “Mark 14:5,” and stylistically it is certainly possibly that the omission of the variant came about from Diatessaron formatting with Mark 14:5. Therefore no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*. (Inside the closed class of sources this reading is absent from the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron.)

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:9b, the TR’s Greek, “*to* (‘the,’ redundant in English translation) *muron* (ointment),” i.e., “ointment” in the wider words, “For this ointment might have been sold for much” etc. (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices K 017 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), and Gamma 036 (10th century); Minuscles 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, twice in two different readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings). It is also supported as Latin, “*unguentum* (ointment),” in old Latin Versions q (6th / 7th century) and c (12th / 13th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, a variant omitting Greek “*to* (-) *muron* (ointment),” and hence reading

simply, “For this *thing* might have been sold for much” etc. (showing italics for added word), is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is further found 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), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th 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, Basil the Great (d. 379); and the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation.

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

Was the variant an accidental omission? Was the “*to (-) muron* (ointment)” “squeezed in” under a final line on a page? Was it then accidentally lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was the variant a deliberate omission? Did a prunist scribe consider that in view of the reference to “ointment” in Matt. 26:7 (‘of ... ointment,’ *murou* from *muron*) and 26:12 (‘ointment,’ *muron* from *muron*), that “the repetition of *to muron* here” at Matt. 26:9b “was unnecessarily wordy”? Did he then prune away the “*to (-) muron* (ointment)” as “a stylistic improvement”?

A deliberate or accidental omission? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that it was an omission from the Received Text here preserved for us in the representative Byzantine reading.

The TR’s reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading over time, and through time, dating from ancient times as attested to by the church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom. It also has the support of a couple of old Latin versions, one from early mediaeval times. By contrast, the variant has relatively weak support in the Greek, although it is a minority reading dating in the Greek from ancient times; and it also has strong support in the Latin. 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. 26:9b 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. 26:9b, “ointment” in the wider words, “For this ointment might have been sold for much” etc., is 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), 1071 (12th century, independent), 579 (13th century, mixed text), 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels). It is further found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.*

However, the variant omitting “ointment,” and so reading simply, “For this *thing* might have been sold for much” etc. (showing italics for added word), 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 089 (6th century, Matt. 26:2-4,7-9), (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); and Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), and 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Thus at Matt. 26:9b the English Standard Version reads, “For this could have been sold for a large sum” etc. (ESV).

At Matt. 26:9b the American Standard Version reads with “ointment” in italics as an added word, “For this *ointment* might have been sold for much” (ASV). The variant is followed with this same type of italics format in the NASB. *Prima facie* the TR’s reading is followed at Matt. 26:9b in the RSV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV; although given their non-usage of italics, and the monolithic support of the neo-Alexandrian texts for the variant, the more likely construction must be that this is regarded as “an added word supplied by the translators” of the RSV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV. But given their non-usage of italics for added words, how can we be sure which reading the RSV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV are here following? We cannot be sure, and nor can any of their benighted devotees.

The old Latin Papists of the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version followed the variant at Matt. 26:9b. Hence the Douay-Rheims reads, “For this might have been sold for much” etc. . So too, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists clearly followed the variant in their JB and NJB. *Well, ... at least they were clear about the fact that they did not support the TR’s reading, ... although, ... their [Roman] Catholic RSV suffers from the same ambiguity as does the RSV, supra.*

Matt. 26:17a “unto him” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, *prima facie* the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron follows the variant here in omitting Latin, “*ei* (‘unto him,’ word 7).” But whereas in the Greek, “*auto* (‘unto him,’ word 7),” is present at Matt. 22:17a, Mark 14:12, & Luke 22:9; in the Latin Vulgate, the “*ei* (‘unto him,’ word 7)” is only present at Mark 14:12. Given that the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex, it is possible that due to Diatessaron formatting this omission was introduced from Luke 22:9. (Even though general stylistic features here at Sangallensis Diatessaron chapter clvii follow the six words of the Vulgate’s Matt. 26:17a, reference is also made in this Diatessaron chapter to e.g., Luke 22:11.) Therefore no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:17a the TR’s Greek, “*auto* (unto him),” in the wider words, “*proselthon* (‘they came’ = ‘came,’ word 1) *oi* (‘the,’ word 2) *mathetai* (‘disciples,’ word 3) *to* (‘to the,’ word 4) *Iesou* (‘Jesus,’ word 5) *legontes* (‘saying,’ word 6) *auto* (‘unto him,’ word 7),” i.e., “the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto him” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25) and M 021 (9th century); Minuscule 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, abbreviating word 5 as “*w*” with a line on top; and writing word 7 with a closed omega as something like, “*ω∞*” with the “*τ*” above the line in the middle of the omega / “*∞*”) and 1968 (1544 A.D., abbreviating word 5 as “*w*” with a line on top; and writing word 7 with an open omega as, “*ωω*” with the “*τ*” above the line in the middle of the omega / “*ω*”). It is also supported as Latin, “*accesserunt* (‘they came’ = ‘came,’ word 1) *discipuli* (‘the disciples,’ words 2 & 3) *ad* (‘to,’ word 4) *Iesum* (‘Jesus,’ word 5) *dicentes* (‘saying,’ word 6) *ei* (‘unto him,’ word 7),” in old Latin Versions f (6th century) and q (6th / 7th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation.

Variant 1, omits Greek “*auto* (‘unto him,’ word 7),” and places words 4 and 5 after word 6, thus reading Greek, “*proselthon* (‘they came’ = ‘came,’ word 1) *oi* (‘the,’ word 2) *mathetai* (‘disciples,’ word 3) *legontes* (‘saying,’ word 6) *to* (‘to the,’ word 4) *Iesou* (‘Jesus,’ word 5),” i.e., “the disciples came, saying to Jesus.” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53, abbreviating word 5 as “*IU*” with a line on top) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century).

Variant 2, omitting Greek “*auto* (‘unto him,’ word 7),” and so reading simply, “the disciples came to Jesus, saying,” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codices K 017 (9th century) and Pi 041 (9th century). It is further found as Latin, “*accesserunt* (‘they came’ = ‘came,’ word 1) *discipuli* (‘the disciples,’ words 2 & 3) *ad* (‘to,’ word 4) *Iesum* (‘Jesus,’ word 5) *dicentes* (‘saying,’ word 6) in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century, omitting word 4³), and making word 5 “*Iesu*”), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), aur (7th century),

³ The Latin *ad* is a preposition used with an accusative i.e., “*ad* (‘to,’ word 4,

l (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 word 5 as “*ihesum*” in its abbreviation “*ihm*”). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found in the ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367).

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

Was *Variant 1* an accidental alteration? In a manuscript that abbreviated word 5 to “*Iu*” with a bar on top, did this originally read, “*t̄o* (‘to,’ word 4) *Iu* (‘Jesus,’ word 5) *legontes* (‘saying,’ word 6) *aut̄o* (‘unto him,’ word 7),” with the “*t̄o Iu*” coming at the end of a line? Due to a paper fade / loss, was “*t̄o Iu*” at the end of one line lost, with the “*legontes aut̄o*” of the next line coming to look something like, “*legontes ::t̄o*”, followed by a stylistic paper space before the following quotation, “*Pou* (Where) *theleis* (wilt thou)” etc.? Did a scribe then “reconstruct” this “from context” as “*legontes t̄o Iu*”?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate alteration? Did an arrogant prunist scribe consider it would be “a stylistic improvement” to prune away “the unnecessarily wordy” “*aut̄o* (‘unto him,’ word 7),” here at Matt. 26:17a, and then reposition the “*t̄o* (‘to the,’ word 4) *Iesou* (‘Jesus,’ word 5)” after the “*legontes* (‘saying,’ word 6)” in order “to achieve greater clarity in greater word economy”? Were these the machinations of one of the “many which corrupt the Word of God” (II Cor. 2:17)?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental alteration? In a manuscript did “*aut̄o* (‘unto him,’ word 7),” come at the end of a line, possibly abbreviated to e.g., “*auo*” with the “*i*” on top, (as occurs in various places of the later Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), or was it in some other way abbreviated? Whether or not it was abbreviated, was it then lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate alteration? Did a prunist scribe consider it would be “a stylistic improvement” to prune away “the unnecessarily wordy” “*aut̄o* (‘unto him,’ word 7),” in order to make “a more succinct text”? Were these the deluded schemings of one of the “many which corrupt the Word of God” (II Cor. 2:17)?

Were these deliberate or accidental alterations? Or was one deliberate, and the other accidental? We do not know. We cannot know. But we can know that these were both alterations to the pure Word of God here preserved for us in the representative

preposition with accusative) *Iesum* (‘Jesus,’ word 5, masculine singular accusative noun, from *Iesus*);” whereas old Latin *d* conveys the same idea with a dative, “*Iesu* (‘to Jesus,’ masculine singular dative noun, from *Iesus*).” The underpinning Greek is also in the dative, “*t̄o* (‘to the,’ word 4, masculine singular dative, definite article from *o*) *Iesou* (‘Jesus,’ word 5, masculine singular dative noun, from *Iesous*; a semi-indeclinable proper noun that uses the same singular genitive form in vocative, genitive, and dative),” and so in this respect the Latin form of old Latin *d* resembles the Greek.

Byzantine text.

The *Textus Receptus* (TR) reading has rock solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading over time, and through time, dating from ancient times. It also has the support of a couple of old Latin Versions from early mediaeval times, and one ancient church writer. By contrast, *Variant 1* has weak support in the Greek, and no support in the Latin; and *Variant 2* has weak support in the Greek, but strong support in the Latin dating from ancient times. Origen's standard varies from very bad, to very good, and everything in between, so that one must use him cautiously and critically. But on this occasion, the fact that the TR's reading enjoys majority Byzantine support dating from ancient times, means that one can use Origen's citation as a further plank of notable support. Weighing up these factors, and bearing in mind the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, I consider that the Latin support dating from early mediaeval times, together with both the antiquity of the Greek Byzantine textual tradition's support, as well as the additional support of the ancient church writer, Origen, is enough to *just bring* the TR's reading "over the line" of a high level "B" in the range of 71-74%, and into the range of a 75-76% "A." Thus on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 26:17a 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. 26:17a, "unto him" in the wider words, "the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto him" etc., is found in Minuscules 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere) and 157 (12th century, independent); 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 Version (1708, Schaafius); and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Variant 1 which omits word 7 ("unto him") and places words 4 ("to") and 5 ("Jesus") after word 6 ("saying"), thus reading, "the disciples came, saying to Jesus," is 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).

Variant 2, which omits word 7 ("unto him") and so reads simply, "the disciples came to Jesus, saying," 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 independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text). It is also found in the Syriac

Harclean h Version (616); the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and the Armenian Version (5th century).

At Matt. 26:17a the erroneous *Variant 2* was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence the ASV reads, “the disciples came to Jesus, saying,” etc. . The incorrect *Variant 2* is also found at Matt. 26:17a in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and Papists’ JB and NJB.

Prima facie the NEB and REB both follow *Variant 1* at Matt. 26:17a; and *prima facie* both the TEV and Moffatt both follow the TR’s reading at Matt. 26:17a, e.g., the Moffatt Bible reads, “the disciples of Jesus came up and said to him,” etc. . On the one hand, when considering these four very liberal, loose, and unreliable versions; given the monolithic support of neo-Alexandrian texts for *Variant 2*, in the case of the NEB, REB, and TEV, and von Soden’s main text in the case of Moffatt, *prima facie* all of these four versions are following *Variant 2*; i.e., with the NEB and REB “translators” rearranging the sentence structure to something that simply looks like *Variant 1*, and both the TEV and Moffatt “adding in” the “to him” (Moffatt), as part of “the act of translation.” But on the other hand, it is also possible that one or all of them are exercising their non-Alexandrian text pincer arm (see comments in Vol. 3 at Matt. 21:24a; and Vol. 4 at Matt. 26:27; Matt. 26:28b; Matt. 26:33b; Matt. 26:42a; Matt. 26:43; Matt. 26:44b; Matt. 26:65; Matt. 26:70; Matt. 26:71a; Matt. 26:71c; Matt. 26:75b; Matt. 26:67; Matt. 27:2a; Matt. 27:4b; Matt. 27:5; Matt. 27:16,17; Matt. 27:21a; Matt. 27:23; Matt. 27:43; Matt. 27:58; Matt. 28:6a; Matt. 28:6b; Matt. 28:14; & Matt. 28:17; or Vol. 5, Mark 1:2d). If so, the NEB and REB would be basing this on a combination of W 032 and Sigma 042, coupled with the *Family 1 Manuscripts* in favour of *Variant 1*; and the TEV and Moffatt would be basing this on the majority Latin text, coupled with some of the Greek Minuscules such as those of the *Family 13 Manuscripts* which follow this reading. So at Matt. 26:17a, are the NEB and REB following *Variant 1* or *Variant 2*, and are the TEV and Moffatt following the TR’s reading or *Variant 2*? Alas, the fact that none of these four versions use italics for added words, coupled with the loose’n’liberal principles of so called “dynamic equivalence” upon which they all “translate,” means that neither we nor any of their benighted devotees can really know. Such are the vagaries of the NEB, REB, TEV, and Moffatt Bible.

The old Latin Papists in their Douay-Rheims here followed *Variant 2* and rendered Matt. 26:17 as, “And on the first day of the Azymes, the disciples came to Jesus, saying: Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the pasch?” (emphasis mine). With regard to this obscure and unclear terminology of “Azymes” and “pasch,” I draw the good Christian reader’s attention to “The Translators to the Reader” section of the King James Bible of 1611, which at the sub-section entitled, “Reasons inducing us not to stand curiously upon an identity of phrasing,” says, “we have on the one side avoided the scrupulosity of the Puritans, who leave the old Ecclesiastical words, and betake to other, as when they put ‘washing’ for ‘baptism,’ and ‘Congregation’ instead of ‘Church’; as also on the other side we have shunned the obscurity of the Papists, in their ‘Azymes,’ ... ‘Pasche,’ and a number of such like, whereof their late [Douay-Rheims] translation is full, and that of purpose to darken the sense, that since they must needs translate the

Bible, yet by the language thereof it may be kept from being understood. But we desire that the Scripture may speak like itself, as in the language of *Canaan*, that it may be understood ...⁴” Let us thank God for the clarity of our King James Bibles which avoid such obscurities as e.g., the Puritans’ “washing” for “baptizing” at Matt. 28:19 where we read in the AV, “Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost” (emphasis mine); and let us thank God for the clarity of our King James Bibles which at e.g., Matt. 26:17, avoid such obscurities as the Papists’ “Azymes” and “pasch”!

Matt. 26:20 “the twelve” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron here reads, “*XII* (the twelve) *discipulis* (disciples) *suus* (his)” (Diatessaron chapter clviii). This Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex, and the Latin Vulgate reads at Matt. 26:20, “*duodecim* (the twelve) *discipulis* (disciples);” at Mark 14:17, “*duodecim* (the twelve);” and at Luke 22:14, “*duodecim* (the twelve) *apostoli* (apostles).” Therefore this appears to be one of those unusual times in which the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron *might* have been influenced by old Latin Versions⁵, although this is by no means certain here at Matt. 26:20 since a number of Vulgate Codices following this same reading (*Variant 2*) are referred to by both Merk and Weber-Gryson. But either way, the Sangallensis Diatessaron here follows *Variant 2, infra*.

I also here remind the reader that the absence of any reference to Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron in either the preliminary discussions or citations outside the closed class of sources, *infra*, such as occurs at this reading, means that no reference is made to that part of the verse in question in the Arabic Diatessaron. For while all Diatessarons are so named because they adopt the Diatessaron formatting idea of Tatian’s Diatessaron in which they seek to “harmonize” the four gospels into one continuous work, in practice, different selections and different “harmonizations” may and do occur in different Diatessarons. Thus even though in this textual commentary only two Diatessarons are generally featured, namely, inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron, and outside the closed class of sources, Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron; if more Diatessarons are consulted, this issue of diversity in Diatessaron formatting will in turn escalate into more and more examples.

⁴ “The Translators to the Reader” (Scrivener’s 1873 Cambridge Paragraph Bible, reprint in Trinitarian Bible Society’s *Classic Reference Bible*, Cambridge University Press, The Queen’s Printer, under Royal Letters Patent, Cambridge, England, UK, for the Trinitarian Bible Society, Tyndale House, London, UK, 2004).

⁵ See my comments in Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), Preface, at “2) The Diatessaron.”

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:20 the TR's Greek, "*ton* (the) *dodeka* (twelve)," i.e. "the twelve" in the wider words, "he sat down with the twelve," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices K 017 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), and Gamma 036 (10th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), 1006 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Revelation), 2 (12th century), 180 (12th century, Byzantine other than in Acts), 1010 (12th century), 597 (13th century), 1292 (13th century, Byzantine outside of the General Epistles), and 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as Latin, "*duodecim* (the twelve)," in old Latin Version d (5th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Eusebius (d. 339) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

Variant 1 is Greek "*ton* (the) *dodeka* (twelve) *matheton* (disciples)," i.e., "the twelve disciples" in the wider words, "he sat down with the twelve disciples." This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); Minuscule 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels); and Lectionary 253 (1020 A.D.). It is further found as Latin, "*duodecim* (the twelve) *discipulis* (disciples)," in a number of Vulgate Codices of Jerome's Latin Vulgate, e.g., Codex Ep (*Codex Epternacensis*, 9th century, Paris, France); and old Latin Versions f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), r1 (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D., written as "*xii dis*"). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Basil the Great (d. 379) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430).

Variant 2 may be reconstructed from the Latin as Greek, "*ton* (the) *dodeka* (twelve) *matheton* (disciples) *autou* (of him)," i.e., "his twelve disciples" in the wider words, "he sat down with his twelve disciples." It is found as Latin, "*duodecim* (the twelve) *discipulis* (disciples) *suis* (his)," in a number of Vulgate Codices of Jerome's Latin Vulgate, e.g., Codices F (*Codex Fuldensis*, 6th century, Fulda, Germany), Z (*Codex Harleianus*, 6th / 7th century, London, UK), P (6th / 7th century, The Split, Croatia)⁶, and C (9th century, *Codex Cavensis*, produced in Spain, now at La Cava, Salerno, southern Italy); and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), aur (7th 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).

Variant 3 may be reconstructed from the Latin as Greek, "*ton* (the) *matheton* (disciples)," i.e., "the disciples" in the wider words, "he sat down with the disciples." It is found as Latin, "*discipulis* (the disciples)," in old Latin Version 1 (7th / 8th century).

⁶ Latin Codex P as designated in Weber-Gryson (2007) rather than Merk (1964).

Variant 4 may be reconstructed from the Latin as Greek, as “*ton* (the) *matheton* (disciples) *autou* (of him),” i.e., “his disciples” in the wider words, “he sat down with his disciples.” It is found as Latin, “*discipulis* (disciples) *suis* (his),” in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation.

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

Was *Variant 1* an accidental addition? Did the words “*ton* (the) *dodeka* (twelve),” come at the end of a line on a page in a given manuscript? Was this part of the page then damaged and lost? Looking at it, did a scribe conclude “from context” that “it must have read, ‘*ton* (the) *dodeka* (twelve)’ at the end of the line,” which indeed it did, but that “squeezed in underneath must have come the word ‘*matheton* (disciples)’”? If so, was he influenced in this decision by the words of Matt. 20:17, “*tous* (the) *dodeka* (twelve) *mathetas* (disciples)”?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate addition? Did a conflationist scribe deliberately add “*mathetas* (disciples)” at Matt. 26:20 because he “preferred the greater clarity” of passages such as Matt. 10:1 and Matt. 20:17 which refer to the “twelve disciples”?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental addition? Did the Greek words “*ton* (the) *dodeka* (twelve),” or the Latin words “*duodecim* (the twelve),” come at the end of a line on a page in a given manuscript? Was this part of the page then damaged and lost? Looking at it, did a Greek or Latin scribe conclude “from context” that “at the end of the line it must have read,” either Greek “*ton* (the) *dodeka* (twelve) *matheton* (disciples) *autou* (of him),” with “*matheton* (disciples) *autou* (of him),” “squeezed in underneath on the far corner of the page;” or Latin “*duodecim* (the twelve) *discipulis* (disciples) *suis* (his),” with “*discipulis* (disciples) *suis* (his),” “squeezed in underneath on the far corner of the page”? If so, was this Greek or Latin scribe influenced in his decision by the words of Matt. 10:1, Greek “*tous* (the) *dodeka* (twelve) *mathetas* (disciples) *autou* (of him),” or Latin, “*duodecim* (the twelve) *discipulis* (disciples) *suis* (his)”?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate addition? Did a conflationist Greek or Latin scribe deliberately add Greek “*matheton* (disciples) *autou* (of him)” or Latin “*discipulis* (disciples) *suis* (his)” at Matt. 26:20 because he “preferred the greater clarity” of Matt. 10:1 which refers to “his twelve disciples”?

Was *Variant 3* an accidental alteration? Did the Greek words “*ton* (the) *dodeka* (twelve),” or the Latin words “*duodecim* (the twelve),” come at the end of a line on a page in a given manuscript? Was this part of the page then damaged and lost? Looking at it, did a Greek or Latin scribe conclude “from context” that “at the end of the line it must have read,” either Greek “*ton* (the) *matheton* (disciples),” or Latin “*discipulis* (the disciples)”? If so, was this Greek or Latin scribe influenced in his decision by e.g., the nearby words of Matt. 26:19 referring to Greek “*oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples),” or Latin, “*disipuli* (the disciples)”?

Was *Variant 3* a deliberate alteration? Did a corruptor Greek or Latin scribe deliberately alter Greek “*ton* (the) *dodeka* (twelve)” or Latin “*duodecim* (the twelve),” to Greek “*ton* (the) *matheton* (disciples),” or Latin “*discipulis* (the disciples)” respectively, because he “preferred the greater clarity” of verses like Matt. 26:19 which refer to “the disciples” rather than “the twelve”?

Was *Variant 4* an accidental alteration? Did the Greek words “*ton* (the) *dodeka* (twelve),” or the Latin words “*duodecim* (the twelve),” come at the end of a line on a page in a given manuscript? Was this part of the page then damaged and lost? Looking at it, did a Greek or Latin scribe conclude “from context” that “at the end of the line it must have read,” either Greek “*ton* (the) *matheton* (disciples) *autou* (of him),” with “*autou* (of him),” “squeezed in underneath on the far corner of the page;” or Latin “*discipulis* (disciples) *suis* (his),” with “*suis* (his),” “squeezed in underneath on the far corner of the page”? If so, was this Greek or Latin scribe influenced in his decision by the words of e.g., Matt. 26:1, Greek “*tois* (the) *mathetais* (disciples) *autou* (of him),” or Latin, “*discipulis* (disciples) *suis* (his)”?

Was *Variant 4* a deliberate alteration? Did a conflationist Greek or Latin scribe deliberately change the reading to Greek “*ton* (the) *matheton* (disciples) *autou* (of him),” or Latin, “*discipulis* (disciples) *suis* (his),” because at Matt. 26:20 he “preferred the greater clarity” of passages such as e.g., Matt. 5:1; 26:1; 28:7 which refers to “his disciples”?

Were these variants deliberate or accidental alterations, or was one or more deliberate, and one or more accidental? We do not know the answers to such questions, but we do know that all four were alterations to the pure Word of God faithfully preserved for us here at Matt. 26:20 in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR’s reading has strong support in the Greek as the majority Byzantine text over time, and through time; dating in the Greek tongue from ancient times as seen by Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea who was the most ancient author of the *Ecclesiastical History*; and Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople and an ancient doctor of the Church. It further enjoys support in the Latin tongue in an ancient old Latin Version. By contrast, *Variant 1* has relatively weak but notable ancient support in the Greek, and better and ancient support in the Latin. *Variant 2* has no support in the Greek, but some strong support in the Latin. *Variants 3 & 4* both have no support in the Greek, and weak support in the Latin. In the absence of any clear and obvious textual problem with the representative Byzantine text, the absence of Greek support for *Variants 2, 3, & 4* means they can be fairly quickly dismissed under the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. While *Variant 2* has some notable ancient Greek support, this is still a slim minority Byzantine reading with less than *c.* 10% of the Byzantine manuscripts⁷.

⁷ Von Soden says the TR’s reading has the support of his K group and thus *c.* 90% plus of the Byzantine manuscripts. I.e., with a K group of *c.* 1,000 manuscripts this is certainly a large enough sample to safely make broad-brush statistical projections from, out of the larger group of about 4,300 Byzantine manuscripts (about 2,000 Byzantine

Weighing up these factors, and giving all due priority to the Greek of more than *c.* 90% of the Byzantine text manuscripts; on this occasion, even though it has no support in ancient times from any Greek codices, I consider the support for this reading in ancient times from both one old Latin Version, and also two ancient Greek writers, one of whom is the church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom, brings the TR's reading "over the line" of a high level "B" and into the range of an "A." Hence on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 26:20 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. 26:20, "the twelve," in the wider words, "he sat down with the twelve," 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 Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (11th century, independent outside of the General Epistles), 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 some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version, and Georgian "2" Version (5th century).

Variant 1, "the twelve disciples" in the wider words, "he sat down with the twelve disciples," 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), (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), 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 1241 (12th century, Alexandrian corruption in General Epistles, Byzantine text in Acts, independent text elsewhere i.e., independent scribal corruption elsewhere e.g., in the Gospels). It is also found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) and Palestinian (*c.* 6th century) Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions, and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian "1" Version (5th century); Slavic (Slavonic) Version (9th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Codices and Minuscules and about 2,300 Byzantine Lectionaries); although, of course, not all of either the smaller sample K group of *c.* 1,000 manuscripts, nor the larger group of *c.* 4,300 manuscripts, would contain this reading at Matt. 20:26.

Variant 2, “his twelve disciples,” in the wider words, “he sat down with his twelve disciples,” is found in the Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century), and Ethiopic Version (c. 500).

Variant 4, “his disciples,” in the wider words, “he sat down with his disciples,” is found in the Syriac Version (1708, Schaafius).

The split between the two main Alexandrian texts here caused a split among the neo-Alexandrians, frustratingly and irritatingly exacerbated for them by the fact that from the Neo-Alexandrian School’s paradigm both have “external support.” Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72) somewhat predictably resolved this problem by following his beloved Codex Sinaiticus and hence *Variant 1*.

Westcott & Hort were evidently baffled by this one. On the one hand, they wanted to follow their “more neutral” text of Codex Vaticanus, but on the other hand, the “neutral” Alexandrian text was here split. They resolved “the problem” by giving an initial priority to the reading of their beloved Codex Vaticanus in the main text, but then qualified this by putting the “*mathetōn* (disciples)” of *Variant 1* in square brackets after the TR’s “*ton* (the) *dōdeka* (twelve),” thus allowing for either reading in Westcott-Hort (1881). “Well, bewildered Brook,” perhaps mused Hort, “at least we’re neutral here;” and perhaps replied, Westcott, “Well, fickle Fenton, we certainly are, we certainly are.”

“Er, I wonder what I should do?” said Erwin Nestle; who was prepared at times to disagree with Westcott & Hort, but was always very reluctant to do so. Here at Matt. 26:20 he evidently concluded that “Er, if the great brains of Westcott & Hort couldn’t resolve this one, then nor can I,” and so “Er” Erwin Nestle here followed the Westcott & Hort “solution” in Nestle’s 21st edition (1952).

“Ooh, ah,” perhaps said Kurt Aland to Bruce Metzger, “I’ve got the solution, hand me a cigar⁸!” “We’ll put the reading of Codex Vaticanus in the main text,” to which Carlo Martini perhaps interjected, “I like the ring of the sound of that ‘Vaticanus’ manuscript;” “and then,” perhaps continued Aland, “we’ll cast some doubt and aspersions on it in harmony with Codex Sinaiticus.” This “capital idea,” meant that for the wrong reasons, the right reading of the TR was placed in the main text of the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993). But the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions Committees said, “that there is a considerable degree of doubt whether the text” i.e., as per Codex Vaticanus, “or the apparatus” i.e., per Codex Sinaiticus, “contains the superior reading.” The contemporary NU Text Committee

⁸ A Wikipedia article on Kurt Aland shows him about four years before his death, reclining in an armchair and smoking a cigar. The photo is dated to c. 1990, and may be clicked on to gain a higher half-page picture size resolution. (“Kurt Aland,” *Wikipedia*, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kurt_Aland).

adopted the same “solution,” saying, “the Committee had difficulty in deciding which” of the two readings “to place in the text.” On both occasions, Bruce Metzger attracted by the Neo-Alexandrian rule, “the shorter reading is the better reading,” was more blasé about the thing, and blurted out, “the external evidence seems to favour the shorter reading” (Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 64; 2nd ed., 1994, p. 53).

In the fluster’n’flurry of neo-Alexandrian “textual analysts” jumping this way and that, the question became, What are the neo-Alexandrian version translators to make of it all at Matt. 26:20? In the event, they were at sixes’n’sevens over it all.

The ASV adopted *Variant 1* and so reads, “the twelve disciples” in its main text, in accordance with Codex Sinaiticus, but has a footnote giving the TR’s reading in accordance with Codex Vaticanus. This ASV format was also followed at Matt. 26:20 in the RSV. But the ASV’s format was reversed, with the TR’s reading of Codex Vaticanus in the main text, and a footnote referring to the *Variant 1* reading of Codex Sinaiticus in the ESV and NRSV. The NASB, NEB, REB, TCNT, and TEV simply followed the *Variant 1* reading of Codex Sinaiticus with no footnote alternative given; whereas the NIV simply followed the TR’s reading of Codex Vaticanus with no footnote alternative given.

The old Latin Papists of the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims had adopted *Variant 2*, “his twelve disciples.” Thus the Douay-Rheims Version reads at Matt. 26:20, “But when it was evening, he sat down with his twelve disciples.” But the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post-Vatican II Council times decided to take a different tack. But which one? The Roman *Catholic RSV* of 1965 replicated the RSV, and so put the *Variant 1* reading of Codex Sinaiticus in the main text, with a footnote reference to the TR’s reading of Codex Vaticanus. But one year later, the Papists’ *Jerusalem Bible* of 1966 followed the *Variant 1* reading of Codex Sinaiticus with no footnote alternative given; and then about 20 years later, the Papists’ *New Jerusalem Bible* of 1985 followed the TR’s reading of Codex Vaticanus with no footnote alternative given.

Amidst this diversity of views over whether to follow the TR’s reading of Codex Vaticanus, the *Variant 1* reading of Codex Sinaiticus, or the *Variant 2* of the old Latin Papists; then came the notoriously crazy “dunderhead of dunderheads,” James Moffatt. Moffatt decided to follow the very obscure *Variant 3* reading, “the disciples,” whose only support is the early mediaeval manuscript of old Latin Version 1 (7th / 8th century). Thus the Moffatt Bible reads at Matt. 26:20, “When evening was come, he lay at table with the disciples.” What about *Variant 4*, “his disciples”? Well, ... let’s just say that in ancient times it appealed to Origen.

Who but the Neo-Alexandrians, such as those of the NU Text Committee with the apostate Protestants, Kurt Aland and Bruce Metzger, and the Papist, Carlo Martini, would make the qualification to the TR’s reading here at Matt. 26:20 that they follow it, BUT “there is a considerable degree of doubt whether the text” i.e., as per Codex Vaticanus, “or the apparatus” i.e., per Codex Sinaiticus, “contains the superior reading” (1975 & 1983), or “the Committee had difficulty in deciding which” of the readings “to place in

the text” (1993)? Who but the old Latin Papists of the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version could possibly take *Variant 2* seriously? Who but the semi neo-Alexandrian, and apostate Puritan, James Moffatt, could possibly take *Variant 3* seriously? Who but Origen could possibly take *Variant 4* seriously? Such are the twists and turns in the concealed crevices in the darkened minds of just some of the “many which corrupt the Word of God” (II Cor. 2:17).

By contrast, amidst the frustrations and irritations of the Neo-Alexandrians; amidst the bizarre ideas of the semi Neo-Alexandrian Moffatt here at Matt. 26:20; and amidst the confusions of the old Latin Papists of post Trent Council and pre-Vatican II Council times here at Matt. 26:20; there is tranquillity, calm, and clarity of thought at Matt. 26:20 amongst the neo-Byzantines who rest upon the superior quality text of the *Textus Receptus*, which is, without doubt, the best text. Let us thank God for our Authorized Versions of 1611 since the AV is the best available English translation, and let us thank God that the AV rests on the Received Text, which is the best text. *Let us be finished with the rest, and let us select the best!*

Matt. 26:22 “every one of them” (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

It is possible to render Greek “*ekastos*” as “every” / “each” or “every one” / “each one” (Mounce⁹) and hence “*eis* (one) *ekastos* (‘every’ or ‘each’)” as either “every one” or, showing added words in italics, as “*one by one each*.” Likewise the Latin “*singuli*” can mean either “every one” or “one by one” (Stelten¹⁰). But the Latin “*unusquisque* (every one)” means the “every one” of the TR’s reading (Stelten¹¹).

This has led some to translate the Greek of the TR and *Variant 1* differently; or relative to what I regard as the points of intersection between the TR and *Variant 2*, the Greek one way, and the Latin the other way. Thus both Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) seem to regard the TR’s reading as meaning, “began every one of them to say;” and *Variant 1* as meaning, “*one by one each* began to say.” Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72) regards the Latin “*singuli*” as similar to, but different from, the Greek *eis ekastos*” i.e., rendering the Greek one way, and the Latin the other way; and so too, Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) uses different Syriac Versions outside the closed class of sources for the TR’s reading and that of *Variant 1*. I have also shown a combined *Variant 2* for non-Greek manuscripts outside the closed class of sources.

I am not much concerned about those manuscripts outside the closed class of

⁹ Mounce’s *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT* (1993), p. 168.

¹⁰ Stelten’s *Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Latin* (1995), p. 248 (*singulus*).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 279.

sources since they have no impact on determination of the text, although I combine both readings of the TR and *Variant 1* in the section outside the closed class of sources, *infra*. As for the more weighty matter of those manuscripts inside the closed class of sources, while I regard the interpretation brought by Tischendorf (1869-72) and Nestle-Aland (1993) as *possible* interpretations, I consider them to be *not very probable* interpretations of the data; since e.g., they drive a sharp wedge between the Greek and Latin that lacks any real contextual justification. But as to the differences in the perceptions of human minds that divide myself and those who here disagree with me, and thus prefer the views of Tischendorf and Nestle-Aland, I guess it is just a case of *C'est la vie!*¹²

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:22 the TR's Greek, "*ekastos* (every one) *auton* (of them)," in the wider words, "began every one of them to say" (AV & TR), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and Pi 041 (9th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.¹³). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339).

Variant 1, Greek, "*eis* (one) *ekastos* (every) *auton* (of them)," in the wider words, "began every one of them to say," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex M 021 (9th century).

Either the TR's Greek reading, or *Variant 1*'s Greek, might be the underpinning Greek text of Latin, "*unusquisque* (every one) *eorum* (of them)," found in old Latin Version d (5th century).

Variant 2 omitting Greek "*auton* (of them)," and so reading simply, Greek "*ekastos* (every one)" (*Variant 2a*) is found in the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407). *Variant 2* which omits "of them" (Greek, *auton*; Latin, *eorum*), may be reconstructed in the Greek as either, "*ekastos* (every one)" (like the Greek form of the TR found in Chrysostom) (*Variant 2a*) or "*eis* (one) *ekastos* (every)" (like the Greek form of *Variant 1*) (*Variant 2b*). This is Latin, "*singuli* (every one)," in the wider words, "began every one to say," and is found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century),

¹² French, "That's life."

¹³ We here see a scribal abbreviation for "*ekastos*" written (over 2 lines) something like, "εκα∞c" in which the right circle is an omicron and the right lower part of the left circle of the "∞" is open, so that there is a doubling up of letters in which the "c" (first "s" of "*ekastos*") also very largely doubles for most of the "τ".

f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the 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 as Latin, “*singuli* (every one),” in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation.

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 addition? In a given a manuscript, did the “*ekastos* (every one)” come at the start of a line, in which one or two letter spaces were left at the end of the previous line? Did a scribe wrongly think something has been lost in a paper fade? Did he then “reconstruct” the “*eis* (one)” from context? Was he influenced in this decision from the wider NT usage of “*eis* (‘one,’ masculine = ‘man,’ AV) *ekastos* (every)” at Acts 2:6 and / or “*eis* (‘one,’ masculine = ‘several,’ AV) *ekastos* (every)” at Rev. 21:21? If so, he evidently did not give due consideration to the usage of “*ekastos* (every one)” at Matt. 18:35.

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate addition? Did a scribe, possibly influenced in his decision from the wider NT usage of “*eis* (‘one,’ masculine = ‘man,’ AV) *ekastos* (every)” at Acts 2:6 and / or “*eis* (‘one,’ masculine = ‘several,’ AV) *ekastos* (every)” at Rev. 21:21, “stylistically prefer” what he took to be “the more immediate clarity” of this terminology, and so deliberately alter Matt. 26:22 to it?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental omission? In a given manuscript, did the “*auton* (of them),” come at the end of a line? Was it also possibly in an abbreviated form (e.g., Lectionary 2378 has a mark something like “~” above the “*q*” to symbolize the “*n*”, and possibly this or something similar existed in such an ancient times manuscript)? In Manuscript London (A 02) there is a partial paper fade of the “*autq* (unto him)” which is even more progressed in deterioration than the partial paper fade beginning of the immediately following words, “*ekastos* (every one) *auton* (of them),” so that I examined this section of my photocopy of a facsimile of A 02 under a magnifying glass. Was the “*auton* (of them),” lost through an undetected paper fade?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate omission? Did a prunist scribe consider the “*auton* (of them),” was “redundant” and “unnecessarily wordy”? Did he then deliberately prune it away?

Were these two variants deliberate or accidental? Or was one deliberate and the other accidental? We do not know. We cannot know. But we can know that the correct text was here Providentially preserved for us at Matt. 26:22 in the representative Byzantine reading.

The TR’s reading has rock solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine text, being found over time (e.g., from ancient times in W 032, through to the 16th century in Lectionary 1968), and through time (e.g., in the late 5th / 6th century in

Sigma 042, in the 9th century in K 017, in the 11th century in Lectionary 2378, and in the 12th century in Minuscule 12), dating from ancient times in *Codices Alexandrinus* (A 02) and *Freerianus* (W 032). It also enjoys the further ancient Greek testimony of Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, who was the most ancient author of the *Ecclesiastical History*. It possibly has some further weak support in the Latin with old Latin Version d, but it is also possible that this was rendered from *Variant 1*. By contrast, *Variant 1* has weak support in the Greek, and if this is the origins of old Latin d's translation, then also some weak support in the Latin; and *Variant 2* has weak support in the Greek and strong support in the Latin. 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. 26:22 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. 26:22, Greek "ekastos (every one) auton (of them)" in the wider words, "began every one of them to say," is found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th 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.*

Variant 1, Greek, "eis (one) ekastos (every) auton (of them)," in the wider words, "began every one of them to say," 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 Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscules 157 (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.*

Either the TR's reading, or *Variant 1*'s reading, are further found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Armenian Version (5th century).

Variant 2 omits Greek "auton (of them)," and so reads simply, Greek "ekastos (every one)" (*Variant 2a*) or "eis (one) ekastos (every)" (*Variant 2b*).

Variant 2b, Greek, "eis (one) ekastos (every)," in the wider words, "began every one to say," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); and Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892

(9th century, mixed text type), and 1071 (12th century, independent).

For the conjectured origins of the “*eis* (one)” element of *Variant 2b*, see *Variant 1, supra*; and for the speculated origins of the omission of the “*auton* (of them)” element of *Variant 2b*, see *Variant 2, supra*.

Variant 2 is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

At Matt. 26:22 the erroneous *Variant 2b* was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Were the issues in the variants limited to the difference between “*ekastos* (every one)” (TR) and the “*eis* (one) *ekastos* (every)” (*Variant’s 1 & 2*), then this matter would have been discussed in Appendix 3. But the issue of omitting “*auton* (of them),” in *Variant 2* means it is discussed here in the main part of the commentary.

Thus omitting “of them” at Matt. 26:22, the American Standard Version reads simply, “every one,” in the wider words, “began to say ... every one” (ASV). So too, the incorrect *Variant 2b* (which we can conclude on the basis of the neo-Alexandrian texts is *Variant 2b* rather than *Variant 2a*,) is also found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV. As previously noted (see “Preliminary Textual Discussion,” *supra*), it is possible to render the Greek of *Variant 2b* as “every one” or “each one,” which is the type of rendering found in the ASV and NASB; or showing added words in italics, as “*one by one* each began to say,” which is the type of rendering found in the RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV, *supra*; and Papists’ Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB and NJB, *infra*. E.g., the English Standard Version reads at Matt. 26:22, “began to say ... one after another” (ESV).

The semi neo-Alexandrian James Moffatt renders this as “each of them said” (Moffatt Bible). But given his known usage of the aberrant Western Text readings (e.g., see Commentary Vol. 3, at Matt. 25:1), it seems likely that his underpinning text here is that of *Variant 1*, Greek, “*eis* (one) *ekastos* (every) *auton* (of them),” which is found in the Western text’s D 05, and from his semi neo-Alexandrian paradigm has “external support” beyond this, *supra*.

The dangers posed by *Variant 2* to the Protestants of the *Textus Receptus* and Saint James Bible is nothing new to we of the Neo-Byzantine School. The old Latin Papists of post Trent Council and pre-Vatican II Council times also followed *Variant 2* in their Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version. Thus rendering the Latin “*singuli*” as “every one” (rather than as “one by one”), at Matt. 26:22 the Douay-Rheims reads, “began every one to say.” In harmony with this, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post-Vatican II Council times also followed *Variant 2* in their Papists Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB & NJB, although they rendered their corrupt Greek text differently to that of the Latin, *supra*.

Matt. 26:26b “blessed” (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Remarks.

In the “Principal Textual Discussion” in the broader context of discussing the institution of the Lord Supper at the Last Supper, some usage is made of Greek declensions from the root Greek words of *eucharisteo* and *eucharistos*. Of related interest, the Greek “*eucharistia*” is a nominative singular feminine noun, and the Latin *eucharistia* is also a nominative singular feminine noun; and Book 2, Homily 15, of Article 35 of the Anglican 39 Articles, says concerning “the Lord’s Supper” taken by “Communicants” at “this table,” that ancient church “fathers named it *Eucharistia*, that is, ‘Thanksgiving.’”

On the one hand, we of the holy Protestant faith have no objections to such patristic citations from the Greek and / or Latin fathers; although we check and subject these, like all things, to the Word of God, accepting the good, and rejecting the bad. But note, good Christian reader, how the Greek and Latin *is here rendered into English* as “Thanksgiving,” and *not left in an untranslated Greek and Latin form* as “*Eucharistia*.” To be sure, we of the holy Protestant faith do have objections to using the Romanist and semi-Romanist terminology of “Eucharist” for the Communion, not due to any intrinsic problem with the word in a theological vacuum, but because those who so use it have tended to give a loading that over-emphasizes that part of the Communion Service known as “The Thanksgiving” i.e., in the 1662 Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* from the section of *The Communion Service* starting with the words, “Lift up your hearts.” “We lift them up unto the Lord” etc. . Their emphasis on this part of *The Communion Service* relates to views of semi-Romanist consubstantiation or Romanist transubstantiation (held by e.g., Puseyites, Eastern Orthodox, and Papists). Though not so in a Lutheran context (consubstantiation), it often further relates to the idolatrous adoration of the Communion elements, e.g., the semi-Puseyites and Puseyites noddings, or Puseyites genuflecting at the consecrated elements.

Thus in the same way that food offered to idols may be safely consumed by a stronger brother (I Cor. 8:8,9), it would be theoretically possible for some brethren to use the term “Eucharist” behind closed doors in a private discussion about the Lord’s Supper. But in the same way that one must not eat food offered to idols in public if this will lead weaker brethren into idolatry (I Cor. 8), so likewise, because of these connotations of idolatry that attach to the English word “Eucharist” in connection with its consubstantiation or transubstantiation superstitious over-focus on the “Thanksgiving” section of the Communion Service, we should jettison any usage of it, other than publicly quoting it to attack the errors of those who engage in the idolatrous adoration of the Communion elements, e.g., Papists. “I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself: but to him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean. But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died” (Rom. 14:14,15).

Thus due to these spiritually repulsive and sickening idolatrous connotations of the English word, “Eucharist,” gladly do I reject usage of this *uk-yuk* and *ooh-you-spue* English word, “Eucharist.” We Protestants, e.g., Low Church Evangelical Anglicans

following the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* and 39 Articles, entirely repudiate the semi-Puseyites and Puseyites semi-Romanist so called “Eucharistic centred” service, and we also repudiate the Papists’ so called “Eucharistic centred” Romanist Mass. For we Protestants believe in a Biblically Christ centred service in which the authority of the infallible Bible is central, for this is how we rightly know and learn of God in his Divine revelation to us. For further discussion on “the question of ‘Why?’ Reformed Anglicans upholding the 1662 prayer book do not want the term ‘Eucharist’ used,” I refer the interested reader to Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) of these Textual Commentaries, Preface, “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” at “b) William Laud,” section, “Some instances of ‘Laud’s Popery’ as fairly being characterized as Laud’s Innovations,” subsection, “The Canons of 1640.”

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. The Book of Armagh (812 A.D.), reads at Matt. 26:26b in Gwynn’s edition (1913) “*benedixit*”. I.e., the “*ixit*” is in italics because the original uses the abbreviation, “bened”, from which Gwynn deduces that this is an abbreviation for “benedixit (blessed),” found in e.g., the Vulgate. But it is also possible that this is an abbreviation of “benedicens (‘blessing’ = ‘blessed’),” found in e.g., old Latin d & f, *infra*. Therefore, I simply show this manuscript supporting the TR’s reading, *infra*.

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codes and reads, “*benedixit* (he blessed)” at Matt. 26:26b (Diatessaron chapter clx). At Mark 14:22 the Vulgate reads, “benedicens (‘[he] blessing’ = ‘[he] blessed’);” and at Luke 22:19 the Vulgate reads, “*gratias* (thanks) *egit* (he gave).” Therefore I show the Sangallensis Diatessaron supporting the TR, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron reads part of Matt. 26:26 with Latin, “*benedixit* (he blessed),” followed immediately by part of Mark 14:23 (Diatessaron chapter xlv). It is thus clear that the “*benedixit* (he blessed)” might have here been assimilated from Mark 14:22 as part of Diatessaron formatting. Hence no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:26b, the TR’s Greek, “*eulogēsas* (‘[he] blessing’ = ‘blessed,’ masculine singular nominative, active aorist participle, from *eulogēō*),” in the wider words spoken at the institution of the Lord’s Supper or Holy Communion, “Jesus took bread, and blessed *it*” (AV, showing AV’s italics for added word), is a minority Byzantine reading with the support of between about one-fifth and one-quarter of Byzantine text manuscripts¹⁴. Thus this is a sizeable minority Byzantine reading E.g., it

¹⁴ The majority Byzantine text reading has the support of von Soden’s K group (of c. 1,000 manuscripts) other than the Kr group and one other K group manuscript. Von Soden’s Kr subgroup contains c. 20% or one-fifth of the K group manuscripts, and

is found in e.g., the purple parchment *Codex Beratinus* (Phi 043, 6th century, St. Matthew & St. Mark; Tirana, Albania), Codex 074 (from the same manuscript as Codices 064 & 090; 6th century, St. Matt. 25, 26, & 28; & St. Mark 1,2, & 5; St. Catherine's Greek Orthodox Monastery, Mt. Sinai, Arabia), and *Codex Seidelianus* (G 011, 9th century, Trinity College, Cambridge University, England, UK); and Minuscules 245 (12th century, Moscow, Russia) and 998 (12th century, Athos, Greece).

The TR's reading is further supported as Latin, "*benedixit* ('he blessed' = 'blessed,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *benedico*)," in *Versio Vulgata Hieronymi* (Jerome's Vulgate Version, 4th / 5th centuries), and *Codex Veronensis* (old Latin Version b, 5th century), *Codex Corbeiensis* (old Latin Version ff2, 5th century), *Codex Claromontanus* (old Latin Version h, 5th 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), *Codex Corbeiensis* (old Latin Version ff1, 10th / 11th century), and *Codex Colbertinus* (old Latin Version c, 12th / 13th century); as well as *Codex Sangallensis* (Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron, 9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the *Vulgata Clementina* (Clementine Vulgate, 1592). It is also supported as Latin, "*cum* (when) *benedixisset* ('he had blessed [it]¹⁵,' subjunctive active pluperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *benedico*)," in *Codex Vercellensis* (old Latin Version a, 4th century); and as Latin, "*benedicens* ('[he] blessing' = '[he] blessed,' masculine singular nominative, active present participle, from *benedico*)," in *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis* (old Latin Version d, 5th century), *Codex Brixianus* (old Latin Version f, 6th century), and *Codex Monacensis* (old Latin Version q, 6th / 7th century). The TR's reading is further supported in *Codex Ardmachanus* (Book of Armagh, 812 A.D.). It is also manifested in the Greek *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633)¹⁶.

so the minority Byzantine reading here has the support of *c.* 20% or one-fifth of the K group; or on a more precise count of *c.* 860 Gospel manuscripts in the K group *c.* 22.5-25% of the Gospel manuscripts. Thus on any reasonable broad-brush statistical projections from this more than adequate sample, between about one-fifth to one-quarter of the overall Byzantine text manuscripts support the TR's reading here. On the Kr subgroup, see Textual Commentary at e.g., Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) at Matt. 5:31a & 12:29, Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), at Matt. 20:15c; & Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) at Matt. 26:33b

¹⁵ The pluperfect is often translated as an indicative (Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, p. 203).

¹⁶ It is also manifested in Scrivener's Text (1894 & 1902). Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) shows 7 of his 8 gospel manuscripts supporting the variant reading of the majority Byzantine text (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; L, Codex Leicestrensis; H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum; P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8). Of course, the presence of the

However, a variant reading Greek “*eucharistesas* ([he] giving thanks’ = ‘gave thanks,’ masculine singular nominative, active aorist participle, from *eucharisteo*),” i.e., “Jesus took bread, and gave thanks *for it*” (showing italics for added words), is the majority Byzantine reading with the support of between about three-quarters and four-fifths of Byzantine text manuscripts. E.g., it is found in Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25¹⁷), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), K 017 (9th century); 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 found in the ancient church Greek writers, Basil the Great (d. 379) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation. It is also manifested in the Greek New Testament editions of Erasmus (1516 & 1522).

There is a textual problem with the representative Byzantine reading’s usage of the word “*eucharistesas* (gave thanks)” at Matt. 26:26b.

Looking more widely at the NT linguistic inter-relationship between “*eulogesas* (blessed)” and “*eucharistesas* (gave thanks)” in the context of the connected usage of “*eulogesas* (blessed)” and “*eucharistesas* (gave thanks)” with respect to eating food, it is clear that the custom was to first either give a General “Thanks” (*eucharistesas*) before eating anything, and then only give a specific “Thanks” for a new item of food; or to give a general Benediction (or Blessing). But if the item of food had already been subject to a General “Thanks” (*eucharistesas*), whether specifically so stated, or evidently the case because the food was already being consumed, then one would not give a second “Thanks” (*eucharistesas*) for that same item of food, although for some reason one might additionally give a Benediction and have that item “blessed” (*eulogesas*).

Thus we read in Matt. 15:36, that our Lord “took the seven loaves and the fishes, and gave thanks (*eucharistesas*), and brake them,” and distributed them. Or in Mark 8:6,7 that Jesus first “took the seven loaves, and gave thanks (*eucharistesas*), and brake, and gave” them out. Then he took “a few small fishes: and he blessed (*eulogesas*)” them, although since the fish were a new item of food, he might also have “gave thanks (*eucharistesas*)” for them. Or in Matt. 14:19 and Luke 9:16 we read of a Benediction, as Jesus “took the five loaves and two fishes” and “blessed (*eulogesen*, from *eulogeo*)¹⁸” them. Or in Luke 22:17-19 we read Christ “took” a new item, “the” pre-Communion Passover “cup, and gave thanks (*eucharistesas*),” and then “took” another new item,

TR’s reading in the Latin Vulgate would also have been taken into account by Elzevir.

¹⁷ Though this section is difficult to read in my photocopy of a photolithographic facsimile, under a magnifying glass this is certainly the reading.

¹⁸ Greek “*eulogesen*,” with or without an optional “*n*” on the end, indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *eulogeo*.

“bread, and gave thanks (*eucharistesas*), and brake it.” (For “Thanks” i.e., from *eucharistos* or *eucharisteo*, cf. John 6:11,23; Acts 27:35; Rom. 14:6; I Cor. 10:30; and for “blessing” i.e., *eulogia* from the same as *eulogeo*, cf. I Cor. 10:16.)

The relevant sequential order of Lord’s Supper events in the Synoptic Gospels, is for our immediate purposes, as follows¹⁹.

1) Christ took a non-Communion “cup” of Passover wine drunk *before* the institution of the Lord’s Supper (Luke 22:17). But no bread had yet been eaten.

2) Jesus “took bread,” a new item of food, and “gave thanks (*eucharistesas*)” for the Communion Bread (Luke 22:19; I Cor. 11:23,24), “saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me” (Luke 22:19), “and gave unto them” present” (Luke 22:19), saying to one or more communicants as he distributed the bread, “Take eat: this is my body which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me” (I Cor. 11:23,24). “Likewise also the cup, saying,” of some wine intended for himself only as Communion celebrant, “This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you” (Luke 22:20), *which he drank himself but did not make in such quantity as to distribute to any of the apostles.*

3) In a manner comparable to the rubric of *The Communion Service* in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662, which says, “If the consecrated Bread or Wine be all spent before all have communicated, the priest is to consecrate more according to the Form before prescribed: Beginning at” etc.²⁰, so likewise, at the Last

¹⁹ I shall leave some other aspects of sequencing, such as the issue of John 13:2 (relevant to the issue of Intinction i.e., the practice of some churches of dipping the Communion bread into the Communion wine,) till the relevant volume.

²⁰ Reformation Anglicans repudiated the Romish priest-altar nexus (e.g., Article 31, *39 Articles*), and this is seen in the exclusive usage of “table” for the Communion Table in the 1662 prayer book. The term “priest” is thus used for clergymen, such as here, per Romans 15:16 where St. Paul says he is a “minister of Jesus Christ, ministering the gospel of God, that the offering of up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost.” Thus e.g., the Minister prays at the Prayer for the Church Militant, that “God” “most mercifully” “accept our alms and oblations, and” “our prayers, which we offer unto thy Divine Majesty.” (Concerning “the Offertory” of money that the rubric says “the priest” “shall humbly present and place” “upon the holy Table” i.e., the Communion Table, n.b., I Cor. 9:13,14 which is one of the verses the “priest” may read when he “shall” “return to the Lord’s Table, and begin the Offertory.”) After the Communion the priest may also pray, “O Lord,” “mercifully” “accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.” This Reformation Anglican tradition is also harmonious with the prophecy that “beginning at Jerusalem” (Luke 24:47) i.e., the “holy mountain Jerusalem” (Isa. 66:20; cf. Micah 4:1,2), from “the Gentiles” (Isa. 66:19), God would “take of them for priests and for Levites” (Isa. 66:21). Here “priests” and “Levites” are in Hebraic poetical parallel, and so the “priests” and “Levites” of the OT act as a prophetic type for Christian “priests.” Yet this is not the universal priesthood of

Supper, some of the apostles having taken of the bread, the consecrated bread being all spent, our Lord consecrated more. (He presumably did this by way of example, so that he foresaw and condoned the type of rubric found in the 1662 prayer book, *supra*.)

4) Thus “as they were eating (*esthionton*, masculine plural genitive, active present participle, from *esthio*)” (Matt. 26:26), or “as they did eat (*esthionton*, masculine plural genitive, active present participle, from *esthio*)” (Mark 14:22), the Communion bread, more bread was consecrated. But because some of them were presently still “eating” (Matt. 26:26; Mark 14:22) the Communion bread i.e., they ate sequentially as in an Anglican Communion where communicants come up to the Communion rails in order from, and then return to, the pews; rather than eating simultaneously as in some Puritan Churches where they first distribute the bread, and then all eat it simultaneously, (not that I regard this as an essential element of how to celebrate the Lord’s Supper, so I do not thereby claim such Puritan Communion Services are invalid or theologically wrong²¹), this new bread was not a new item of food *per se*, but a further distribution of an item of food *some of them were then presently eating*. Therefore Jesus took this second amount of Communion “bread, and blessed (*eulogesas*)” it, “and brake it,” and gave it to them” (Mark 14:22) i.e., “to the disciples” (Matt. 26:26), “And said, Take eat; this is my body” (Matt. 26:26; Mark 14:22).

5) Then because he now came to what was a new item of food for the disciples in “the cup,” for while the twelve had been “eating” (Matt. 26:26; Mark 14:22) Communion Bread before the later Communion Bread of Step 4 was “blessed,” *supra*, there is no record that any were *drinking contemporaneously with* this time (although they had earlier drunk the different pre-Communion Passover cup of Step 1, *supra*). For only Christ drank the small amount of wine he consecrated as Communion celebrant at step 2), *supra*. So Christ now “took the cup,” and “gave thanks (*eucharistesas*)” (Matt. 26:27; Mark 14:23), “he gave it to them: and they all drank of it” (Mark 14:23).

believers (I Peter 2:9; Rev. 5:10), but a smaller group of ministers evident in the Hebraic parallelism of “Levites” as opposed to “the children of Israel” (Isa. 66:20,21), so that notwithstanding elements of this prophecy found in the OT types, NT Gospel Ministers are here referred to as “priests” (Isa. 66:21) *in harmony with* Rom. 15:16; I Cor. 9:13,14 (where the NT “altar” is the metaphoric “altar” of sacrifice of Christians’ tithes and offerings); and the Anglican tradition of sometimes calling Ministers, “priests.” (But that the semi-Romanist Puseyites and semi-Puseyites, being greatly deceived, do abuse and misuse the term “priest” in the prayer book, is a sad truth; and they also follow the illegal semi-Romanist falsehoods of the Laudians in seeking to use the term “altar” for the Communion Table.) Cf. my comments on the etymology of “priest” at Matt. 26:5, “*presbuteroi* (elders),” *infra*.

²¹ See Article 34 of the Anglican 39 Articles, “It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly like; ... and may be changed so that nothing be ordained against God’s Word. ... Every particular ... Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites ... ordained only by man’s authority, so that all things be done to edifying.”

The clear and obvious stylistic textual problem with Matt. 26:26b *is now readily obvious to the diligent and discerning reader*. For “as they were eating (*esthionton*, masculine plural genitive, active present participle, from *esthio*)” Communion Bread in Matt. 26:26b, how could Christ possibly have consecrated more Communion Bread using the terminology of a new item i.e., the majority Byzantine text’s “*eucharistesas* (gave thanks)”)? Clearly the action of Matt. 26:26b is contextually parallel with Mark 14:22, and *while I do not say as some kind of assimilation with Mark 14:22 that it must be like Mark 14:22 and read “eulogesas (blessed)” because Mark 14:22 does*; (since if this were the absurd argument one could reasonably say Christ said both the “*eucharistesas*” / “gave thanks” of the majority Byzantine text’s Matt. 26:26b and the “blessed” / “*eulogesas*” of Mark 14:22), I do say that *ONLY* the “blessed (*eulogesas*)” of Mark 14:22 or the “blessed (*eulogesas*)” of the minority Byzantine reading here at Matt. 26:26b is stylistically possible. Since the painful incongruity of the representative Byzantine text’s reading of “*eucharistesas* (gave thanks)” here at Matt. 26:26b, can only be relieved and released from its stylistic agony by adopting the minority Byzantine reading of “*eulogesas* (blessed),” this must be the correct here at Matt. 26:26b.

The origins of the variant are necessarily speculative. A Latin translation of Origen contains the reading of the variant. While it is possible that Origen’s Greek text was corrupted by a later Latin scribe, it is also possible that it faithfully preserves Origen’s reading, and certainly the variant looks exactly like the type of thing that Origen would be likely to do “when up to his old tricks.”

Was the variant an accidental alteration? In a given manuscript was “*eulogesas* (blessed),” written over two lines, with “*eulog*” on one line, and “*esas*” on the next? Due to a paper fade / loss or paper damage, did the first line come to look something like “*eu::*”? We know from the Gospels of Manuscript London (A02), that words were sometimes “squeezed in” at the end with smaller letters. With reference to the “*eucharistesas* (gave thanks)” of Luke 22:19 and / or I Cor. 11:24, did a scribe conclude that the “*eucharist* (EYXAPICT)” element of this word must have in its latter letters been “squeezed in” at the end of the line i.e., originally looking something like “EYXAPICT”? Did he thus “reconstruct” this as “*eucharistesas* (gave thanks)”?

Was the variant a deliberate alteration? Did a scribe seeking to assimilate Matt. 26:26b to Luke 22:19 and / or I Cor. 11:24, deliberately alter “*eulogesas* (blessed)” to “*eucharistesas* (gave thanks)” at Matt. 26:26b?

Was this a deliberate or accidental alteration? We do not know. We cannot know. We only know that it was evidently an alteration since it left behind a tortured reading which textually screams and cries out about its incongruity.

The reading of the *Textus Receptus* (TR) at Matt. 26:26b has strong minority support in the Greek with between about one-fifth and one-quarter of Byzantine text manuscripts. It is clearly supported by textual analysis. It further enjoys near monolithic support in the Latin textual tradition, being found in the Latin Vulgate of one

of the four doctors of the Western Church, the church father, St. Jerome; and also in all old Latin Versions. By contrast, the variant has strong support in the Greek with between about three-quarters and four-fifths of Byzantine text manuscripts, and a couple of ancient church Greek writers; although it has relatively weak support in the Latin, being found in a Latin translation of the ancient church Greek writer, Origen, who may well be the variant's originator. Since the textual analysis showing the textual problem in the representative Byzantine text is an analysis of the Greek, in which the variant is preferred on the basis of textual analysis of the Greek, full force and credence is given to the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. But since textual analysis of the Greek shows that the correct reading of the TR was faithfully preserved in the near monolithic support of it in the Latin textual tradition, we here see the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, bowing down humbly and fulfilling its proper function as a God-ordained help meet for the Greek. In this context, it is notable that the TR's reading is found in the Latin in ancient times in e.g., old Latin b & h, and so through reference to both the Greek and Latin the TR's clearly existed over time and through time, dating from ancient times. Weighing up these considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 26:26b 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. 26:26b, "blessed" in the wider words, "Jesus took bread, and blessed *it*" (showing italics for added words), 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 0160 (4th / 5th century, Matt. 26:25-26,34-36), (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). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), and 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent). It is further found in the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions, and the margin of the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; the Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant, "gave thanks," i.e., "Jesus took bread, and gave thanks *for it*" (showing italics for added words), is found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1241 (12th century, Alexandrian corruption in General Epistles, Byzantine text in Acts, independent text elsewhere i.e., independent scribal corruption elsewhere e.g., in the Gospels), 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.* It is also found in the main text of the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version.

Primarily due to its presence in both main Alexandrian texts, for the wrong reasons, the right reading was adopted at Matt. 26:26b in the NU Text *et al.* Hence the correct reading, “blessed” is found in the ASV. For the same wrong reasons, the right reading is also found at Matt. 26:26b in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, TEV, and Papists’ JB and NJB.

With both the Alexandrian School scribes and Western School Greek scribes here getting the right reading, even the semi neo-Alexandrian James Moffatt managed by a fluke to get the right text for his rendering of “after the blessing” (Moffatt Bible).

It beggars belief to suggest that the slipshod’n’tardy ancient Alexandrian School of scribes, or the bumbling’n’stumbling Western School Greek scribes, would have been able to deduce the correct reading here at Matt. 26:26b from textual analysis, a branch of knowledge in which they were evidently most deficient in the requisite gifts of God. Therefore, both Alexandrian and Western Greek scribes must have simply preserved the correct reading in what here at Matt. 26:26b were uncorrupted manuscript lines.

The neo-Alexandrians and semi neo-Alexandrian Moffatt have therefore as a carry on from this, preserved the correct reading at Matt. 26:26b. For this, we can give them no great credit. Indeed, under the ridiculous neo-Alexandrian rule that the incongruous or problem reading is “the more likely” one, *a rule that not only greatly favours textual corrupters, but also falsely and mischievously attributes to “these smart people” a better knowledge of the Greek than “those silly Bible writers,”* we cannot doubt that they would have preferred the majority Byzantine reading for its incongruity, had it been found in the Alexandrian texts and e.g., the “external support” of the Western Text.

Likewise, the old Latin Papists also got the right reading here at Matt. 26:26b in both the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version. Hence the Douay-Rheims here reads, “blessed (Latin, *benedixit*).” Yet once again, they got the right reading for the wrong reasons, since they unnaturally elevated the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, over and above its lord and master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. Thus it was once again by a fluke that they got the correct reading here, since the TR’s reading has near monolithic support in the Latin textual tradition at Matt. 26:26b.

And so, good Christian reader, the question must be asked, Did anyone get it wrong here? On this occasion it seems only the Majority Text Burgonites.

In Green’s Textual Apparatus (1986), Pierpont claims on a Burgonite majority text paradigm that the TR’s reading should be changed to the variant, and he claims, “80-94% of all manuscripts support the change.” As previously discussed, Pierpont failed to

factor in an adequate error bar of *c.* 10% when dealing with the data in von Soden (1913)²². It would thus be more accurate to say that the majority Byzantine reading has the support of something between about three-quarters and four-fifths of Byzantine text manuscripts, *supra*, so that at its upper end it *might* be as high as 80% and thus fall within the range given by Pierpont of “80-94% of all manuscripts,” but it might also be a bit lower than this. Either way, it is clearly the majority Byzantine text reading.

The erroneous variant is thus found in the main text of the majority texts of both Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). The Majority Text Burgonites’ *New King James Version* (1979 & 1982) thus has at Matt. 26:26b the TR’s reading in the main text as “blessed,” but a footnote which says, “M[ajority]-Text reads ‘gave thanks for’” (NKJV ftn). Given that the “Preface” of the NKJV claims that, “The Majority Text” “Corrects those readings” of “the *Textus Receptus*” “which have little or no support in the Greek manuscript tradition;” it follows that the NKJV is here claiming on its Majority Text School rules that the variant is the “correct” reading at Matt. 26:26b.

As for these Majority Text principles, the great brag of the Puseyite, John Burgon (d. 1888), was that, “Again and again we shall have occasion to point out ... that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction;” and that “the ‘*Textus Receptus*’ ..., calls for ... revision,” “upon the” basis of the “majority of authorities²³.” And yet time and time again, both here at Matt. 26:26b and elsewhere, we have had occasion to point out that the *Textus Receptus* needs no such correction upon Burgon’s Majority Text principles. What? Hast thou not heard? Or hath it not been told unto thee? *Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum!* “The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever!”²⁴

Matt. 26:27 “the cup” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Remarks & Textual Discussion.

Preliminary Remarks.

The First Matter. The issue of whether our Lord “took the cup” (singular) or “took a cup,” may have certain theological ramifications among Protestants.

²² In Green’s Textual Apparatus, Pierpont failed to factor in an error bar allowance of *c.* 10% in recognition of the generalist nature of von Soden’s groups; although this defect does not negate the general usefulness of this textual apparatus. See Textual Commentaries Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, “*Robinson & Pierpont’s (1991) new edition Byzantine Textform (2005);” and “‘Riding the great white stallion’ that is ‘stabled’ at von Soden’s ‘Ohio ranch’.”

²³ Burgon’s *Revision Revised*, p. 21; *Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, pp. 13,15.

²⁴ In its Latin form from the Vulgate, motto of the Lutheran Reformation taken from I Peter 1:25.

Specifically, the idea of “the cup” may be developed as the idea of *a common cup* such as found in The Communion Service of the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662; whereas the idea of “a cup” might be used to develop the notion of multiple cups, such as found in the small glasses used in various Puritan derived Churches e.g., Presbyterian Churches.

Yet to this should be made certain qualifications. The first is that while I prefer the common cup of the Anglican Communion Service of the 1662 prayer book, and consider that this is what was done with the Lord giving a common cup to his apostles at the institution of the Lord’s Supper; nevertheless, I do not regard this issue of a common cup to be an essential element of how to celebrate the Lord’s Supper, and so I do not thereby claim Puritan Communion Services using multiple cups are invalid or theologically wrong (much as I do not want this practice brought into Anglican Churches). That is because like Cranmer I am a symbolist, so that to “break” “bread” (I Cor. 10:16) symbolizes the fact that Christ’s “body” “is broken for you” (I Cor. 11:24); and to pour out wine into a cup and drink it, symbolizes the fact that Christ’s blood was poured out for us. Hence I consider the important thing is, in the words of The Communion Service in the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), said to the communicant, “take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving” (emphasis mine). Indeed, I have taken Communion from both a common cup at Anglican Protestant services, and also from a small glass cup at Puritan Protestant services.

The second qualification is that even in an Anglican Communion Service of the 1662 prayer book, there may be multiple cups since the rubric says the Minister is “to take the Cup into his hand” at the words, “He took the Cup; and, when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this;” and he is to also “lay his hand upon every vessel (be it Chalice of Flagon) in which there is any wine to be consecrated” when he says the words, “This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me. Amen.” Thus where there are many communicants, there may be a second chalice, or even a third chalice, placed on the Communion Table, so that a Minister might in fact have multiple Communion cups, although this would not be the case when there is a smaller number of communicants.

The Second Matter. The readings show an interesting divide between Theophilus of Alexandria for the TR’s reading, and both Origen and Chrysostom for the variant’s reading. All three names are relevant to Chrysostom’s first exile from Constantinople.

On the upside, Theophilus came to repudiate his Origenist errors, thus demonstrating a most welcome maturation in his thinking. But on the downside, as part of his newfound anti-Origenism, he overreacted to the point of finding “an Origenist under every bed” with his claim that St. Chrysostom was a secret Origenist. St. Chrysostom’s enemies in Constantinople, who disliked his preparedness to denounce various offences, including Eudoxia, wife of the Byzantine (Eastern Roman) Emperor, Arcadius (Regnal Years: jointly with his father, Theodosius I, 383-395; sole rule 395-

402; jointly with his son, Theodosius II, 402-408), saw political value in an alliance with Theophilus at the Synod of Oak in 403. This resulted in a show-trial of St. Chrysostom who was deposed. But an earthquake on the night of his arrest, twiggged the conscience of Eudoxia who feared that God might be thereby indicating his displeasure at the conspiratorial actions against St. Chrysostom; and this combined with the cries of those at Constantinople against the show trial, and a sudden accident in the imperial palace; to create a situation where Eudoxia backed down, and St. Chrysostom was recalled to Constantinople amidst great rejoicing by the people at the return of “the golden-mouthed” preacher²⁵. Theophilus, realizing that the tide had turned against him, beat a hasty retreat, “hotfooting it” out of Constantinople “with his tail between his legs.”

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Old Latin a here reads, “*calice* (‘a cup’ or ‘the cup’),” and the Latin Vulgate and all other old Latin Versions read, “*calicem* (‘a cup’ or ‘the cup’).” This is rendered at Matt. 26:27 in the two main Latin based translations with the definite article, namely, by the proto-Protestant and *Morning Star of the Reformation*, John Wycliffe, as “the cup” Wycliffe (1380), and by the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version as, “the chalice” (Douay-Rheims NT, 1582). Nevertheless, in broad terms the Latin lacks a definite article (the) and indefinite article (a / an) distinction²⁶, and so like the reading of the Greek variant, it might here be rendered as either “a cup” or “the cup.” Therefore no reference is made to the Latin, *infra*.

The Second Matter. The UBS 3rd corrected (1983) and 4th revised (1993) editions, both say that that the TR’s reading and the variant are each supported by “a part of the Byzantine manuscript tradition.” Von Soden (1913) says that the TR’s reading is supported by his K group, other than the Ki subgroup less one manuscript; i.e., the variant has the support of the Ki subgroup other than H 013. Von Soden’s Ki subgroup consists of seven Byzantine manuscripts, all of which contain the Gospels, and so this means the variant has the support of six K group manuscripts, *prima facie* out of a total of c. 860 K group Gospel manuscripts. 6 out of 860 manuscripts is c. 0.697% or c. 0.7%. But bearing in mind the generalist nature of von Soden’s groups with which one must allow an error bar of c. 10%, means that the TR’s reading here has the support of c. 90% plus of the Byzantine manuscripts. (The K group sample is clearly large enough to make broad-brush statistical projections from for the larger group of some thousands of Byzantine text Gospel manuscripts.) As to where between c. 0.7% and c. 10% of manuscripts the strength of the variant rests is anybody’s guess; since von Soden’s generalist groups only allow for broad-brush statistical calculations.

²⁵ Greek *chrysostomos* (golden-mouthed) is from *chruseos* (golden) and *stoma* (mouth).

²⁶ Some limited qualification to this exists since an indefinite article of “a” / “an” though generally not grammatically expressed in a distinctive way, might be sometimes conveyed with “*unus* (one),” or “*quidam* (‘one,’ or ‘a certain thing / one’).”

The strength of the variant among the Byzantine manuscripts is thus below *c.* 10%. Under the circumstances, methinks that the UBS textual apparatus doth protest too much. This is hardly a division within the Byzantine text significant enough to warrant both readings being given the “Byzpt” (Byzantine part) symbol, which gives the impression of a much more seriously divided Byzantine text than what we actually have.

The Third Matter. Outside the closed class of sources, Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72) considers some Coptic Versions (Sahidic & Bohairic) have a similar reading to the variant, whereas UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993) consider they and another Coptic Version (the Middle) have the same reading as the variant. I am unfamiliar with the Allophylian tongue of the Egyptian Copts, a language of no importance for understanding the New Testament text of Scripture. Hence on this occasion I have decided to exercise a discretion and not refer to any of the Coptic Versions, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:27, the TR’s Greek, “*to* (the) *poterion* (cup),” in the wider words referring to the institution of the Holy Communion, “And he took the (*to*) cup (*poterion*), and gave thanks, and gave *it* to them,” etc. (AV, showing AV’s italics for added word), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25²⁷), H 013 (9th century) and V 031 (9th century); Minuscules 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels), 2 (12th century), 597 (13th century), 1292 (13th century, Byzantine outside of the General Epistles), and 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported in the ancient church Greek writer, Theophilus of Alexandria (d. 412); and is the most probable reading of the ancient church Greek writer, Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444), where stylistic and contextual factors do not permit complete certainty.

However, a variant omitting the definite article, Greek “*to* (the),” with the remaining “*poterion*” thus reading either, “a cup” or “the cup,” depending on the translator’s preference, is found in Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and G 011 (9th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 1006 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Revelation); and Lectionaries 185 (11th century), 1634 (12th century), 299 (13th century), and 547 (13th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

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

Was the variant an accidental omission? Was the definite article, “*to* (the),” lost in an undetected paper fade?

²⁷ Though this section is difficult to read in my photocopy of a photolithographic facsimile, under a magnifying glass this is certainly the reading.

Was the variant a deliberate omission? If so, was this a “a brain-child” of Origen or another copyist? And if deliberate, did the scribe removing these words think in terms of a single Communion Cup or multiple Communion cups?

Did a prunist scribe believe in a common Communion cup? Did a prunist scribe consider that “context meant that” Matt. 26:27 “so obviously refers to a common cup,” that the “*to* (the),” is “redundant”? Did he thus deliberately prune away the “*to* (the)”?

Did a prunist scribe believe in multiple Communion cups? Did a corrupter scribe wish to argue for multiple Communion cups by saying that when Jesus “gave” wine “to them, saying, Drink ye all of it” (Mat. 26:27), this meant that he poured it out of his cup into multiple cups? Did this corrupter scribe want to create a text in which the presence of these multiple cups could be “inferred” from “the fact” that Jesus had “a cup” not “the cup”? Did he thus prune away the definite article, “*to* (the)”?

Was the variant a deliberate or accidental omission? We do not know. We cannot now know. But we can know that it was an omission to the text of Scripture here Providentially preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR’s reading has rock solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading over time, and through time, dating from ancient times with *Codex Alexandrinus* (A 02). It has the definite further support of one ancient church writer. By contrast, the variant has relatively weak support in the Greek, being found in less than *c.* 10% of manuscripts, no good textual argument to commend it, and it looks like it might have originated with Origen. Weighing up these factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 26:27 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. 26:27, Greek, “*to poterion*,” i.e., “the (*to*) cup (*poterion*),” 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); and Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1243 (11th century, independent outside of the General Epistles), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels). It is further found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.*

However, the variant, Greek, “*poterion*,” which may be rendered as either “a cup” or “the cup” depending on the Greek translator’s preference, is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th 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), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th 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 also found in the Armenian Version (5th century), and the Georgian Version (5th century).

At Matt. 26:27, the erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence the ASV reads, “And he took a cup,” although an ASV footnote says, “Some ancient authorities read ‘the cup’.” The incorrect variant is also found without any such footnote in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, TEV, TCNT, NEB, REB, Moffatt, and the Papists’ JB and NJB.

The *New International Version* reads at Matt. 26:27, “the cup” (NIV). But the NIV Preface says, “The Greek text used” for the NT “was an eclectic one.” While it is clear that this was a neo-Alexandrian text, given that neo-Alexandrians have two pincer arms by which as textual critics they determine their neo-Alexandrian text, a major arm which looks to the two leading Alexandrian Texts, and a minor arm, used quite rarely (though used a little bit more by the semi neo-Alexandrian, James Moffatt,) necessarily raises the following question. Did the NIV translators here follow their Alexandrian text pincer arm, and simply translate Greek, “*poterion*,” as “the cup;” or did they here use a non-Alexandrian text pincer arm, and decide to follow the Western Text’s D 05 with its various “external support”? Either way, they have here gotten the correct translation. (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.)

Matt. 26:28b “the new testament” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Remarks & Textual Discussion.

Preliminary Remarks.

One of the Greek words found in the reading under discussion here at Matt. 26:28b is “*diathekes*” from *diatheke*²⁸. This is rendered in the Authorized King James Version of 1611 as “the new testament” (AV), and in the New King James Version of 1982 as “the new covenant” (NKJV). I refer the interested reader to my former comments on the fact that “the AV strikes a reasonable balance in its translation of *diatheke* as ‘testament’ or ‘covenant’,” in Textual Commentaries Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), at Preface, “(7) Degrees of degradation in some of the modern revisions,” at the subsection on how, “A sixth degree of debasement, found in NKJV, ASV, NASB, RSV,

²⁸ Greek “*diathekes* (‘testament’ or ‘covenant,’ feminine singular genitive noun, from *diatheke*).”

NRSV, and ESV, has to do with carefulness of translation.”

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. The opening words of Matt. 26:28 are, “*touto* (this) *gar* (for) *esti* (is) *to* (‘the,’ redundant in English translation) *aima* (blood).” These first three words appear to have been initially lost by the scribe of Lectionary 2378, whose eye jumped from the “*to*” of “*touto* (this)” to the “*to*” of “*to* (the).” He then realized his mistake, and so added back in with a protrusion to the right of the column (p. 72b, column 2), the words, “*touto* (this) *esti* (is),” evidently judging that in the limited space he had, he could leave out the “*gar* (for).” (For the “*to*” of Matt. 26:28a see Appendix 3.)

This “photograph of a copyist’s error,” reminds us that: 1) words might be sometimes “squeezed in” on the end of a line, and thus more easily lost in e.g., an undetected paper fade; and 2) a scribe might deliberately choose to leave out a word he deemed as “unimportant” or “relatively unimportant” such as the “*gar* (for)” here in such circumstances, and then a later copyist scribe would simply copy out this corrupted text. Of course another scribe, and surely *a better scribe* than the one here in Lectionary 2378, would have used some device, e.g., an asterisk (*) or combination of asterisks, to indicate that between the “*touto* (this) *esti* (is)” comes the word, “*gar* (for);” or better still, written it out in the correct order, using such an asterisk device referring the reader to e.g., the top of the page. But when looking at the manuscripts, we must deal with the reality of what did happen.

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting).

Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron *prima facie* supports the TR’s reading at Matt. 26:28b with, “*novi* (new) *testamenti* ([the] testament),” i.e., “the new testament” (Diatessaron chapter clx). However, the Sangallensis Diatessaron is a Latin Vulgate Codex, and the Vulgate reads at Mark 14:24, “*novi* (new) *testamenti* ([the] testament);” and at Luke 22:20, “*novum* (new) *testamentum* ([the] testament).” Thus it is theoretically possible that the “*novi* (new)” was here a direct assimilation from Mark 14:24 with some secondary reference to Luke 22:20. While the near monolithic support of the Latin textual tradition for “*novi* (new)” at Matt. 26:28b makes this an improbable possibility, I shall nevertheless here exercise a discretion and not refer to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron also reads in Ciasca’s 19th century Latin translation of the 12th-14th centuries Arabic, “*novum* (new) *testamentum* ([the] testament)” (Diatessaron chapter xlv). But issues of this possibly coming from Mark 14:24 and / or Luke 22:20 as part of Diatessaron formatting, mean that no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:28b, the TR's Greek, "*tes* (the) *kainēs* (new) *diathekes* (testament)," in the wider words referring to the institution of the Lord's Supper, "For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins," etc. (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25²⁹), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and M 021 (9th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), 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), 1292 (13th century, Byzantine outside of the General Epistles), and 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as Latin, "*novi* (new) *testamenti* ([the] testament)," i.e., "the new testament," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century, adding between "*novi*" and "*testamenti*," the words, "*et aeterni*" / "and eternal"), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the 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 writers, Chrysostom (d. 407), Theophilus of Alexandria (d. 412), and Theodoret of Cyrus (d. 460); the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation, and the ancient church Greek writer, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation (c. 395); and the ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430).

However, a variant omitting Greek "*kainēs* (new)," and thus reading simply, "*tes* (the) *diathekes* (testament)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Y 034 (9th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); and the ancient church Latin writer, Cyprian (d. 258).

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

Was the variant an accidental omission? After he wrote "*tes* (the)," did the eye of a scribe jump by ellipsis from the "*es*" of the "*tes*" to the "*es*" of the "*kainēs* (new)," and did he then just keep writing with "*diathekes* (testament)" etc., thus accidentally omitting the "*kainēs* (new)"?

Was the variant a deliberate omission? Did a scribe who had some incomplete second-hand knowledge and appreciation for the fact that there is only one "everlasting covenant" (Heb. 13:20) in both Old and New Testaments, namely, the covenant of grace (Gen. 6:8,9,18; Heb. 11:7; Gal. 3:17), through which men are justified by faith alone (Rom. 4:1-8), not understand that one can also have a covenant (Exod. 31:16) within a

²⁹ Though this section is difficult to read in my photocopy of a photolithographic facsimile, under a magnifying glass this is certainly the reading.

covenant (Exod. 31:18), so that the covenant of grace was a covenant inside both certain Old and New Testament Covenants? (Hence it was administered differently in the Old and New Testaments.) Did he thus fail to understand how it could be said of the one eternal *covenant of grace*, that the “Messiah” “shall confirm the covenant with many” of the Jews, for both 3½ years before his death, and 3½ years after his death (Dan. 9:26,27) up till the stoning of St. Stephen (Acts 7)? Did such a scribe thus wrongly conclude that this “new testament” covenant of Matt. 26:28b was therefore “not a new” covenant, with the consequence that he pruned away the “new”? Alas, the unsaved sometimes learn something of the truth, but hold it in unrighteousness, for no man truly regenerated by the power of the Holy Ghost under the covenant of grace would ever seek to so wilfully tamper with the Word of God.

Was the variant a deliberate or accidental omission? We cannot be sure. However, the presence of this variant both here and at Mark 14:24 increases the probability of a deliberate omission, either because the presence of “*kaines* (new)” caused some “theological concern,” or because it was lost at one of these two readings by accident, and then assimilated to the other of these two readings deliberately. (Cf. commentary at Mark 14:24).

The TR’s reading has rock solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading with no good textual argument against it, found over time, and through time, dating from ancient times. It also has rock solid support in the Latin as the near monolithic reading of the Latin textual tradition. It further enjoys support in the Greek from, e.g., the ancient church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom; and in the Latin from, e.g., the ancient church fathers and doctors, St. Jerome and St. Augustine. By contrast, the variant has 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. 26:28b 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. 26:28b, “new,” in the wider words, “the new testament,” 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) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and 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), 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels), 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: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions, and some manuscripts of the Syriac Palestinian Version; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian “2” Version (5th century); Slavic Version (9th century); and Ethiopic Versions (*c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant omitting “new,” and so reading simply, “the testament,” 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), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century), and a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and Georgian “1” Version (5th century).

At Matt. 26:28b the erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Thus the ASV reads, “the covenant,” although an ASV footnote says, “Many ancient authorities insert ‘new’.” The incorrect variant is also found at Matt. 26:28b with an ASV type footnote referring to the TR’s reading in the RSV, ESV, NRSV, and NIV; and without any such footnote referring to the TR’s reading in the NASB and TEV.

However the semi neo-Alexandrian, James Moffatt, evidently impressed by the combination of the Western Text’s D 05, and much “external support” beyond this in e.g., both the Syriac Versions and old Latin Versions, here decided to exercise his non-Alexandrian text pincer arm. Thus for the wrong reasons he adopted the right reading. Hence at Matt. 26:28b the Moffatt Bible reads “the new covenant.” (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.)

The old Latin Papists of post Trent Council and pre-Vatican II Council times here adopted the correct reading at Matt. 26:28b in their Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version; the latter of which here correctly reads, “the new testament.” By contrast, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post Vatican II Council times here adopted the incorrect variant with an ASV type footnote referring to the TR’s reading in their Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB. Such are some of the so called “improvements” made by Popish persons following the Alexandrian Text over the Latin Text.

Matt. 26:33b “yet will I never be offended” (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. To understand the relevant construct of a *concession clause* in the context of Matt. 26:33b, *infra*, here represented by the “*ei* (Though)” of Matt. 16:33a, it is recommended that the reader first read about the “*ei* (Though)” in Appendix 1 of this Volume 4 (Matt. 26-28) at Matt. 26:33a. The matters discussed there will be largely

taken for granted as assumed knowledge in the discussion, *infra*.

The Second Matter. Von Soden (1913) regards old Latin h as following *Variant 2*, whereas both Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) regard old Latin h as following *Variant 1*.

As previously discussed, whether one takes the Greek reading "ei" or "ei kai" at Matt. 26:33a, this is here a *concession conjunction* meaning "Though" which matches the Latin, "etsi" of e.g., the Vulgate and old Latin h (see Matt. 26:33a in Appendix 1). This context means that the "autem" of old Latin h has the nuance of "yet" rather than "but" at Matt. 26:33b. Thus while "autem" more commonly has the sense of "but," it can have the sense of "yet" as in the Clementine at John 7:8; or in both the Vulgate and Clementine at Matt. 13:21 where the Douay-Rheims reads, "Yet (*autem*) hath he no root" etc. . Though "yet" is a far less common meaning for "autem," (as is likewise, for instance, "and," in the Vulgate's Matt. 23:4a; 24:49b; 26:59; or "for" in the Vulgate's Luke 20:38,) I think "yet" is the contextual meaning here, and so Tischendorf and Nestle-Aland might with some justification say that old Latin h here follows *Variant 1* in translating Greek "de" with Latin, "autem."

But a similar property to the Greek "alla" of *Variant 2* as the Latin "autem," means that the Greek "alla" may less commonly mean "yet," as seen by e.g., its usage in the concession clauses of Mark 14:29 and II Cor. 13:4. Hence the AV reads at II Cor. 13:3 "For though (*ei*) he was crucified through weakness, yet (*alla*) he liveth by the power of God." Thus von Soden might with some justification say that old Latin h here follows *Variant 2* in translating the Greek "alla" with Latin, "autem."

Hence my position is that old Latin h might be translating, (or its antecedent Latin manuscript line may be translating,) from the Greek of either *Variants 1* or *2*. We simply do not know. But it is relevant for showing that it did not follow the TR.

The failure of these textual apparatus compilers to recognize such ambiguities on the Latin of old Latin h, makes me suspicious that they may well have done something similar with various versions in other tongues (which I do not know,) outside the closed class of sources that they show following *Variant 1*. However, on the basis that in the Greek manuscripts *Variant 1* is much better attested to than *Variant 2*, so that in terms of probabilities *Variant 1* is a much more likely source than *Variant 2* for these versions to be ultimately translating from; and also on the basis that sources outside the closed class of sources are of no importance for determining the text of Scripture; on this occasion, I shall exercise a discretion and show under *Variant 1* those versions outside the closed class of sources so listed in these textual apparatuses, *infra*.

The Third Matter. "Up, up, in the sky; von Soden still flies!" As I have previously noted, unlike his contemporary German baron, Baron von Richthofen (d. 1918), the "Red Baron" air pilot of World War I; the work of Baron von Soden (d. 1914)

“still flies”³⁰. We are grateful to both God and Baron Herman Freiherr von Soden for the excellent storehouse of information in von Soden’s 1913 textual apparatus (even though we do not agree with von Soden’s textual theory and corresponding Greek text in the main text of his work). I remind the reader of this fact, lest my comments on the “rubbery” figures we obtain from von Soden should be misconstrued or misapplied, so as to deny or cast doubt upon, the general usefulness and value of von Soden’s work for determining the broad-brush percentages of various readings.

Greek “*de*” (*Variant 1*) has the support of von Soden’s Kx group. 513 Kx manuscripts out of 983 K group manuscripts is *c.* 52%; or more precisely, 513 Kx manuscripts out of 860 K group Gospel manuscripts is *c.* 59.65% or *c.* 60%. Allowing an error bar of *c.* 10%, means this figure of *c.* 60% could be *c.* 6% lower or higher. If it was *c.* 54% it would, even on von Soden’s generalist groups, still be the MBT since this is a lower possible figure; and if it were as high as *c.* 66% then it would very safely be the MBT reading. Either way, I think both Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005) are correct to show “*de*” as the majority reading, but to also show that the text is “seriously divided” (Hodges & Farstad³¹), or “significantly divided” (Robinson & Pierpont³²) with the minority Byzantine reading that lacks this “*de*.”

Von Soden says the TR’s reading has the support of his K1 and Kr subgroups. K1 contains *c.* 50 Byzantine text Gospel manuscripts³³ (cf. Textual Commentary Vol. 1,

³⁰ Textual Commentaries Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, “* Robinson & Pierpont’s (1991) new edition Byzantine Textform (2005).”

³¹ Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xxi & 91.

³² Robinson & Pierpont (2005), pp. xviii & 61.

³³ K1 group: Byzantine Text: (37 Manuscripts): Codices 0211 (7th century, von Soden’s ε 49), V 031 (9th century, von Soden’s ε 75), Omega 45 (9th century, von Soden’s ε 61), S 028 (10th century, von Soden’s ε 1027); Minuscules 461 (9th century, von Soden’s ε 92), 399 (10th century von Soden’s ε 94 other than Matthew which is Ia), 1077 (10th century, von Soden’s ε 1139), 1172 (10th century, von Soden’s ε 1036), 272 (11th century, von Soden’s ε 1182), 277 (11th century, von Soden’s ε 166), 476 (11th century, von Soden’s ε 1126), 655 (11th / 12th century, von Soden’s ε 177), 699 (11th century, von Soden’s δ 104, K1 in the Gospels; K in Acts, Pauline Epistles, & Revelation), 711 (11th century, von Soden’s ε 1179), 1006 (11th century, von Soden’s ε 1156, Byzantine outside Revelation), 1045 (11th century, von Soden’s ε 1151), 1470 (11th century, von Soden’s ε 2014), 57 (12th century, von Soden’s δ 255, K1 group in Gospels; Kc group in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 1123 (11th century, von Soden’s ε 1152), 1514 (11th century, von Soden’s ε 2026), 1556 (11th century, von Soden’s ε 1134), 1672 (11th century, von Soden’s ε 1149), 2172 (11th century, von Soden’s ε 191), 2281 (11th century, von Soden’s ε 158), 1191 (11th / 12th century, von Soden’s ε 1099), 261 (12th century, von Soden’s ε 282), 355 (12th century, von Soden’s ε 235), 408 (12th century, von Soden’s ε 231), 419 (12th century, von Soden’s ε 232), 438 (12th century, von Soden’s ε 241), 509 (12th century, von Soden’s ε 258), 524 (12th century, von Soden’s ε

Matt. 1-14, at Matt. 13:14)³⁴. This 50 out of c. 860 K group Gospel manuscripts is c. 5.8% or c. 6% of K Group.

Von Soden's Kr group has 211 manuscripts, of which c. 189 manuscripts are exclusively Byzantine inside a wider K group that has 914 exclusively Byzantine manuscripts. Von Soden's Kr group of manuscripts on a generalist count represents c. 18-20% or about one-fifth of the 914 exclusively Byzantine text manuscripts in von Soden's K group; or on a more precise count of Gospel manuscripts in the K group c. 22.5-25% of the Gospel manuscripts³⁵.

Combining these figures, either 189 exclusively Byzantine Kr group manuscripts plus c. 50 K1 manuscripts is 239 exclusively Byzantine manuscripts; or alternatively, 211 Kr group manuscripts *in toto* plus c. 50 K1 manuscripts is 261. Using the first figure, out of c. 860 Gospel manuscripts, this is $239/860 = c. 27.8\%$ or c. 28%; or using the

265), 688 (12th century, von Soden's ε 246), 975 (12th century, von Soden's ε 3024), 2177 (12th century, von Soden's ε 1296), 263 (13th century, von Soden's δ 372, Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles, K1 group in Byzantine Gospels, Ia3 group in Byzantine Acts & non-Byzantine Pauline Epistles), 1087 (13th century, von Soden's ε 2035), & 656 (13th / 14th century, von Soden's δ 463, K1 in the Gospels, Kr in the General Epistles). K1 group: Non Byzantine Text (1 manuscript): 263 (13th century, *supra* in non-Byzantine Pauline Epistles, δ 372). K1 group: Unclassified outside of von Soden's system [15 manuscripts]: 163 (11th century, von Soden's ε 114, in both K1 group & I group), 345 (11th century, von Soden's ε 119, K1 group & I group), 661 (11th century, von Soden's ε 179), 933 (12th century, von Soden's ε 2004), 974 (12th century, von Soden's ε 2043), 1257 (12th century, von Soden's ε 1104), 1511 (12th century, von Soden's ε 2025), 1575 (12th century, von Soden's ε 1273), 382 (13th century, von Soden's ε 300) 972 (13th century, von Soden's ε 3022), 1372 (14th century, von Soden's ε 4004), 1410 (14th century, von Soden's ε 468, K1 od. Kak), 1440 (14th century, von Soden's ε 1456), 1580 (14th century, von Soden's ε 1432), 1587 (14th century, von Soden's ε 1434).

³⁴ It is uncertain if 3 manuscripts are in the K1 group (Minuscule 690, Byzantine text, von Soden's ε 435; Minuscule 927, unclassified outside of von Soden's system, 12th century, von Soden's δ 251, uncertain if K1 in the Gospels, uncertain if Kak in the Gospels, Ia2 in Acts & Pauline Epistles; & Minuscule 1646, unclassified outside of von Soden's system, 12th century, von Soden's δ 267). But of the 40 K1 group manuscripts that are classified outside of von Soden's system, 37 (92.5%) are exclusively Byzantine, 2 (5%) are Byzantine in specific parts, and 1 (2.5%) are non-Byzantine. Applying these as projections to the 15 manuscripts of K1 otherwise not classified outside of von Soden, means that 13.875% are exclusively Byzantine. Hence c. 13 or 14 are exclusively Byzantine. Using the figure of c. 13, the exclusively Byzantine count of K1 is thus c. 50 (37 + 13) out of 55 K1 manuscripts.

³⁵ See Textual Commentary, Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) at Matt. 5:31a & 12:29, & Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), at Matt. 20:15c.

second figure, $261/860 = c. 30.3\%$ or $c. 30\%$. While von Soden based figures are always “rubbery,” a broad-brush figure of $c. 28\%-30\%$ plus or minus an error bar of $c. 10\%$ of this i.e., $c. 3\%$, means that we can say that this minority Byzantine reading has between $c. 25\%$ and 33% support, or between about one-quarter and one-third of the Byzantine manuscripts.

Whatever one thinks of the vagaries and uncertainties of the “rubbery figures” that emerge from von Soden’s data, this is still very useful information for giving us THE BIG PICTURE. Thus it is clear that the *Variant 1* reading is the majority Byzantine reading at $c. 54\%-66\%$ manuscript support, and the TR’s reading is the second strongest attested to reading at $c. 25\%-33\%$ manuscript support. Thus on any reasonable broad-brush statistical projections from this more than adequate sample of K group manuscripts, we can say that between about one-quarter and one-third of the Byzantine text manuscripts here support the TR’s reading.

In Green’s Textual Apparatus (1986), Pierpont takes the view that between these two readings, “the evidence is about evenly divided (40-60% support),” and so “we cannot be certain which reading represents the” “majority text.” He has seemingly based this conclusion on the fact that on von Soden’s data *Variant 1* has the support of $c. 60\%$, without considering the issues of $c. 10\%$ error bar (which Pierpont consistently does not take into account); and from this deduced the strength of the corresponding main alternative reading of the TR was “therefore the remaining $c. 40\%$.” But this further fails to take into account the fact that von Soden only itemizes $c. 30\%$ for the TR’s reading. As to where the remaining $c. 10\%$ goes is anybody’s guess. It might e.g., go to *Variant 2*, although on the basis of these other figures with respect to the TR’s and variant’s respective manuscript strength, it seems unlikely that it would all go to *Variant 2*.

If we were to look at Tischendorf’s much smaller selection in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72), out of 17 Byzantine Greek Codices and Church Greek writer citations at Matt. 26:33a, 4 Byzantine codices and two ancient Greek writer citations are given for the TR’s reading i.e., $6/17 = c. 35\%$; 8 Byzantine codices and one ancient Greek writer citation are given for the majority Byzantine text, i.e., $9/17 = c. 53\%$; and two Greek writer citations are given for *Variant 2* i.e., $2/16 = c. 12\%$. Or if one stayed to just the Greek codices, then out of 12 Byzantine codices, $4/12$ or $c. 33\%$ support the TR’s reading, and $9/12$ or $c. 75\%$ support *Variant 2*. Either way, this limited sample tends to cast some qualified further doubt on Pierpont’s figures in Green’s Textual Apparatus.

But putting aside any projections based on Tischendorf’s much smaller sample, on von Soden’s figures I would still have to disagree with Pierpont’s lack of certainty as to whether or not *Variant 1* or the TR is the majority Byzantine reading. I would consider that we can confidently say that *Variant 1* is the majority Byzantine reading since the lower figure of $c. 54\%$ is a base figure possibility; and it corresponds with an upper figure possibility for the TR’s reading of $c. 33\%$. I would also consider that we can with confidence say that the TR’s reading has the support of about at least a quarter (or 25%) of the Byzantine text manuscripts. Hence on this occasion I do not consider that the data from von Soden indicates that the Byzantine text can be said to be fairly

evenly divided between the two readings of the TR and *Variant 1*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:33b, the TR's Greek, "*ego* (I) *oudepote* (never) *skandalisthesomai* (I will be offended)," i.e., showing AV's italics for added word, "yet will I never be offended" (AV), is a strong minority Byzantine reading with *c.* 25%-33% known manuscript support. It is supported by e.g., Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and V 031 (9th century); Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as Latin, "*ego* (I) *numquam* (never) *scandalizabor* (I will be offended)," i.e., "I will never be offended" or (showing added word in italics,) "yet will I never be offended," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the 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, Origen (d. 254), in both the Greek and also a Latin translation.

Variant 1 which adds Greek "*de* (yet)," after the "*ego* (I)," and so reads, "*ego* (I) *de* (yet) *oudepote* (never) *skandalisthesomai* (I will be offended)," i.e., "yet will I never be offended," is the majority Byzantine text reading with *c.* 54%-66% known manuscript support. It is found in e.g., Codices E 07 (8th century), F 09 (9th century), G 011 (9th century), and Gamma 036 (10th century), Minuscule 2 (12th century); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Basil the Great (d. 379).

Variant 2, "*all*' (yet) *ego* (I) *oudepote* (never) *skandalisthesomai* (I will be offended)," i.e., "yet will I never be offended," is found in the ancient church Greek writers, Basil the Great (d. 379) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

Variants 1 & 2. The Latin "*autem*" of old Latin Version h (5th century) in "*ego* (I) *autem* (yet) *numquam* (never) *scandalizabor* (I will be offended)," i.e., "yet will I never be offended," might be following either *Variant 1* or *Variant 2* (see "Preliminary Textual Discussion," "The Second Matter").

Variant 1 is the majority Byzantine text reading. There is a textual problem with the representative Byzantine reading's usage of the word, "*de* (yet)," at Matt. 26:33b. As discussed in Appendix 1, Matt. 26:33 is part of a *concession clause* in which "*ei* (Though)," acts as a *concession conjunction* (comparable to *ei kai*)³⁶. Thus in the wider verse 33, the Greek reads of the majority Byzantine text, "... *o* (-) *Petros* (Peter) *eipen*

³⁶ Young's *Greek*, p. 185.

(said) *auto* (unto him), *Ei* (Though) *pantes* (all [men]) *skandalisthesontai* (shall be offended) *en* ('in' = 'because of,' AV) *soi* (thee), *ego* (I) *oudepote* (never) *skandalisthesomai* (I will be offended)" i.e., "Peter ... said unto him, Though (*ei*) all men shall be offended because of thee, yet (*de*) will I never be offended" (emphasis mine).

This means that in the context of this *concession clause* usage of "*ei* (Though)," the "*ei* (Though)" introduces a *concession clause* with a first proposition, namely, "Though (*ei*) all men shall be offended because of thee," and the "*de* (yet)," then introduces the unexpected result, namely, "yet (*de*) will I never be offended." Thus the "*ei* (Though)" and "*de* (yet)" here form a stylistic couplet.

Yet it is clear that in the NT *Koine* Greek such a *concession clause* related couplet is quite alien in sound. There are broadly three possible *concession clause* related grammatical possibilities that may go with the "*ei* (though)" here at Matt. 26:33b.

Firstly, Lucan Greek uses a couplet of "*ei kai* (though)" with "*dia ge* (*dia* / 'because of,' + *ge* / 'even' - an enclitic particle giving an emphasis to the word that it goes with = 'yet because of' or 'yet because,' AV)," in Luke 11:8 and Luke 18:4,5.

Secondly, and more commonly in the NT, the normative *concession clause* related couplet is "*ei*" or "*ei kai*" ('although' / 'though') + "*alla*" (in some texts abbreviated to *all'* before a vowel,) (yet). This is found at Mark 14:29; I Cor. 8:5,6³⁷; 9:2³⁸; II Cor. 4:16; 5:16; 7:12; 11:6; 13:4; Col. 2:5. Thus e.g., the "parallel" passage of Mark 14:29 reads, "... *o* (-) ... *Petros* (Peter) ... *e phe* (said) *auto* (unto him), *Kai ei* (Though) *pantes* (all) *skandalisthesontai* (shall be offended), *all'* (yet) *ouk* ([will] not) *ego* (I)," i.e., "Although (*Kai ei*) all shall be offended, yet (*all'*) will not I" (AV). Or II Cor. 13:4 reads, "For though (*kai ei*) he was crucified through weakness, yet (*alla*) he liveth by the power of God."

Thirdly, there may be no specific couplet word formed with the *concession clause* "*ei*" or "*ei kai*." This is found at II Cor. 7:8 (thrice), 12:11; 12:15; Heb. 6:9³⁹. E.g., at II Cor. 12:15, "though (*ei kai*) the more abundantly I love you, the less I be loved."

It follows from this that a *concession clause* related couplet using "*ei* (Though)" + "*de* (yet)," such as found in the majority Byzantine text's *Variant 1*, clangs on the ears as bad NT Greek, and so cannot possibly be correct.

³⁷ Here with *eiper* = *ei* (though) + *per* (an enclitic particle giving an emphasis to the word that it goes with) = 'though there be' (AV).

³⁸ Here *alla* (yet) + *ge* (an enclitic particle giving an emphasis to the word that it goes with) = 'yet doubtless' (AV)."

³⁹ Cf. with regard to this third type (of some special interest to us for it is the type found in the TR here at Matt. 26:33b), in the Septuagint (LXX), Job 9:21 (*eite* = *ei* / "if" + *te* / "even" = "though"), and Micah 5:2 (*ei*).

We are thus left with two *prima facie* possibilities. Either the *alla* of *Variant 2* as found in two ancient church Greek writers and *possibly* an old Latin Version, or the absence of any specific couplet word as found in the minority Byzantine reading. But in the same way that the majority Byzantine text is preferred over one or more minority Byzantine readings if there is no good textual argument against it; so likewise, after the majority Byzantine reading is dismissed, when we have two or more remaining minority readings that may be possible readings, the issue of their relative manuscript support is relevant. Here we find that the minority Byzantine reading in which there is an absence of any specific couplet word has the support of *c.* 25%-33% of Greek manuscripts; whereas *Variant 2* has only two known Greek manuscripts in the form of two ancient church writers, and so weak Greek manuscript support⁴⁰. If in these circumstances, either two or more readings are fairly evenly divided in their Greek manuscript support, one then considers overall attestation inside the closed class of sources. For instance, looking to see if the Latin textual tradition strongly and decisively favours one reading over the other, and if it does, then taking that reading (see commentary at Matt. 26:70, “Preliminary Textual Discussion,” “The Second Matter,” *infra*), unless there is a clear and obvious textual problem in that strongly attested to Latin reading that was remedied by what is then both a slim Greek and slim Latin reading. Thus only in such circumstance would one go to textual analysis betwixt two or more such rival readings. I.e., only if one could show a textual reason as to why the reading with clearly less manuscript support, such as *Variant 2* here, was to be preferred over that of the reading with clearly stronger manuscript support, such as the minority Byzantine reading here, could one select the one with clearly less manuscript support, in this instance, *Variant 2*. Since this cannot be done, i.e., since there is no good textual argument against the minority Byzantine reading of the TR, this is the one here preferred.

The origins of the two variants are conjectural.

Was *Variant 1* an accidental addition? In a given manuscript, at Matt. 26:33b was there a slight gap left between the “*ego* (I)” and “*oudepote* (never)”? Did a scribe conclude from “comparison” with Mark 14:29, that “something equivalent to the ‘*alla*,’ but with less letters, must have dropped out of the text here by a paper fade”? Did he then supply the “*de*” which is a common conjunction in St. Matthew’s Gospel?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate addition? Was a corrupter scribe attracted by what he took to be “the greater clarity” of the “*alla*” in the Mark 14:29 reading? Did he think himself “doubly smart,” by using a semi-assimilation rather than a direct assimilation so as “to cover his tracks,” changing the Marcan “*alla*” to the common Matthean conjunction of “*de*” here at Matt. 26:33b?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental addition? In a given manuscript, did the “*ego* (I)”

⁴⁰ Von Soden refers to another Greek manuscript which is unclassified with respect to text type outside of von Soden’s system (Minuscule 1293, 12th century, von Soden’s ε 190 in his Iϕc group).

come at the end of one line, and the “*oudepote* (never)” at the start of the next, perhaps with a couple of letter spaces more at the end of the line above, and a few letter spaces more at the end of the line below? Did a scribe conclude from “comparison” with Mark 14:29, that “the ‘*alla*’ must have dropped out of the text here by a paper fade”? Did he then “add back in” what he took to be this “missing ‘*alla*’”?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate addition? Did a scribe seeking a “more standard Gospel text,” deliberately assimilate the “*alla*” of Mark 14:29 to Matt. 26:33b?

Were these deliberate or accidental additions? Or was one deliberate, and the other accidental? We do not know. We cannot now know. But we can know that they were both additions to the Received Text at Matt. 26:33b.

The TR’s reading is clearly supported by textual analysis since only the TR’s reading and *Variant 2* reading remedy the clear and obvious defect in the majority Byzantine text’s reading of *Variant 1*. Beyond this, the TR’s reading is clearly the preferred reading since it has the known support of about one-quarter to one-third of the Byzantine Greek manuscripts (c. 25%-33%), and so is a strong minority reading; whereas the *Variant 2* reading has weak manuscript support. Furthermore, the TR’s reading has the near monolithic support of the Latin textual tradition, including St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, so that we here see an example of the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, helping out its lord and master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin* – since the textual analysis is centred on the Greek. The TR’s reading has the further support of one ancient church writer in both the Greek and Latin. By contrast, the *Variant 1* reading is still the majority Byzantine text reading with c. 54%-66% known manuscript support in the Greek, and has the further support of one ancient church Greek writer. But it has, at best, weak support in the Latin, with only one old Latin Version, which might have been translated from either *Variant 1* or *Variant 2*. Weighing up these factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 26:33b 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. 26:33b, “*yet will I never be offended*” (showing italics for added word), 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 text type) Codex 067 (6th century, Matt. 14; 24-26), (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 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 788 (11th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th 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). It is further found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), as Latin, "*ego* (I) *numquam* (never) *a* (from) *te* (thee) *deficiam* (I will defect)," i.e., "I will never defect from thee."

Variant 1 which adds Greek "*de* (yet)," and so reads, "yet will I never be offended," is found in the neo-Alexandrians' "queen of minuscules," Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type); as well as Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent) and 700 (11th century, independent). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions, and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; the Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The erroneous *Variant 1* entered the main text of Hodges & Farstad's Burgonite majority text (1985), with a footnote saying the text was "seriously divided" with the TR's reading⁴¹; and likewise the main text of Robinson & Pierpont's Burgonite majority text (2005), with a sidenote saying the text was "significantly divided" with the TR's reading⁴². However, the Burgonites' *New King James Version* (1979-1982) which is very selective in its textual apparatus in that it only shows a small sample of where the majority text varies from the Received Text, thereby giving a false impression of a much higher level of agreement between the Majority Text and Received Text than in fact exists, (a common technique of deception amongst majority text Burgonites, cf. e.g., Matt. 26:38, *infra*, some of whom even go so far as to claim Burgon's majority text theoretics result in the TR), here at Matt. 26:33b lacks any footnote stating that the Majority Text adds "yet." But to the extent that its "Preface" claims "The Majority Text" "Corrects those readings" of "the Textus Receptus" "which have little or no support in the Greek manuscript tradition," and points readers to Hodges & Farstad's "*Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text*," we cannot doubt that among the lesser number of NKJV readers who consult the Greek of Hodges & Farstad, the incorrect conclusion that they would draw would be that the inclusion of "yet" at Matt. 26:33b thus "corrects" the TR.

The braggadocio Puseyite Burgon's brag was this, "Again and again we shall have occasion to point out ... that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction," and that "the '*Textus Receptus*' ..., calls for ... revision," "upon the" basis of the "majority of authorities⁴³." And yet again and again, we have had occasion to point out, that the *Textus Receptus* needs no correction on either Burgon's "majority" text theoretics, or the old Latin Papists' theoretics, or the neo-Alexandrians' theoretics!

⁴¹ Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xxi & 91.

⁴² Robinson & Pierpont (2005), pp. xviii & 61.

⁴³ Burgon's *Revision Revised*, p. 21; *Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, pp. 13,15.

At Matt. 26:33b, the presence of the TR's reading in the two main Alexandrian texts, and to a lesser extent, the "external support" beyond this in e.g., the Western text, meant that for the wrong reasons the right reading of the TR was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence the ASV reads, "I will never be offended." So too at Matt. 26:33b, the correct reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

It is *prima facie* possible to render the "*de*" of *Variant 1* or "*alla*" of *Variant 2* as "but" (although in the case of *Variant 1* the concession clause context means it is best rendered "yet"). What then are we to make of this type of rendering in the *New English Bible* and *Revised English Bible*? Does it simply reflect loose'n'liberal "dynamic equivalent" so called "translation" techniques by the NEB and REB translators, who are in fact following the TR's reading found in Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus? Or does it mean that they are exercising their non-Alexandrian text pincer arm, if so, on the basis of the neo-Alexandrians so called, "queen of minuscules," Minuscule 33, coupled with support from such sources as e.g., the majority Byzantine text, the so called "Caesarean Text" in the Armenian Version, and Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian and Bohairic Versions? (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.) Alas, the non-usage of italics in such "modern" versions as the NEB and REB, coupled with their loose translation style, means neither we nor any of their readers can really know just exactly what the NEB and REB "translators" thought they were doing here at Matt. 26:33a. Such are the vagaries and uncertainties of those who foolishly depart from the crystal clear clarity of the Authorized Version here at Matt. 26:33a.

Matt. 26:38 "Then saith he unto them" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Largely from von Soden's textual apparatus, I have itemized 16 Byzantine Greek text manuscripts that support the TR's minority Byzantine reading, *infra*. This includes for the first time, a record of the reading in Lectionary 2378. Excluding Lectionary 2378, there are thus 14 known manuscripts inside von Soden's I and K groups of about 1,500 manuscripts of which *c.* 85% are exclusively Byzantine text, and *c.* 90% are Byzantine if one includes those that are Byzantine text only in specific parts. This *c.* 85% of 1,500 manuscripts is *c.* 1300 manuscripts, and so 14 manuscripts for the TR's reading out of *c.* 1300 manuscripts is *c.* 1.08%. This gives us a base "rubbery figure" of *c.* 1% Greek manuscript support for the TR.

More broadly, von Soden says the majority Byzantine reading has the support of his K group i.e., on his generalist three groups *c.* 90% + of K group, and so on any reasonable statistical projections *c.* 90% plus of the overall Byzantine text. Therefore this gives us a "rubbery figure" for the TR's support of less than *c.* 10% of the Byzantine text. But as to where the TR's Greek manuscript support falls between these two figures of *c.* 1% and *c.* 10% is anybody's guess. Thus are the strengths and weaknesses in von Soden's data.

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Inside the closed class of sources,

the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron contains the reading of Matt. 26:38 in its Diatessaron chapter 180 (although in the internet form of Siever's 1892 edition I use, it is wrongly labelled as "Lc 22 38"). The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex, and the Latin, "*Tunc* (Then) *ait* (saith he) *illis* (unto those [ones])," of Matt. 26:38 in the Vulgate and Sangallensis Diatessaron, compares and contrasts with the Vulgate's "*Et* (And) *ait* (saith he) *illis* (unto those [ones])" at Mark 14:34. But given the absence of "*Jesus* (Jesus)" at Mark 14:34, it is theoretically possible that the Sangallensis Diatessaron did not include this as part of its Diatessaron formatting. Therefore no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron reads Latin, "*Et* (And) *ait* (saith he) *illis* (unto those [ones])" at this Diatessaron's chapter 48. Similar *prima facie* factors of a Diatessaron formatting inter-play with Mark 14:34, here made more real by the fact that the Latin "*Et* (And)" of this reading looks like it came from Mark 14:34, means that likewise, no reference is made to Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:38 the TR's Greek, "*Tote* (Then) *legei* (saith he) *autois* (unto them)," i.e., "Then saith he unto them," is a minority Byzantine reading supported in *Codex Alexandrinus* (A 02, 5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25); *Codex Freerianus* (W 032, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53, Washington, D.C., USA); the magnificently illuminated purple parchment, *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century, Rossano, Italy); the purple parchment, *Codex Beratinus* (Phi 043, 6th century, St. Matthew's & St. Mark's Gospels, Tirana, Albania); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark; National Library, Paris, France), 21 (12th century; National Library, Paris, France), 270 (12th century; National Library, Paris, France), 443 (12th century; Cambridge University, England, UK), 924 (12th century, Athos, Greece), 998 (12th century, Athos, Greece), 1200 (12th century, St. Catherine's Greek Orthodox Monastery, Mt. Sinai, Arabia), 1375 (12th century, Moscow, Russia), and 291 (13th century; National Library, Paris, France); and the Sydney University Lectionary written in brown ink with colourful bright red illumination of key letters and section markers, Lectionary 2378 (11th century, sent to Bulgaria from Constantinople; *Sidneiensis Universitatis, Terra Australis*⁴⁴).

The TR's reading is further supported as Latin, "*Tunc* (Then) *ait* (saith he) *illis* (unto those [ones])," in *Versio Vulgata Hieronymi* (Jerome's Vulgate Version, 4th / 5th centuries), *Codex Veronensis* (old Latin Version b, 5th century), *Codex Corbeiensis* (old Latin Version ff2, 5th 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), *Codex Corbeiensis* (old Latin Version ff1, 10th / 11th century), and *Codex*

⁴⁴ Latin, "*Sidneiensis* (Sydney) *Universitatis* (University of), *Terra* (Land) *Australis* (Southern)," "*Terra Australis*" = "Australia."

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 also supported as Latin, “*Tunc* (Then) *dicit* (saith he) *eis* (unto them),” in *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis* (old Latin Version d, 5th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407). It is also manifested in the Greek *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of e.g., Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633); and the reading, “Then he said to them,” is manifested in the Latin based translation of Wycliffe (1380).

However, a variant reading, “*Tote* (Then) *legei* (saith) *autois* (unto them) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus),” i.e., “Then saith Jesus unto them,” is the majority Byzantine reading found in e.g., K 017 (9th century), M 021 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), Pi 041 (9th century), and Gamma 036 (10th century); Minuscules 262 (10th century) and 2 (12th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D., abbreviating “*O IHCOYC*” as “*OIC*” with a bar on top of the “*IC*”). It is also found as Latin, “*Tunc* (Then) *dicit* (saith he) *eis* (unto them) *Iesus* (Jesus),” in old Latin Version a (4th century); as Latin, “*Tunc* (Then) *ait* (saith he) *illis* (unto those [ones]) *Iesus* (Jesus),” in old Latin Version h (5th century); and as Latin, “*Tunc* (Then) *ait* (saith he) *illis* (unto those [ones]) *Iesus* (Jesus),” in old Latin Version f (6th century). It is manifested in the Greek NT editions of e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522); and the reading, “Then said Jesus unto them” (Tyndale, 1526 & 1534; Cranmer, 1534; & Geneva Bible, 1557 & 1560).

There is a textual problem with the representative Byzantine text’s usage of, “*o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus),” at Matt. 26:38. In the wider immediate stylistic context of St. Matthew’s Gospel that verse 38 comes in, it is clear that the Matthean Greek only uses the proper noun of “*o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus),” to introduce a quote when a wider shift in the discourse means that to not use it would result in confusion or a lack of clarity. Thus *before* verse 38 in Matt. 26:8-10 there is conversation between “his disciples,” and so as not to introduce a quote that might confusingly sound like it was coming from one of them, we read, “When Jesus (*o Iesous*) understood it, he said unto them,” etc. (Matt. 26:10). Then of a related type of clarity we find that when the discourse shifts to “the first day of the feast of unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus (*to Iesou*), saying unto him,” etc. (Matt. 26:17). Likewise, amidst the plurality of “they (*auton*)” who “were eating,” we read at Matt. 26:26, “Jesus (*o Iesous*) took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body” etc. . Then after “they went out into the mount of Olives” (Matt. 26:30), in order to distinguish the speaker from his disciples we again read, “Then saith Jesus (*o Iesous*) Jesus unto them,” etc. (Matt. 26:31). After an exchange between “Jesus (*o Iesous*)” (Matt. 26:31) and “Peter (*o Petros*)” (Matt. 26:33), to avoid someone at first thinking that the start of the next words might be coming from Peter, we read the clarifying words of introduction, “Jesus (*o Iesous*) said unto him,” etc. (Matt. 26:34). And following the end of this discourse involving Jesus, Peter, and the other disciples (Matt. 26:35), when they came to Gethsemane, to avoid anyone initially thinking that the initial words were said by Peter or one of the disciples as some kind of continuation of verse 35, we read in verse 36, “Then cometh Jesus (*o Iesous*) with them unto a place called Gethsemane, and saith unto the disciples,” etc. .

So likewise *after verse 38*, in verses 47-49 we first have a similar situation in quoting the words of “Judas,” who had said, “Whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he: hold him fast;” and so to not confuse the reader into thinking that the initial “Hail (*Chaire*)” is from Jesus, we first read of Judas, that “forthwith he came to Jesus (*to Iesou*), and said, Hail” etc. (Matt. 26:49). Then to stop any confusion that Judas is still speaking, we read, “And Jesus (*o ... Iesous*) said unto him,” etc. (Matt. 26:50). And so likewise in verses 52 (Jesus not the one who “drew his word”), 55 (Jesus not Peter), 64 (Jesus not the high priest).

After this perusal of the surrounding literary style with respect to “Jesus” and quotations in chapter 26, let us now consider verse 38. In Matt. 26:26 we read that “cometh Jesus (*o Iesous*) with them unto a place called Gethsemane, and saith unto the disciples, Sit ye here, while I go and pray yonder.” Hence there is no need to use the proper noun of Jesus in verse 37, “And he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be very sorrowful and very heavy.” With this combination of contextual focus on Jesus, and the usage of the personal pronoun “*autois* (unto them),” once again there is no need to use the proper noun of Jesus in verse 38, “Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death” etc. . *Thus the majority Byzantine text reading*, “Then saith Jesus (*o Iesous*) unto them,” *looks like a strange grammatical creature* imposed upon the text contrary to the contextual literary style of the surrounding Matthean Greek. Therefore, the representative Byzantine text reading cannot be correct. The stylistic textual turbulence caused by the great grammatical waves pounding down on this passage at Matt. 26:38, can only be calmed, with a return to the tranquil seas of contextual textual style, by adopting the minority Byzantine reading. Thus the correct reading must be, “*Tote* (Then) *legei* (saith he) *autois* (unto them).” (Therefore on this occasion I agree with Stephanus *et al* over Erasmus⁴⁵.)

The origins of the variant are speculative.

Was the variant an accidental addition? In Lectionary 1968 the words “*O* (‘the,’ redundant in English translation) *IHCOYC* (Jesus),” are abbreviated as “*OIC*” with a bar on top of the “*IC*,” and we know that this type of abbreviation was used in ancient times from, e.g., Codex W 032. The last word of the TR’s reading before these added words of the variant is, “*AYTOIC* (unto them).” Did a scribe first write the “*AYTOIC*”? Perhaps fatigued, working at night under a flickering lamp, and with a head cold, did he then look back quickly at his original manuscript, and seeing the last three letters of the “*AYTOIC*,” quickly think in his head these were “*OIC*”? Did he then write down “*OIC*,” adding a bar on top without really thinking about the matter further, and then just

⁴⁵ Cf. e.g., Textual Commentaries Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), Matt. 12:32a (App. 1, Erasmus favoured over Stephanus); Matt. 14:14b (App. 1, Erasmus favoured over Stephanus); Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), John 21:3 discussed at Matt. 15:39a, (App. 1, majority Byzantine text favoured over Stephanus, and though I do not mention it there, also over Erasmus); Matt. 20:2 (App. 1, majority Byzantine text favoured over both Erasmus & Stephanus), Matt. 10:15b (Erasmus 1516 favoured over Erasmus 1522 & Stephanus).

keep writing?

Was the variant a deliberate addition? Did a scribe, not understanding the subtleties of the Matthean Greek in the context that this passage is set in, erroneously think that he could add a “clarification” by inserting the name of “*o (-) Iēsous (Jesus)*” here at Matt. 26:38?

Was this a deliberate or an accidental addition? We do not know. But we do know that it was an addition to the *Textus Receptus* here at Matt. 26:38.

The TR has relatively weak support in the Greek with only a certainty of *c.* 1% of the Byzantine texts; and even though it *might* be as high as *c.* 10%, or something in between these two figures, this is by no means certain or assured. But it has correspondingly strong support in the Latin textual tradition, with the impressive support of the Latin Vulgate of the ancient church father and doctor, St. Jerome; together with most of the old Latin versions. This strength in the Latin textual tradition is also manifested in the fact that it is the reading found in the Latin based English translation of John Wycliffe, *The Morning Star of the Reformation*. And since the textual analysis in its favour is based on the Greek, we here see the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, bowing down in dutiful and helpful obeisance to give manuscript support for the reading of the *Textus Receptus* in most of the Latin textual tradition. In addition to being the reading favoured by textual analysis, it also enjoys the further support of the ancient church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom, the “golden-mouthed” preacher of Constantinople. By contrast, the variant has strong support in the Greek as the majority Byzantine reading with the support of at least *c.* 90% of the Byzantine texts; but correspondingly its support in the Latin is relatively weak. Though some earlier neo-Byzantines followed the majority Byzantine text here at Matt. 26:38, like good red wine they matured with age, so that upon matured reflection the later neo-Byzantines came to embrace the minority Byzantine reading also found in e.g., St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 26:38 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. 26:38, “Then saith he unto them,” 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 text type) Codex 067 (6th century, Matt. 14; 24-26), (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 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 788 (11th century, independent), 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). It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant which adds “Jesus,” and so reads, “Then saith Jesus unto them,” is found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and 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). It is also found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; and Slavic Version (9th century).

The rationale of latter neo-Byzantines who followed the TR’s reading, *supra*, such as Elzevir, was clearly based on textual considerations. Thus, for instance, though Elzevir adopted the TR’s reading in his 1633 NT text, in Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) six out of a possible eight manuscripts are shown following the erroneous majority Byzantine reading of the variant (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).

By contrast, the rationale of the neo-Alexandrians who here followed the TR’s reading, and thus on this occasion the correct reading, was centred on the erroneous basis that it was preserved in the two main Alexandrian texts, and is also found in what from the Alexandrian School’s paradigm would be “the external support” of e.g., the Western Text (D 05), and for those which believe in a “Caesarean text,” the Caesarean Text (Armenian Version). Hence at Matt. 26:38, for the wrong reasons, the right reading of the TR was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Thus the neo-Alexandrians “got it right by a fluke,” since this unfortunate textual corruption was very largely, though not entirely, isolated to the Byzantine text. Hence the correct reading at Matt. 26:38 is found in the ASV as, “Then saith he unto them,” etc. . It is also found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, TEV, and Papists’ JB and NJB.

So too the old Latin Papists got the correct reading at Matt. 26:38, since on this occasion the Latin textual tradition very largely preserved the correct reading of the *Textus Receptus*. Thus their faulty methodology in what from the old Latin Papists paradigm would falsely be “the superiority” of the maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, meant that they too “got it right by a fluke.” Hence the correct reading at Matt. 26:38 is found in the Clementine Vulgate; and likewise the Douay-Rheims correctly reads, “Then he saith to them,” etc. .

However, the erroneous variant which adds “Jesus” is found in the main text of the Burgonite majority texts of Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). And Pierpont says in Green’s Textual Apparatus (1986) that the variant should replace the TR’s reading because “95-100% of all manuscripts support the change;” although these figures slightly overstate the definitely known majority Byzantine text strength since this can only be safely said to be in range of *c.* 90-99%, and the

corresponding manuscript strength of the TR's reading can thus be only safely be said to be in the range of *c.* 1-10%, *supra*.

I have previously stated my unease at the lack of competence of the NKJV translators, not only with respect to their translation skills⁴⁶; but also with respect to the fact, that even when judged within the confines of their own paradigm of the Burgonite Majority Text School, they are inconsistently selective as to when they do or do not show where the Majority Text of Hodges & Farstad disagrees with the TR's reading⁴⁷. Here at Matt. 26:38 we find a very clear instance of this, since though the Majority Text of Hodges & Farstad, and the Majority Byzantine Text follows the variant of "Jesus" with at least *c.* 90% of manuscripts, there is no footnote saying so in the NKJV. Once again, it is hard to see this as anything but a Burgonite ruse in which Burgonites try to claim either overtly (e.g., the Dean Burgon Society of USA), or covertly by inference (e.g., Burgon himself in his general selection for study in books published for the public of those areas where the Majority Text agreed with the TR as opposed to a neo-Alexandrian text like Westcott & Hort), that the Majority Text and Received Text are a lot closer than what they actually are⁴⁸.

But at the end of the day, though Burgon tried to curry support for his Majority Text School with King James Bible users by primarily focusing on those areas where it agreed with the *Textus Receptus* against the neo-Alexandrian text of Westcott & Hort; in the final analysis, he was part of a pincer-movement, in which the Neo-Alexandrians were one pincer arm, and the Burgonites were the other pincer arm, seeking to attack and destroy, if such a thing were possible, their common target of the *Textus Receptus*. Like Westcott & Hort, Burgon was a Puseyite and so opposed to the glorious Reformation with its Protestant truths founded on *sola Scriptura* (Latin, "Scripture alone"). Thus lurking beneath his general over-focus on those areas where the Majority Text and Received Text agreed against the Alexandrian Text, Burgon lay-in-wait with "a short dagger," that he would lunge into truth when those holding the truth of the Authorized Version first got close enough to him, and "at ease" with him, for him to strike it into their hearts. What were his real marching orders to those who knew of him less superficially than those very sincere, somewhat incompetent, and very misguided persons such as found to this day in the *Dean Burgon Society*? Simply this. The Burgon brag that, "Again and again we shall have occasion to point out ... that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction," and that "the '*Textus Receptus*' ..., calls for ... revision," "upon the" basis of the "majority of authorities⁴⁹." But our "armour of God" is on (Eph. 6:11),

⁴⁶ E.g., see my comments on Gen. 1:2 in Textual Commentaries Vol. 1, App. 3, at "The conjunctions, for instance, 'de' (and) and 'otic' (that)."

⁴⁷ E.g., see my comment at Matt. 26:35b in Appendix 3.

⁴⁸ Cf. e.g., my comments at Matt. 26:33b, *supra*.

⁴⁹ Burgon's *Revision Revised*, p. 21; *Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, pp. 13,15.

neither Burgon’s “short dagger” nor the Neo-Alexandrians nor old Latin Papists “long daggers and swords,” can penetrate it, and they with their “daggers and swords” are also cut down by “the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God” (Eph. 6:17). For we neo-Byzantine swordsmen march to the beat of a different drummer. Hear then, good Christian reader, the tune to which we march. You will find our marching tune in I Peter 1:25. *Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum!* “The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever!”

Matt. 26:42a “cup” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex, and here reads, “*calix* (cup) *hic* (this).” This is different to the Vulgate’s Luke 22:42 which reads, “*calicem* (cup) *istum* (this),” and given that the Sangallensis Diatessaron here places Luke 22:43 before the words of Matt. 26:42 at Sangallensis Diatessaron chapter 183, it was seemingly considered for the purposes of Diatessaron formatting, that the words of Luke 22:42 paralleled those of Mark 14:36, “*calicem* (cup) *hunc* (this)” found at Diatessaron chapter 182 i.e., the Sangallensis Diatessaron apparently takes the view that the words of Luke 22:42 belong to the first time Christ prayed (Matt. 26:36-41; Mark 14:32-38), rather than the second time (Matt. 26:42-43; Mark 14:39,40) or third time (Matt. 26:44-46; Mark 14:41,42). This Diatessaron formatting evidently considered St. Luke’s account was a mixed selection of all three times, since Luke 22:44 is then placed after Matt. 26:42a (second time), and so it is then seemingly considered that Luke 22:46,47 picks up after the third time hence it is not repeated, but instead Matt. 26:45-47 is used. For my purposes it is not necessary to comment on the accuracy or otherwise of this Diatessaron formatting view; suffice to say, that for my purposes here at Matt. 26:42a, I therefore exercise a discretion and show the Sangallensis Diatessaron supporting the TR, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, by contrast, the Arabic Diatessaron places the words of Luke 23:42 before those of Matt. 26:42, and those of Luke 22:43 after those of Matt. 26:42; thus sandwiching Matt. 26:42 in between these two verses of Luke 22:42 & 43. It further places Matt. 26:42 immediately after Mark 14:38b i.e., the second time (Matt. 26:42-43; Mark 14:39,40) at Arabic Diatessaron chapter 48. For my purposes it is not necessary to comment on the accuracy or otherwise of this Diatessaron formatting view; suffice to say, that for my purposes here at Matt. 26:42a, I therefore exercise a discretion and show the Sangallensis Diatessaron following the TR, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:42a the TR’s Greek, “*touto* (‘this,’ word 1) *to* (‘the,’ redundant in English translation, word 2) *poterion* (‘cup,’ word 3),” in the wider words, “if this cup (*to poterion*) may not pass away” etc. (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), E 07 (8th century), and S 028 (10th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, in word order 2,3,1; cf. old Latin l & g1, *infra*) and 1968

(1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, “*hic* (‘this,’ word 1) *calix* (‘cup’ = Greek words 2 & 3),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions f (6th 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 also supported as Latin, “*calix* (cup) *hic* (this),” in old Latin Versions 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century); as Latin, “*hoc* (this) *poculum* (cup),” in old Latin Versions a (4th century) and h (5th century); and as Latin, “*calix* (cup) *iste* (this),” in old Latin Version d (5th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367; in the same word order as old Latin l & g1, *supra*).

However, a variant omitting “*to* (-) *poterion* (cup),” and thus reading simply, “*touto* (this),” i.e., “if this may not pass away” etc. (AV), is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), and Pi 041 (9th century). It is further found as Latin, “*hoc* (this),” in old Latin Versions b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), and q (6th / 7th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Eusebius (d. 339), and Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writer, Ambrose (d. 397).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text which is thus correct. The origins of the variant are conjectural, although it appears to have originated with Origen.

Was the variant an accidental omission? The fact that Lectionary 2378 first omitted the “*touto* (this),” and then added it back in after “*to* (-) *poterion* (cup),” possibly alerts us to the presence of a potentially tricky letter and word confusion here at Matt. 26:42a, with an ellipsis from the “*to*” and the beginning of “*touto* (this)” to the “*to*” of “*to* (-) *poterion* (cup).” *But does the plot thicken still further?* Looking at the words, “*touto* (this) *to* (-) *poterion* (cup) *parelthein* (pass away),” possibly in a continuous script manuscript, did a scribe become confused by the last “*to*” of “*touto*” and following “*to p*” with the next word starting with “*p*” i.e., “*toutotopoterionparelthein*”, so that after he wrote the last “*to*” of “*touto*”, thinking in his mind “*top*” from “*to poterion*”, but not consciously thinking what the “*top*” was from, did his eye then jump to the “*p*” of “*parelthein*,” and did he then keep writing, thus accidentally omitting the “*to poterion*”?

Was the variant a deliberate omission? Did a scribe, seeking a semi-assimilation with the Marcan account where the first time Jesus says, “if it were possible, the (*e*) hour (*ora*) might pass from him” (Mark 14:35), and the second time he “spake the same words” (Mark 14:39), deliberately prune away the “*to* (-) *poterion* (cup)” at Matt. 26:42 to make these accounts more similar, and allow for the insertion in Matt. 26:42 of “the hour”? If so, any inference that the deleted word would be “the hour” of Mark 14:35 is quite silly as Christ goes on to say, “except I drink it” (Matt. 26:42). Moreover, any such “assimilation” fails to recognize Christ said the words of both the Matthean and Marcan accounts, and quite possibly many more that we have no record of. But of course, any scribe who thinks he may tamper with the Word of God and somehow “improve” it, is by

definition dim-witted. Therefore, did such a dim-witted scribe miss these points, and prune away the “*to (-) poterion* (cup)” of Matt. 26:42 as a semi-assimilation with the Marcan account?

Was this a deliberate omission by a dim-witted scribe, or an accidental omission by a less adroit scribe on one of his “vague days”? We do not know. We cannot know. But we can know that this was an omission from the Received Text of Scripture here preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR’s reading has strong support in the Greek over time, and through time, dating from the late 5th century (ancient times) or 6th century (early mediaeval times). It also has strong support in the Latin textual tradition, with St. Jerome’s Vulgate and most old Latin Versions, dating from ancient times (old Latin a, d, & h). It also enjoys the support of the church father, St. Hilary; whom Book 1, Homily 3, Article 35 of the Anglican 39 Articles notes upheld the doctrine of justification by faith alone, saying, “St. Hilary saith these words plainly in the ninth canon upon Matthew: ‘Faith only justifieth’⁵⁰.” By contrast, the variant looks like it originated with the heretic, Origen. It has relatively weak support in both the Greek and Latin, although its support comes from ancient times. Weighing up these factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 26:42a 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. 26:42a, “this cup,” is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century; in Greek word order 2,3,1). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscules 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text); as well as in (Greek word order 2,3,1) the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is further found in the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the variant which omits “cup,” and so reads simply, “this,” 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 067 (6th century, Matt. 14; 24-26), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th

⁵⁰ Latin, “*Fides* (faith) *enim* (in fact) *sola* (only) *justificat* (justifieth);” Griffiths, J., (Editor), *The Two Books of Homilies*, Oxford, UK, 1859, at p. 28.

century, independent), and 1071 (12th century, independent); as well as the *Family I Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is also found in the Syriac Harclean h Version (616); some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

At Matt. 26:42a, the strength of the TR's reading in the Latin meant that the old Latin Papists followed the correct reading in the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version, the latter of which reads, "if this chalice (Latin, *calix*) may not pass away" etc. .

The erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence the ASV reads, "if this cannot pass away" etc. . So too, the incorrect variant is found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, and NRSV.

By contrast, "cup (Greek, *to poterion*)" is found at Matt. 26:42a in the NIV, TEV, NEB, REB, TCNT, JB, NJB, and Moffatt Bible. Is this a case of the neo-Alexandrian NIV, TEV, NEB, and REB translators, and semi neo-Alexandrian Moffatt, exercising their non-Alexandrian pincer arm? Did one or more of them conclude that with such "wide support" as e.g., the Western Text (D 05), so called "pre-Caesarean Text" (Family 13), so called "Caesarean Text" (Armenian Version), and Syriac (Sinaitic & Pesitto), that "cup" was "the better reading." On the one hand, such a possibility is most likely with Moffatt, since the Western Text here follows the TR's reading; and the fact that the NIV uses an "eclectic" Greek text (NIV Preface) also increases the probability of this in the case of the NIV. But on the other hand, since the NIV, TEV, NEB, REB, TCNT, JB, NJB, and Moffatt Bible are all very loose'n'liberal "translations," which employ many gratuitous "dynamic equivalents," it is also possible that this was being added in as "an implied word" as part of a "dynamic equivalent." (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.) So are the NIV, TEV, NEB, REB, TCNT, JB, NJB, and Moffatt Bible here employing their non-Alexandrian pincer arm, or are they using a "dynamic equivalent" that simply looks like the TR's reading? Or is one, two, three, four, five, six, or seven of them doing one thing, and the other seven, six, five, four, three, two, or one, respectively, doing the other thing? The vagaries of the NIV, TEV, NEB, REB, TCNT, Moffatt, and the Papists' JB and NJB, mean we simply do not know, and nor do any of their benighted devotees.

Matt. 26:42b "from me" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*ap'* (from) *emou* (me)," in the wider words, "O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from (*ap'*) me (*emou*), except I drink it, thy will be done" (AV & TR), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and Gamma 036 (10th 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 as Latin, "*a* (from) *me* (me)," in old Latin

Versions ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), and q (6th / 7th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D., as a compound word, “*ame*”). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; and the ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367).

However, a variant omitting Greek, “*ap*’ (from) *emou* (me),” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 924 (12th century). The omission is further found in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Eusebius (d. 339); and ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367) and Ambrose (d. 397).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which thus must stand. The origins of the variant are speculative, although it appears to have originated with Origen.

Was the variant an accidental omission? Probably coming at the end of a line, and possibly also “squeezed in” at the end of the line, was the “*ap*’ (from) *emou* (me)” lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was the variant a deliberate omission? Did a prunist scribe, if so, probably Origen, regard the “*ap*’ (from) *emou* (me)” as “redundant” and “unnecessarily wordy”? did he then prune them away in order to make “a more succinct text”?

Was this a deliberate or accidental omission? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that it was an omission to the *Textus Receptus* here Providentially preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR’s reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading over time, and through time, dating from ancient times. It also has support as a minority reading in the Latin textual tradition, once again dating from ancient times. It further enjoys the support of the church fathers, St. John Chrysostom in the Greek, and St. Hilary in the Latin. By contrast, the variant has relatively weak support in the Greek, and correspondingly strong support in the Latin; with the variant looking very much like the type of thing that Origen would do. 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. 26:42b 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. 26:42b, “from

me,” in the wider words, “may not pass away from me, except I drink it” etc., is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 067 (6th century, Matt. 14; 24-26), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also 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*, 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 Version (616); and the Armenian Version (5th century).

However, the variant omitting, “from me,” and so reading simply, “may not pass away, except I drink it” etc., 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) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscules 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 I Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

At Matt. 26:42b the erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence the ASV reads, “cannot pass away, except I drink it” etc. . So too the incorrect variant is found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

For we Neo-Byzantine School defenders of the *Textus Receptus*, this attack upon the Received Text of Matt. 26:42b is nothing “new” that has only come about as a consequence of the rise of the Neo-Alexandrian School from the nineteenth century on. The old Latin Papists of post Trent Council and pre-Vatican II Council times followed the variant in both the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims, the latter of which reads, “may not pass away, but I must drink it” etc. . So too at Matt. 26:42b, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post Vatican II Council times follow the variant in their Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB.

Matt. 26:43 “And he came and found them asleep again” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:43, Hodges & Farstad (1985), who base their majority text on both von Soden’s K and I groups, show a “seriously divided” text between the TR’s reading

and the *Variant 1* reading⁵¹; whereas Robinson & Pierpont (2005), who base their majority text on von Soden's K group, show the TR's reading as that of the MBT without any such qualification. Their common source book of von Soden (1913), says the K group follows the TR's word order, but that the Kr subgroup follows *Variant 1*. The Kr subgroup has between *c.* 20% or one-fifth of the *c.* 1,000 K group manuscripts overall, and *c.* 22.5-25% or one-quarter of the K group's *c.* 860 Gospel manuscripts; and thus on any reasonable broad-brush statistical projections *c.* 20-25% of the MBT⁵².

Allowing an error bar of 10% i.e., i.e., the K group support for the MBT is *c.* 75-80% +/- *c.* 7.5-8%, and the K group support for *Variant 1* is *c.* 20-25% +/- *c.* 2-2.5%, raises the question of where within this range of less than *c.* 10% the support for *Variant 2* is. Von Soden's K group figures are too generalist to tell us anything about this. While I generally base such MBT statistical projections exclusively on von Soden's K group, on this occasion, are we able to improve upon these figures with respect to *Variant 2* by additionally consulting von Soden's I group figures?

Inside his I group at Matt. 26:43, von Soden shows *Variant 2* followed by the Byzantine text manuscripts: Codices A 02, K 017, and Pi 041; and Minuscules 1355 (12th century), 291 (13th century), 1604 (13th century), and 235 (14th century). However, the fact that von Soden shows K 017 following *Variant 2* and both Nestle-Aland (1993) and Swanson (1995) show K 017 following *Variant 1*, and the fact that I also know from my photocopy of a Facsimile of A 02 that it too in fact follows *Variant 1*, highlights another difficulty with von Soden's textual apparatus here at Matt. 26:43, namely, von Soden shows as one variant, "*autous* (word 2, 'them') *palin* (word 3, 'again')," and as another variant, "*euriskei* (word 1a)" or "*euren* (word 1b, 'found')." Thus I am only able to reconstruct *Variant 2* readings from von Soden by following those readings shown as "*euren* (word 1b, 'found')," but not shown as having "*palin* (word 3, 'again')" after "*autous* (word 2, 'them')," of which A 02 and K 017 are such instances. But of course, given the generalist nature of von Soden's groups, he may select A 02 or K 017 for one reading, but not the other, hence the *prima facie* discrepancy between von Soden and both Nestle-Aland and Swanson, in fact is not a discrepancy, since both Nestle-Aland and Swanson give the full reading whereas von Soden gives only a part of it. Furthermore, while *prima facie* we should allow an error bar of *c.* 10% within von Soden's group, one must here allow it for both of the two readings that *Variant 2* is made up of, i.e., 20% not 10% of 7 manuscripts, which is 1.4 manuscripts i.e., 1 or 2 manuscripts. But such error bar figures are at their most inaccurate and most unreliable when dealing with very small numbers of von Soden manuscripts, such as here.

If von Soden had either specifically grouped together *Variant 2* as a variant in its own right here at Matt. 26:43; or if the sample gotten from the methodology I here used were a better sized sample, then we could use such figures with the normal qualifications.

⁵¹ Hodges & Farstad, pp. xxi & 92.

⁵² On the Kr subgroup, see footnote on Matt. 26:33a, *supra*.

But given that we are dealing with a reconstruction based on putting together the data in two textual readings that von Soden used, coupled with the fact that we are dealing with a very small sample of 7 manuscripts, of which *c.* 2 are to be excluded, i.e., a remaining group of just 5 manuscripts, means any projections based on this data is statistically extremely hazardous in the context of von Soden's often random selections from his generalist groupings, and his wider I and K group of *c.* 1,300 Byzantine manuscripts. Therefore, under the circumstances, I think the safest thing to say here at Matt. 26:43 is that while there are some *prima facie* indications that the support for *Variant 2* is less than 1%, exactly where under the higher mark of *c.* 10% the support for *Variant 2* rests is still "anybody's guess," although given the lower figures for the TR are at *c.* 75% and *Variant 1* are at *c.* 20%, on the available data, it looks like the support for *Variant 2* may well be below 5%. In short, on this occasion consulting von Soden's I group does not yield us anything sufficiently firm to be of definitive value over and above that which we could have determined from simply consulting the data on his K group.

Thus in broad terms one can say that the TR's reading has the support of at least *c.* 75% of Byzantine text manuscripts; *Variant 1* has the support of at least *c.* 20% of Byzantine text manuscripts; and *Variant 2* has less than *c.* 10% support, and on the available data, may well be below 5%.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:43 the TR reads Greek, "*Kai* (And) *elthon* (word 1a, 'coming' = 'he came,' masculine singular nominative, active aorist participle, from *erchomai*) *euriskei* (word 2a, '[and] he found' = '[and] found,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *eurisko*) *autous* (word 3, 'them') *palin* (word 4, 'again')," i.e., "And he came and found them asleep again" (AV & TR), in which the emphasis of "again (*palin*)," is on the fact he "found them ... again." This is the majority Byzantine text reading found in e.g., M 021 (9th century) and U 030 (9th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also found as Latin, "*Et* (And) *cum* (when) *venisset* ('he had come,' word 1b, subjunctive active pluperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *venio*) *rursus* ('again,' adverb⁵³) *invenit* ('he findeth' = 'findeth,' word 2a, indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *invenio*) *eos* ('them,' word 3)," i.e., "And when he had come, again he findeth them asleep," in old Latin Version a (4th century). It is further found as Latin, "*Et* (And) *veniens* ('coming' = 'he cometh,' word 1c, masculine singular nominative, active present participle, from *venio*) *invenit* ('[and] he findeth' = '[and] findeth,' word 2a) *eos* ('them,' word 3) *iterum* ('again,' word 4)," i.e., "And he cometh and findeth them asleep again," in old Latin Version q (6th / 7th century).

⁵³ The Latin adverb is generally put next to the verb it goes with, and before its verb when it ends a sentence, so that here, the adverb goes with "*invenit* (he findeth)." See Basil Gildersleeve's *Latin Grammar* (1st ed. 1867, 2nd ed. 1872, 3rd ed. 1895; Gilder sleeve & Lodge's 3rd edition, Macmillan & Co., 1895, reprint, Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, Wauconda, Illinois, USA, 2000), pp. 431-2, section 677.

Variant 1 reads Greek, “*elthon* (word 1, ‘he came’) *euren* (word 2b, ‘[and] found,’ indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *eurisko*⁵⁴) *autous* (word 3, ‘them’) *palin* (word 4, ‘again’),” i.e., “And he came and found them asleep again” (AV & TR), in which the emphasis of “again (*palin*),” is on the fact he “found them ... again.” This is a minority Byzantine reading e.g., Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), and K 017 (9th century); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century).

Variant 2 reads Greek, “*elthon* (word 1, ‘he came’) *palin* (word 4, ‘again’) *euren* (word 2b, ‘[and] he found’ = ‘[and] found’) *autous* (word 3, ‘them’),” i.e., “And he came again and found them asleep,” in which the emphasis of “again (*palin*),” is on the fact “he came again.” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is further found as Latin, “*Et* (And) *venit* (‘he cometh.’ word 1d, indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *venio*) *iterum* (‘again,’ word 4), *et* (and) *invenit* (‘he findeth’ = ‘findeth,’ word 2a) *eos* (‘them,’ word 3),” i.e., “And he cometh again, and findeth them asleep,” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found as Latin, “*venit* (‘he cometh,’ word 1d) *iterum* (‘again,’ word 4), *invenit* (‘[and] findeth,’ word 2a) *eos* (‘them,’ word 3),” i.e., “he cometh again, and findeth them asleep,” in the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.); and as Latin, “*Et* (And) *veniens* (‘he cometh,’ word 1c) *iterum* (‘again,’ word 4), *invenit* (‘[and] findeth,’ word 2a) *eos* (‘them,’ word 3),” i.e., “And he cometh again, and findeth them asleep,” in old Latin Version d (5th century).

The TR’s reading and *Variant 1* have the same meaning in English, though there is a difference of emphasis between these two readings and that of *Variant 2*. For whereas the TR and *Variant 1* both put the emphasis of “again (*palin*)” on the fact that Christ “found them ... again,” by contrast, *Variant 2* puts the emphasis of “again (*palin*)” on the fact that “he” i.e., Christ, “he came again.”

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

Was *Variant 1* an accidental alteration? In a manuscript reading “*Kai* (And) *elthon* (he came) *euriskei* ([and] found) *autous* (them) *palin* (again),” probably with the word “*euriskei* ([and] found)” coming at the end of the line, as a consequence of a paper fade did the “*euriskei*” come to look something like “*eur::::*”? Was this then “reconstructed” by a scribe “from context” as “*euren* ([and] found)”? If so, was he

⁵⁴ This aorist declension will here be the same, whether declined as a first aorist from *aura* or a second aorist from *euron* (Mounce’s *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT*, pp. 21 & 226).

influenced by the usage of “*euren* (‘he found’ = ‘found’)” at Matt. 18:28 and / or Matt. 20:6 and / or Matt. 21:19? If so, he would have done better to have considered the “*euriskei*” of Matt. 7:8; 12:43,44; 26:40.

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate alteration? I remember an Anglican clergyman in the Diocese of Sydney saying to me some years ago, that he believed in “always the best for God,” and so e.g., the Communion chalice and patens should be of a high quality silver, and shining clean for church services, etc. . But not all persons who profess and call themselves “Christian,” share such sentiments as, “always the best for God.” In an era when writing parchments were hard to get and expensive, did a scribe think it some kind of “clever change” to “use the shorter and more concise” term of “*euren* ([and] found)” instead of “*euriskei* ([and] found),” as a “paper saving” device?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental alteration? Using a manuscript with the TR’s “*elthon* (word 1a, ‘he came’) *euriskei* (word 2a, ‘[and] found) *autous* (word 3, ‘them’) *palin* (word 4, ‘again’),” did a scribe writing quickly, first leave out the “*euriskei* (word 2a)” and then realizing his error, add it back in after word 3, because without thinking it through carefully he wrongly thought, “It means the same thing”? If so, the “*euriskei* (word 2a, ‘[and] found’)” was then later changed to “*euren* (word 2b, ‘[and] found’).” Or did a scribe using a manuscript with the *Variant 1*’s “*elthon* (word 1, ‘he came’) *euren* (word 2b, ‘[and] found’) *autous* (word 3, ‘them’) *palin* (word 4, ‘again’),” writing quickly, first leave out the “*euren* (word 2b),” and then realizing his error, add it back in after word 3, because without thinking it through carefully he wrongly thought, “It means the same thing”?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate alteration? Did a scribe with an elevated view of the apostolate, consider it to “undesirable” to be “rubbing in the fact” at Matt. 26:43 that once “again” Christ “found them asleep”? Did he therefore think it some kind of “theological improvement” to “elevate the apostolate in the people’s minds,” and so move the “*palin* (word 4, ‘again’)” to switch the emphasis and make it Christ who “came again”? Alternatively, or possibly in conjunction with such thinking, is this usage of “*palin* (word 4, ‘again’)” at Matt. 26:43 a semi-assimilation with the usage of “*palin* (again)” at Matt. 26:42 and Matt. 26:44a? If this was a deliberate alteration, was this theological “corrector” scribe working from a copy of the TR that later had word 2a changed to word 2b, or was he working from a *Variant 1* manuscript?

Were these variants deliberate or accidental changes or some combination thereof? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that they were changes to the text of Scripture here Providentially preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR’s reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine Greek reading, over time and through time, enjoying the support of at least *c.* 75% or about three-quarters of the Byzantine text Greek manuscripts, against which there is no good textual argument. Through reference to the Latin textual tradition, its manuscript support can be shown to exist from ancient times with old Latin a (4th century), and from early mediaeval times with old Latin q (6th / 7th century). By contrast, *Variant 1* has the

support of at least *c.* 20% or about one-fifth of the Greek Byzantine text manuscripts, and so is a strong minority Greek reading, dating from ancient times. *Variant 2* has the support of less than *c.* 10% of the Greek Byzantine text manuscripts, and on the available data, may well be below 5%. But it has correspondingly strong support in the Latin dating from ancient times. Weighing up these considerations; bearing in mind the fact that the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, here supports the TR's reading; and the fact that if it is at all possible, we of the neo-Byzantine School like to show a reading over time and through time, dating from ancient times; on this occasion, I consider that the Latin support dating from both ancient times and early mediaeval times, is enough to *just bring* the TR's reading "over the line" of a high level "B" in the range of 71-74%, and into the range of a lower level 75-76% "A." Thus on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 26:43 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. 26:43, "And he came and found (*euriskei*, word 2a) them asleep again," i.e., in which the emphasis of "again (*palin*)," is on the fact he "found them ... again," is found in Minuscule 579 (13th century, mixed text).

Variant 1, "And he came and found (*euren*, word 2b) them asleep again," i.e., in which the emphasis of "again (*palin*)," is on the fact he "found them ... again," is found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels).

Either the TR's reading or that of *Variant 1*, is further found in the Syriac Harclean h Version (616).

Variant 2, "And he came again and found (*euren*, word 2b) them asleep," i.e., in which the emphasis of "again (*palin*)," is on the fact "he came again," 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 C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 067 (6th century, Matt. 14; 24-26), (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), 700 (11th century, independent), and 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*; 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 Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions, and the margin of the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century), and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version.

At Matt. 26:43 the erroneous *Variant 2* was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence the ASV reads, “And he came again and found them sleeping.” So too the incorrect *Variant 2* is also found at Matt. 26:43 in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, and TEV.

For we neo-Byzantines, this general adoption of *Variant 2* at Matt. 26:43 by e.g., the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post Vatican II Council times in their JB and NJB is nothing new. The old Latin Papists of pre Vatican II Council times also followed this reading in both the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version, the latter of which reads here, “And he cometh again and findeth them sleeping.”

However, either the correct reading of the TR or that of *Variant 1* is found in the *New International Version*, which reads at Matt. 26:43, “When he came back, he again found them sleeping” (NIV). Likewise, Moffatt reads at Matt. 26:43, “And when he returned, he found them asleep again” (Moffatt Bible). Why did they choose to exercise their non-Alexandrian text pincer arm on this occasion? Possibly drawing on both the TR’s reading and *Variant 1*, they were evidently impressed by “the broad textual support” in the Byzantine Text type (TR), reaching back into antiquity (*Variant 1*, A 02 & W 032), found more widely in e.g., Minuscule 579 (TR’s reading) and Codex Delta 037 (*Variant 1*); together with its support in the Syriac (Harclean Version).

Yet this of itself would not have been enough for either neo-Alexandrian translators of the NIV or a semi neo-Alexandrian translator in the case of Moffatt, to adopt this TR and / or *Variant 1* reading. In textual terms, they evidently adjudged the reading of the TR and / or *Variant 1* the “harder” and “therefore more likely” reading. This may have rested on the fact that it puts the apostolate in a less favourable light than does the reading of *Variant 2* and / or the fact that the “again (*palin*)” of *Variant 2* at Matt. 26:43 is more like the usage of the “again (*palin*)” of Matt. 26:42 and Matt. 26:44a, and so looks like a semi-assimilation with these two passages. But as is generally the case in such instances of neo-Alexandrians or semi neo-Alexandrians exercising a non-Alexandrian text pincer arm, most of the other neo-Alexandrians disagree with them. In this instance, most neo-Alexandrians looked to “the comfort zone” support of their two main Alexandrian texts; and “external support” in e.g., the Western Text, most of the Latin textual tradition, and the Syriac (Sinaitic and Pesitto Versions); and hence they saw no reason to depart from the Neo-Alexandrian normativity of their paradigm here at Matt. 26:43. (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.)

Matt. 26:44b “saying the same words” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate

Codex, and here *prima facie* follows the TR's reading in its words, "*eundem* (the same) *sermonem* ('discourse' = 'words') *dicens* (saying)" (Diatessaron chapter clxxxii). However, this same formulae of words is found in the Vulgate at both Matt. 26:44b and Mark 14:39. Therefore no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, the presence of Ciasca's nineteenth century Latin translation of "*eundem* (the same) *sermonem* ('discourse' = 'words') *dicens* (saying)" (Diatessaron chapter xlvi), raises the same basic issue with regard to Matt. 26:44b and Mark 14:39. Hence no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:44b the TR's Greek, "*ton* (the) *auton* (same) *logon* (words) *eipon* (saying)," i.e., "saying the same words" (TR & AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and E 07 (8th 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 further supported as Latin, "*eundem* (the same) *sermonem* ('discourse' = 'words'⁵⁵) *dicens* (saying)," i.e., "saying the same words," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions 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).

However, a variant which upon reconstruction of the Latin, "*iterato* (repeating)," as Greek, "*eipon* (saying) *palin* (again)," is Greek, "*ton* (the) *auton* (same) *logon* (words) *eipon* (saying) *palin* (again)" i.e., "saying the same words again," is a minority Latin reading. It is found as Latin, "*eundem* (the same) *sermonem* ('discourse' = 'words') *iterato* ('repeating' = 'saying again')," i.e., "saying again the same words," in old Latin Version a (4th century).

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

Was the variant an accidental addition?

We know from the Byzantine Text parts of Greek manuscripts such as e.g., *Manuscript London* (A 02) and *Manuscript Washington* (W 032), that many of the verse numbers that come from Stephanus's 1551 work and which are found in the AV, in fact

⁵⁵ Latin, "*sermonem* (masculine singular accusative noun)," comes from *sermo*; and via the Old French, "*sermon*" and Anglo-French, "*sermun*," Latin "*sermo*" gives us our English word, "sermon."

manifest more ancient unnumbered verse divisions. E.g., here at Matt. 26:44b, *Manuscript London* ends verse 44b at the end of one line, and starts the “*Tote* (Then)” of verse 45 on a new line, making the “T” of “TOTE” to protrude about one letter space to the left of the right-hand justified page column so as to make it stand out more. Likewise in *Manuscript Washington*, the first word of verse 45, which looks something like “ΕΙΠΩ̄”, is “squeezed in” at the end of one line so that it protrudes further than most words on the page to the right, in order to start verse 45 on a new line.

In such a Greek manuscript was there a stylistic paper space at the end of verse 44 and before verse 45 in order to make such an unnumbered verse division? Did a scribe wrongly take this to be a “paper fade”? Looking at this verse, did a Greek scribe then think that the earlier “*palin* (again)” of this verse “should be repeated here” to “fill in this gap”? Or did a Latin scribe think that the sense of the earlier, “*iterum* (again),” should be inserted here with “*iterato* (‘repeating’ = ‘saying again’)”?

Was the variant a deliberate addition? Did a second rate Greek or Latin scribe consider that to place either Greek “*palin* (again)” or Latin “*iterato* (‘repeating’ = ‘saying again’)” here at the end of verse 44, would be “a good stylistic balance” with the earlier Greek “*palin* (again)” or “*iterum* (again)” respectively of this verse?

Was this a deliberate or accidental addition? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that it was an addition to the Received Text of Scripture here faithfully preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR’s reading has rock solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading against which there is no good textual argument, being found in the Greek over time, and through time, dating from ancient times. It has similar strong manuscript support in the Latin textual tradition, being the near monolithic Latin reading, including, for example, the Latin Vulgate of the church father and doctor, St. Jerome. By contrast, the variant has no known support in the Greek, and in the Latin only the support of one manuscript. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 26:44b 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. 26:44b, “saying the same words,” 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 067 (6th century, Matt. 14; 24-26), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and 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), 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 the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; and the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions.

However, the variant which adds, “again,” and so reads, “saying the same words again,” is found as Greek, “*palin* (again),” 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 also found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century).

At Matt. 26:44b the incorrect variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. In doing so, Westcott-Hort gives a sidenote in which they give an alternative rendering in which the Greek, “*palin* (again)” attaches to the start of verse 45 i.e., “*Palin* (‘Again,’ adverb) *tote* (‘then,’ adverb) *erchetai* (cometh he)” etc. . On the one hand, the usage of a double adverb in Greek may be found in *some contexts*, for instance, the “*sphodra* (‘greatly,’ adverb) *sphodra* (‘greatly,’ adverb),” i.e., “very greatly” or “exceedingly” of Judith 4:2 (Septuagint Apocrypha)⁵⁶; but on the other hand, any such double adverb is at best rare and unusual. However an adjective and adverb is more common e.g., at Matt. 6:30, “*pollo* (‘much,’ neuter singular dative adjective, from *polus-e-u*) *mallon* (‘more,’ adverb),” in the words, “shall he not much more clothe you?” (Cf. *polus-e-u* with the adverb *sphodra*, in the Septuagint at e.g., Josh. 11:4; 22:8; I Sam. / III Kgs 10:2; II Sam. / IV Kgs 21:16, LXX.) And the usage of both “*palin*” (e.g., Matt. 4:8; 5:33; 13:45,47) and “*tote*” (e.g., Matt. 9:14; 11:20; 13:36) in the context of Matthean Greek, makes the terminology of “*Palin* (‘Again,’ adverb) *tote* (‘then,’ adverb)” here as a variant reading of Matt. 26:45 look decidedly awkward and strained. If this were the meaning, a more expected way of saying this would be that which we find in the Johannean Greek of John 10:7, “*oun* (‘then,’ particle) *palin* (‘again,’ adverb),” or John 18:7, “*Palin* (‘again,’ adverb) *oun* (‘then,’ particle).” Moreover, this reading of the variant at Matt. 26:44b is an impossible construction with regard to the Latin of old Latin a, *supra*. Hence this *highly* (adverb) *unlikely* (adverb) and improbable meaning of the variant here at Matt. 26:44b as promoted in this sidenote by Westcott & Hort, has understandably not been so advocated in later neo-Alexandrian texts.

⁵⁶ Found in the main text of Brenton’s Septuagint and Rahlfs-Hanhart’s Septuagint, the latter says this reads simply “*sphodra* (‘greatly,’ adverb)” in the Septuagints attached to Codex Alexandrinus and Codex Sinaiticus, but “*sphodra* (‘greatly,’ adverb) *sphodra* (‘greatly,’ adverb),” is found in Codex Vaticanus. (Rahlfs-Hanhart is based mainly on these three Septuagints attached to the NT Greek manuscripts of the same Codices’ names.) But for my purposes, its presence in the Septuagint of Codex Vaticanus is enough to demonstrate it as a Greek grammatical construction.

However, what from the paradigm of the Neo-Alexandrian School is the absence of very much “external support” for the variant, coupled with the neo-Alexandrian’s general rule that “the shorter reading is the better reading,” meant that for the wrong reasons, the correct reading of the TR was adopted at Matt. 26:44b by the RSV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV. For example the *New Revised Standard Version* reads, “saying the same words” (NRSV). This is thus an example of a number of neo-Alexandrian translators using their non-Alexandrian text pincer arm. (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.)

By contrast, because from the paradigm of the Neo-Alexandrian School, the variant is supported by the two main Alexandrian texts and has some “external support” beyond this in e.g., old Latin a, Codex L 019, and the Bohairic Version, the erroneous variant was adopted by a number of neo-Alexandrian translators. It is found at Matt. 26:44b in the ASV as “saying again the same words.” It is also found in the NASB, ESV, and TCNT.

The variant was also adopted by the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of the JB and NJB. They thus departed from the correct reading of the old Latin Papists in the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims, the latter of which reads, at Matt. 26:44b, “saying the selfsame word.”

The adoption of the variant at Matt. 26:44b by all textual compilers of the Neo-Alexandrian School that we consider in these commentaries; together with some, though not all neo-Alexandrian translators, was based first and foremost on its presence in the two main Alexandrian texts. This reminds us that while the ancient Alexandrian scribes were usually prunists, sometimes they were conflationists e.g., Acts 16:7. (See also my comments on such conflation in Vol. 1 at Matt. 7:22 and Matt. 7:29; in Vol. 2 at Matt. 20:10d in App. 3 on Codex Sinaiticus; and in Vol. 4 at Matt. 26:53b, *Variant 3* on Codex Sinaiticus, and at Matt. 27:49; and Vol. 5 at Mark 1:4). For among the “many which corrupt the Word of God” (II Cor. 2:17), some like to “take away from the words of the book” (Rev. 22:19), and some like to “add unto these things” (Rev. 22:18). By contrast, for we neo-Byzantines, the Word of God as found in the *Textus Receptus* is “just right.” *We seek for no changes, we desire for no changes, we want no changes. Give us the “very pure” “Word” of God, for we “loveth it” (Ps. 119:140), and will admit no rivals to its textual purity!*⁵⁷

Matt. 26:45a “his disciples” (TR & AV) {A}

⁵⁷ Cf. my sermon, “Exposition of I & II Thessalonians 3/3: The Doctrine of Scripture – The ‘Word’,” Short title, “The Pure Word,” of February 17, 2011 (Mangrove Mountain Union Church, N.S.W., Australia), at <http://www.sermonaudio.com> or go directly to my sermons and select to listen to this one at <http://www.sermonaudio.com/kingjamesbible>; printed copy at Textual Commentaries Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25), “Appendix 8: A Sermons Bonus.”

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron follows the TR's reading at Matt. 26:45a with Latin, "*discipulos* (disciples) *suos* (his)" (Diatessaron chapter clxxxii). The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex, and the Vulgate uses these same words at Luke 22:45. However, the Sangallensis Diatessaron first uses the section from Luke 22:45 at its verse 4, and then later uses the Matt. 26:45a section at its verse 7 of chapter 182. Therefore I show the Sangallensis Diatessaron supporting the TR's reading, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:45a the TR's Greek, "*tous* (the) *mathetas* (disciples) *autou* (of him)," i.e., "his disciples" (AV & TR), 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), U 030 (9th century), and Gamma 036 (10th 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 as Latin, "*discipulos* (disciples) *suos* (his)," 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), aur (7th century), l (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, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation.

However, a variant omitting Greek, "*autou* (of him)," and so reading simply, "*tous* (the) *mathetas* (disciples)," i.e., "the disciples," is a minority Byzantine reading found in e.g., Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), M 021 (9th century), and Pi 041 (9th century). It is also found as Latin, "*discipulos* (disciples)," in old Latin Versions q (6th / 7th century) and r1 (7th century).

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

Was the variant an accidental omission? Probably coming at the end of a line, was the "*autou* (of him)" lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was the variant a deliberate omission? Did a prunist scribe consider the "*autou* (of him)" was "redundant," since "contextually it is obvious that these are Jesus' disciples"? Did he then prune away the "*autou* (of him)" as "a stylistic improvement"?

Was this a deliberate or accidental omission? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that it was an omission to the *Textus Receptus* (TR) here preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR has rock solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading against which there is no good textual argument, found over time, and through time, dating from ancient times. It also has rock solid support in the Latin as the near monolithic reading of the Latin textual tradition, including the Vulgate of the ancient church father and doctor, S. Hierome (St. Jerome). By contrast, the variant has relatively weak support in both the Greek and Latin. Weighing up these factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 26:45a 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. 26:45a, "his disciples" is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); and Minuscule 579 (13th century, mixed text). It is further found in the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant which reads, "the disciples," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and 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), 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (12th century, independent), and 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude). It is also found in the Syriac Harclean h Version (616); the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); and the Armenian Version (5th century).

The erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Thus at Matt. 26:45a the ASV reads "the disciples." So too, the incorrect variant is found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

The correct reading was adopted by the post Trent Council and pre Vatican II Council old Latin Papists in both their Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version, the latter of which reads at Matt. 26:45a, "his disciples." However, the post Vatican II Council new neo-Alexandrian Papists adopted the erroneous variant of Codex Vaticanus *et al* in their Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB.

Matt. 26:53a "now" (TR & AV) {A}; &

Matt. 26:53b "he shall presently give me" (TR & AV) {A}.

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

I shall discuss the Matt. 26:53a and Matt. 26:53b readings in this section because of the nexus that may exist between Matt. 26:53a and *Variant 1* of Matt. 26:53b in *some*,

though *not all*, manuscripts. (For Matt. 26:53c and Matt. 26:53d see Appendix 3.)

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:53a the TR's Greek, "*arti* (now)," in the wider words, "Thinkest thou that I cannot now (*arti*) pray to my Father" etc. (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and U 030 (9th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*modo* (now)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254), in both the Greek and also a Latin translation; and the ancient church Latin writer, Orosius (d. after 418).

At Matt. 26:53a, a variant omitting Greek, "*arti* (now)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 1010 (12th century), and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th 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 in the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); and the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation.

At Matt. 26:53b the TR's Greek, "*parastesei* (he shall presently give) *moi* (me)," in the wider words, "he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?" is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53, with spelling variant of "*plious*" / "more"), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and U 030 (9th 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 further supported as Latin, "*exhibebit* (he shall presently give) *mihi* (me)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), and c (12th / 13th century), as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D., with compound word *plusquam* = *plus* / 'more' + *quam* / 'than,' whereas the other Latin manuscripts show this as two words).

At Matt. 26:53b *Variant 1* adding, Greek "*arti* (now)," to read, "*parastesei* (he shall presently give) *moi* (me) *arti* (now)," i.e., "he shall now give me," is found in the ancient church Greek writers, Chrysostom (d. 407) and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444). It is further found as Latin, "*modo* (now)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century); 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 in the ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420).

At Matt. 26:53b *Variant 2* adding, Greek, “*ode* (‘here’ or ‘in this place’),” to read, “*parastesei* (he shall presently give) *moi* (me) *ode* (here),” i.e., “he shall here give me,” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 924 (12th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer Basil the Great (d. 379).

At Matt. 26:53b *Variant 3* adding both a similar reading to *Variant 2*, as well as *Variant 1*, is found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

At Matt. 26:53a and Matt. 26:53b there is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must thus stand. The origins of the variants are speculative; although *Variant 3* is possibly some kind of conflation of *Variants 1 & 2*.

Was the Matt. 26:53a variant an accidental omission? As a scribe read the words, “*dunamai* (I cannot) *arti* (now) *parakalesai* (pray to),” did he first write the “*dunamai*”? Possibly distracted by an external stimulus, or possibly fatigued, or possibly both, as he thought in his head, “I’m up to the iota,” did he quickly look back to the part of the manuscript he was copying out from, and seeing the final iota (“i”) of the “*arti*” then immediately look to the right of this word, and then write down “*parakalesai*” and just keep going?

Was the Matt. 26:53a variant a deliberate omission? Did a prunist scribe consider that the “*arti* (now)” here was “redundant,” and simply prune it away?

On the one hand, the Book of Armagh omits the first Greek “*arti* (now)” which would be Latin, “*modo* (now)” at Matt. 26:53a, but does not add in the second Greek “*arti* (now)” which would be Latin, “*modo* (now)” at Matt. 26:53b (*Variant 1*). But on the other hand, in *some*, though not all manuscripts, we find that the Matt. 26:53a “*arti* (now)” is first omitted from the words, “Thinkest thou that I cannot now (*arti*) pray to my Father,” and then added in at Matt. 26:53b (*Variant 1*) after the “*moi* (me).” This combination is found in the Greek with Chrysostom; and in the Latin in the Vulgate and old Latin *aur*, 1, *g1*, *ff1*, and *Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron*; as manifested in the *Clementine Vulgate*. Is this just a quaint coincidence? I.e., was *Variant 1* at Matt. 26:53b an accidental addition, since its preceding word, “me (Greek, *moi*; Latin, *mihi*),” came at the end of a line, and a scribe wrongly thought “something was missing” and so added in the “now (Greek, *arti*; Latin, *modo*)”? Alternatively, this raises the issue of whether the Matt. 26:53a variant and Matt. 26:53b *Variant 1* variants are deliberately related?

In Greek the future tense can refer to either *a continuance* in the future, or *an attainment / completion* in the future. E.g., let us consider *a continuance* in the future with both a present and future starting point through reference to the Greek word, “*apsetai* (‘shall touch,’ indicative middle future, 3rd person singular verb, from *apto*).” When Lysias (5th century B.C.) says, “*oudeis* (no-one) *auton* (them) *apsetai* (‘he shall touch,’ future tense)” (Lysias 1:36), i.e., “No-one shall touch them,” then this means that

from the present time *continuing* into the future⁵⁸. By contrast, we see a *continuance* in the future with a future starting point in the Greek Septuagint's rendering of Exod. 19:13, which says that three days in the future (Exod. 19:11), "the Lord will descend upon Mount Sinai," and when this happens in connection with the giving of the Sinai Covenant, this "mountain" is not to be touched, "*Ouch* (not) *apsetai* ('shall touch,' future tense) *autou* (it) *cheir* (a hand)" i.e., "A hand shall not touch it" (Exod. 19:13, LXX).

Furthermore, in Greek a complex sentence contains both a principal (or main) clause and a subordinate (or dependent) clause, in which the subordinate clause needs the principal clause in order to make sense⁵⁹. E.g., "The man committed to works' righteousness wept bitterly (principal clause), because he could not perfectly keep the Sinai Covenant of the Ten Commandments (subordinate clause)" Or, "The man cried out for mercy under the covenant of grace (principal clause), because he now realized the covenant from Mount Sinai gendereth to bondage (subordinate clause)" (Luke 18:9-14; 18-27; Gal. 1:6; 3:11; 4:24; 5:4).

Here at Matt. 26:53 the present tense is used in the main clause. "Thinkest thou (*dokeis*, present tense⁶⁰) that I cannot (*dunamai*, present tense⁶¹) now pray to my Father?" Therefore, when we see the future tense of "*parastesei*" in the subordinate clause, its meaning must be that of from the present time *continuing* into the future i.e., "he shall presently give," in the wider words, "and he shall presently give (*parastesei*, future tense⁶²) me more than twelve legions of angels?" These same type of grammatical structures are also relevant to the Latin here⁶³.

⁵⁸ Basil Gildersleeve's *Syntax of Classical Greek*, From Homer to Demosthenes, American Book Company, New York, USA, reprinted with an index of passages by Peter Stork by Groningen Bouma's Boekhuis B.V. Publishers, 1980, p. 115, section 265.

⁵⁹ Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, p. 657; Young's *Greek*, p. 179; Wenham, J.W., *The Elements of NT Greek*, Cambridge University, UK, 1965, p. 13.

⁶⁰ Indicative active present, 2nd person singular verb, from *dokeo*.

⁶¹ Indicative passive present, 1st person singular verb, from *dunamai*.

⁶² Indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *paristemi*.

⁶³ Basil Gildersleeve's *Latin Grammar* (1st ed. 1867, 3rd ed. 1895), *op. cit.*, p. 154, section 223 (future tense denotes *continuance* in future, whereas future perfect tense denotes an *attainment / completion* in future); p. 299, section 472 (compound sentence). The present tense is here used in the principal clause with e.g., "Thinkest thou (*putas*, indicative active present, 2nd person singular verb, from *puto*)," or "to be able (*posse*, infinitive active present, from *possum*)" joining with other parts to become "I cannot;" and so once again the idea of the future tense in "*exhibebit* (indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *exhibeo*)," in this subordinate clause is, "he will give me presently." Thus notwithstanding certain differences between the Latin and the Greek, for our purposes, in broad terms their grammatical structures here are strikingly similar.

This raises the following issue with respect to both Matt. 26:53a and *Variant 1* of Matt. 26:53b. Did a prunist scribe either not understand this issue of a principal and subordinate clause, or think its usage here “could be put in a better way”? Either way, did he then both prune away the “now (Greek, *arti*; Latin, *modo*)” at Matt. 26:53a, and simultaneously add in the “now (Greek, *arti*; Latin, *modo*)” at Matt. 26:53b (*Variant 1*)? If so, did he see this as “a transference in the interests of a stylistic improvement,” since the presence of the “now (Greek, *arti*; Latin, *modo*)” in the subordinate clause acts “to more readily explain” that the future tense “*parastesei*” conveys the idea that Christ says “he shall now (Greek, *arti*) give me” these “angels”?

Was the Matt. 26:53b *Variant 2* an accidental addition? Did the preceding word, “*moi* (me)” come at the end of a line? Did a scribe wrongly think “something was missing”? Did he then add in the “*ode* (‘here’ or ‘in this place’),” on the basis of “context”? Did he get this idea from the “*ode* (here)” of Matt. 26:38?

Was the Matt. 26:53b *Variant 2* a deliberate addition? Did a scribe consider it would be “a stylistic improvement” to here add in “*ode* (here),” for “the purposes of grater clarity”?

Were these deliberate or accidental changes? Or was it some combination thereof? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that these were changes to the text of Scripture here preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR’s reading at both Matt. 26:53a and Matt. 26:53b has rock solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading over time and through time, dating from ancient times. Both Matt. 26:53a and Matt. 26:53b also have good support in the Latin textual tradition with about half a dozen old Latin versions dating from ancient times. Matt. 26:53a also enjoys the further support of a couple of ancient church writers in both the Greek and Latin; for example, its Latin support includes that of Orosius. Paulus Orosius of Spain was sent to Palestine by Augustine of Hippo, where Orosius defended orthodoxy in opposition to the Pelagian heresy; and for his history of the world and Roman Empire up till 417 A.D., Orosius is remembered as the first Christian to write a world history. By contrast, the variants at both Matt. 26:53a and Matt. 26:53b (*Variants 1 & 2*) have weak support in the Greek and no good textual argument to commend them. However, unlike Matt. 26:53b *Variant 2*, both Matt. 26:53a and Matt. 26:53b *Variant 1* have stronger support in the Latin with the Vulgate, and also about half a dozen old Latin versions dating from early mediaeval times. Both Matt. 26:53a and Matt. 26:53b (*Variant 1*) also have the further support of some ancient church writers in both the Greek and Latin; and Matt. 26:53b (*Variant 2*) has the support of a couple of ancient Greek church writers. 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 readings at both Matt. 26:53a and Matt. 26:53b each an “A” i.e., in both instances, 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. 26:53a, “now,” in the principal clause, “Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father,” 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); and 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), 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*; 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 Version (616).

At Matt. 26:53a, “now” is omitted, thus making the principal clause, “Thinkest thou that I cannot pray to my Father,” 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); Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), and 579 (13th century, mixed text). It is also found in the Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century); the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

At Matt. 26:53b the TR’s “he shall presently give me,” in the wider words of the subordinate clause, “and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?” 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) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (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), 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 Harclean h Version (616).

At Matt. 26:53b, *Variant 1* adding “now,” thus making the subordinate clause, “and he shall now give me more than twelve legions of angels?” 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); Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 157 (12th century, independent). It is also found in the Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century); the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

At Matt. 26:53b, *Variant 2* adding “here,” thus making the subordinate clause, “and he shall here give me more than twelve legions of angels?” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.*

At Matt. 26:53b, *Variant 3* adding “ode (here) arti (now),” i.e., “here now,” thus making the subordinate clause, “and he shall here now give me more than twelve legions of angels?” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). There is a similar reading in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century). This appears to be a conflation of *Variants 1 & 2*, once again reminding us, that while scribes of the Alexandrian School usually pruned the text, they also sometimes added to it, or conflated it. (See also my comments on such Alexandrian School conflation at Matt. 26:44b, *supra.*)

The two main Alexandrian texts are agreed at Matt. 26:53a, but split at Matt. 26:53b between *Variants 1* (Codex Vaticanus) & *3* (Codex Sinaiticus). From the paradigm of the Neo-Alexandrian School, since “the shorter reading is” generally regarded as “the better reading,” and there is “wider external support” for Matt. 26:53b *Variant 1* over Matt. 26:53b *Variant 3*, the Matt. 26:53b *Variant 3* reading of Codex Sinaiticus has been generally jettisoned by neo-Alexandrians in favour of the Matt. 26:53b *Variant 1* reading of Codex Vaticanus. (Cf. my comments on the Alexandrian School's less commonly conflating rather than pruning, at Matt. 26:44b, *supra.*)

Hence the combination of the Matt. 26:53a variant omitting Greek “*arti* (now)” in the principal clause, with the Matt. 26:53b *Variant 1* adding Greek “*arti* (now)” in the subordinate clause, was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence at Matt. 26:53 the ASV reads, “Or thinkest thou that I cannot beseech my Father (Matt. 26:53a), and he shall even now send me (Matt. 26:53b) more than twelve legions of angels?” This same erroneous combination is found at Matt. 26:53 in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

The old Latin Papists also followed this combination of the Matt. 26:53a variant omitting Latin “*modo* (now)” in the principal clause, with the Matt. 26:53b *Variant 1* adding Latin “*modo* (now)” in the subordinate clause, in both their Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims; so that the presence of this same combination of the Matt. 26:53a variant omitting Greek “*arti* (now)” in the principal clause, with the Matt. 26:53b *Variant 1* adding Greek “*arti* (now)” in the subordinate clause, is also found in the new neo-Alexandrian Papists' Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB and NJB. This merely acts to remind us

that this attack upon the neo-Byzantine *Textus Receptus* here at Matt. 26:53a and Matt. 26:53b is nothing new. But there is a twist in this saga with the Douay-Rheims rendering of Matt. 26:53 as, “Thinkest thou that I cannot ask my Father (Matt. 26:53a), and he will give me presently (Matt. 26:53b) more than twelve legions of angels?” And that is that as with the TR’s future tense in a subordinate clause to a present tense principal clause, one can render Matt. 26:53b as “he shall presently give me” (AV & TR), so with the Matt. 26:53b *Variant 1* it is possible to absorb the “now (Greek *arti*; Latin *modo*),” into the same terminology of, “he will give me presently” (Douay-Rheims); although to date only the old Latin Papists have ever done so. Such are the twists and turns of reality.

Matt. 26:55b “with you” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. There is some overlap between the two words of Matt. 26:55b and the seven words of Matt. 26:55c discussed in Appendix 3. The word order issues of Matt. 26:55c will not be generally discussed here at Matt. 26:55b, although some limited reference is made to it at, “Was the variant an accidental omission?,” *infra*.

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Inside the closed class of sources the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex. The Vulgate reads “*apud* (with) *vos* (you)” at both Matt. 26:55b and Mark 14:40, and at Luke 22:53 reads “*cum* (with) ... *vobiscum* (you).” Therefore the Sangallensis Diatessaron’s reading of “*apud* (with) *vos* (you)” (Diatessaron chapter clxxxv) might be drawn from Matt. 26:55b and / or Mark 14:40, with some secondary reference to Luke 22:53. Hence no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, similar issues of Matt. 26:55b and / or Mark 14:40 and / or Luke 22:53 in the Arabic Diatessaron (Diatessaron chapter xlviiii), mean that no reference is made to Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:55b the TR’s Greek, “*pros* (with) *umas* (you),” in the wider words, “I sat daily with (*pros*) you (*umas*) teaching in the temple” etc. (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices A 02 (*Codex Alexandrinus*, 5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25); W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53, Washington, D.C., USA); the magnificently illuminated purple parchment, Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century, Rossano, Italy); M 021 (*Codex Campianus*, 9th century, Paris, France); and Gamma 036 (*Codex Oxoniensis Bodleianus*, 10th century, Oxford, UK); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark; Paris, France) and 2 (12th century; Basel, Switzerland); and the two Sydney University Lectionaries written in brown ink with colourful bright red illumination of key letters and section markers, to wit, Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) and

1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). It is also supported as Latin, “*apud* (with) *vos* (you),” 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); 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 in the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339); and the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation.

However, a variant omitting “*pros* (with) *umas* (you),” and so reading simply, “I sat daily teaching in the temple” etc., is found in the ancient church Greek writers, Chrysostom (d. 407) and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

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

Was the variant an accidental omission? We know from *Manuscript Washington* (W 032) that a scribe could sometimes omit a short word, and then realizing his mistake, add it back in as a sidenote e.g., at Luke 12:30 (p. 259). Some evidence for a similar problem here at Matt. 26:55b exists in the fact that the TR’s and representative Byzantine text’s reading, “*pros* (‘with,’ word 1) *umas* (‘you,’ word 2) *ekathezomen* (‘I sat,’ word 3),” becomes in *Manuscript London* (A 02) word order 3,1,2 (see Matt. 26:55c in Appendix 3). Therefore, did a scribe writing quite quickly, accidentally omit the words “*pros* (with) *umas* (you)” from Matt. 26:55b, but unlike the more adroit scribe of *Manuscript London*, did he then fail to realize his error, and so just kept writing?

Was the variant a deliberate omission? Did an arrogant prunist scribe consider that the words “*pros* (with) *umas* (you)” were “unnecessary”? Did he then consider it “a stylistic improvement” in the interests of “a more succinct text” to prune them away?

Was this a deliberate or accidental omission? We do not know. We cannot now know. But we can know that the correct reading has been here preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR’s reading has rock solid support in both the Greek and Latin, in both instances dating from ancient times. This support includes the Latin Vulgate of the ancient church father and doctor, St. Jerome. By contrast, the variant has no support in the Latin, and relatively weak support in the Greek. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 26:55b 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. 26:55b, “with you,” in the wider words, “I sat daily with you teaching in the temple” etc., 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) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 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 the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant which omits “with you,” and so reads simply, “I sat daily teaching in the temple” etc., 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 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), and 700 (11th century, independent). It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century); and the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.

At Matt. 26:55b the erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. Hence the ASV reads, “I sat daily teaching in the temple” etc. . The incorrect variant is also found at Matt. 26:55b in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

Due to its strength in the Latin textual tradition, the pre Vatican II Council old Latin Papists adopted the correct reading at Matt. 26:55b in both the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims, the latter of which reads, “I sat daily with (Latin, *apud*) you (Latin, *vos*), teaching in the temple” etc. . But the post Vatican II Council new neo-Alexandrian Papists adopted the erroneous variant in their Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB. However, while the Jerusalem Bible of 1966 contained a footnote giving the TR’s reading as found in the Latin Vulgate, this footnote was removed in the later *New Jerusalem Bible* of 1985. Thus the twinges of conscience they first had in 1966 about cutting out these words of the *Textus Receptus* were over time dulled and finally deadened. Such is the corrosive quality of sin, which is a slippery-side into more and more sin, leading finally into that “bottomless pit” called “hell” (Rev. 20:1,3,13,14).

Matt. 26:59a “and elders” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate

Codex, and whereas the Vulgate lacks the TR's reading at Matt. 26:59a, it reads "*senioribus* (elders)" at Mark 15:1 and "*seniores* (elders)" at Luke 22:66. The reading of the Sangallensis Diatessaron as "*senioribus* (elders)" (Diatessaron chapter clxxxix), appears to be made with some reference to Mark 15:1 and Luke 22:66. Thus it is not possible from this data in the Sangallensis Diatessaron to know whether or not the Vulgate used did or did not follow the TR's reading here. Therefore no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:59a the TR's Greek, "*kai* (and) *oi* ('the,' not necessary here in English translation) *presbuteroi* (elders)⁶⁴," i.e., "the chief priests, and (*kai*) elders (*oi presbuteroi*), and all the council" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), 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 K 017 (9th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, twice in two different readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings). It is also supported as Latin, "*et* (and) *seniores* (elders)," in old Latin Versions f (6th century) and q (6th / 7th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation.

However, a variant omits Greek "*kai* (and) *oi* (-) *presbuteroi* (elders)," and so reads simply, "the chief priests and all the council." The omission is found 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), aur (7th century), l (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 also found in the ancient church Greek writers,

⁶⁴ Masculine plural nominative adjective, from *presbuteros* which (as Greek, πρεσβύτερος) may also be transliterated as *presbyteros*, and from which via the Ecclesiastical Latin, "*présbyter*," one gets our English word "presbyter," as used by Presbyterians of their clergymen. From this same Latin and Greek base, but first with the Latin, "*présbyter*," further filtered through the Old Norse "*prestr*," Old High German "*priast*" and "*prest*," and Old English "*preost*," we get our English word "priest" as used by Anglicans of their clergymen. But in the Low Church Evangelical Anglican tradition that I endorse, the term "priest" is rarely used for what is more commonly called "the Minister," which is a term also found in the 1662 prayer book, and in Romans 15:16 we find "the minister," and "ministering" used in conjunction with the priestly terminology of "offering up." By Low Church Evangelical Anglican convention, the terminology of "priest" is generally confined to the context of an Ordination Service, e.g., when we religious conservatives who believe in the authority of Scripture talk about our "Biblically based opposition to the Ordination of women priests." Cf. my comments on "priest" at Matt. 26:26b, *supra*.

Origen (d. 254), Eusebius (d. 339), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); and ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text which thus must stand. The origins of the variant are conjectural. (Cf. Matt. 26:3, *supra*.)

Was the variant an accidental omission? After writing, “*oi (the) de (Now) archiereis (chief priests),*” at seeing “*kai (and) oi (-) presbuteroi (elders) kai (and) to (the) sunedrion (council)⁶⁵ olon (all),*” did a scribe’s eye jump from the “*kai*” of “*kai oi presbuteroi*” to the “*kai*” of “*kai to sunedrion,*” thus accidentally omitting, “*kai oi presbuteroi*” (or if he first wrote this “*kai,*” then accidentally omitting, “*oi presbuteroi kai*”)?

Was the variant a deliberate omission? Did a prunist scribe consider “*kai (and) oi (-) presbuteroi (elders)*” here was “unnecessary”? If so, was he influenced by the similar terminology of “*oi (the) de (And) archiereis (chief priests) kai (and) olon (all) to (the) sunedrion (council)*” at Mark 14:55?

Was this a deliberate or accidental omission? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that it was an omission to the Word of God Providentially preserved for us here in the representative Byzantine text reading.

The TR’s reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading, over time, and through time, dating from ancient times. It also has some relatively weak support in the Latin. By contrast, the variant has some relatively weak support in the Greek, and corresponding strong support in the Latin. Bearing in mind the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*; I consider the strong support in the Greek, when coupled with the testimony in the Latin from both ancient times (Origen) and early mediaeval times (old Latin f & q), on this occasion is enough to *just bring* the TR’s reading “over the line” of a high level “B” in the range of 71-74%, and into the range of a lower level 75-76% “A.” Thus on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 26:59a 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. 26:59a, “and elders,” in the wider words, “the chief priests, and elders, and all the council” etc., is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke,

⁶⁵ Greek “*sunedrion* (neuter singular nominative noun),” is from *sunedrion*, from which we get our English form of the word, “Sanhedrin.” This is a compound word from “*sun* (together with)” and “*edra / hedra* (‘seat,’ related to *edraios / hedraios* meaning sedentary)” i.e., “seated together” as a council.

independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text). It is also found in the *Family I Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant which omits “and elders,” thus reading simply, “the chief priests and all the council” etc., 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 Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) and 157 (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 Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.

At Matt. 26:59a the erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence the ASV reads, “the chief priests and the whole council” etc. . So too, the incorrect variant is found at Matt. 26:59a in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

We neo-Byzantines have drawn our swords to defend the *Textus Receptus* here afore. The erroneous variant was adopted by the old Latin Papists of pre-Vatican II Council times in the Clementine Vulgate, and manifested at Matt. 26:59a in their Douay-Rheims as, “the chief priests and the whole council” etc. . Following the Vatican II Council (1962-5), the new neo-Alexandrian Papists found themselves strongly attracted to the idea that they should join up with the old Latin Papists and apostate Protestant neo-Alexandrian textual critics, and taking the Word of God, “cut it with the penknife” (Jer. 36:23) so as to remove the words, “and elders.” Thus this textual corruption is also found in the Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB.

Matt. 26:60a “yea ... found they none” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. I have previously noted that Lectionary 2378 sometimes, albeit fairly infrequently, uses an abbreviation for “*kai*” that looks like a back-the-front question mark joined to a “u,” i.e., something like “*ﻯ*”⁶⁶. Here at Matt. 26:60a this abbreviation is twice used for the “*kai*” in “*ﻯ* (= *kai*, ‘but’) *ouch* (none) *euron* (found), *ﻯ* (= *kai*, ‘yea’)” etc. . This comes at a section of the first reading (Lectionary p. 74a) in which the last

⁶⁶ See Textual Commentaries Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), Appendix 1, Matt. 10:37,38 discussed at Matt. 20:4.

five lines of column 1 of the two columned page, protrude more to the left and right than the rest of the column 1 does, and the writing is slightly smaller. It thus looks like it was here used as a device to “squeeze” more into the space than normal. This first reading follows as the TR’s reading with a number of abbreviations in this smaller squeezed in writing for 5 lines down to an abbreviated “*trion* (three),” before the resumption of the normal script from “*emeron* (days)” in Matt. 26:61.

At Lectionary 2378’s second reading (column 1, p. 81a), a similar thing happens, although the first “*kai* (but)” is abbreviated to something like “κ”. This second reading then follows as the TR’s reading with a number of abbreviations in this smaller squeezed in writing for 4-5 lines down to an abbreviated “*outos* (This),” before the resumption of the normal script from “*ephe* (said)” in Matt. 26:61.

Thus e.g., at both Lectionary readings the “*ouch* (none)” of this reading is also abbreviated from “ουχ” to a combined “ou” that looks something like an “8” without the top curve on the “8” i.e., a “v” that sits on top of a “o” (cf. Lectionary 2378 at Matt. 26:65, *infra*). These sections are relevant to the readings at Matt. 26:60, but both resume the normal text before the reading of “*auton* (it)” at Matt. 26:61, *infra*.

Working from my photocopies of a microfilm form, the implication seemed to be that the original script was rubbed out by a corrector scribe who then fitted in the new text here. Therefore I inspected the original at Sydney University. Here I found that at both the first and second readings there are two further factors clearly evidencing such an erasure and recopying.

Firstly, both have markings from before the erasure at the edges, evidencing previous writing, e.g., at the first reading (p. 74a) under the “καί (and)” before “Διὰ (to)” (Matt. 26:61) of the last line in column 1; and at the second reading (p. 81a) on line 3 of column 1, above the “*opos* (‘to,’ which has a closed ‘ω’ with a bar across its top for the Greek letter pi, i.e., ‘p’, representing the standard seminary Greek, “π”, and a closed ‘ω’ for the Greek letter omega i.e., ‘o’, representing the standard seminary Greek, ‘ω’, and so looks something like ‘oωoc’, rather than the standard seminary Greek from, ‘oπως’)” (Matt. 26:59). Secondly, when I rubbed my finger gently across the vellum of both pages, it was discernibly rougher at these sections than the smoother surrounding vellum. This is clearly “the scar” at both readings of a corrector scribe who has “scratched out” the original reading, before writing in the new one.

Due to time constraints and general priorities, I am not now examining this matter in more intricate detail. But without now examining this matter further, the salient point for my purposes is to note that at least here in Lectionary 2378, such abbreviations for “*kai*” were contextually being used as space saving devices when deemed “necessary.” Thus they do not necessarily reflect a scribal writing form of general preference, who indeed may have preferred to write the word out in full. At these “squeezed in” lines, the nib of the scribe’s pen is finer than the nib of the scribe’s pen who wrote the other parts. Does a different pen mean a different pen man? Was the “corrector” scribe of these two readings the original scribe who used some abbreviations he did not normally use

because of these space constraints; or was it a later scribe?

The Second Matter. I remind the reader that there are numerous minor variants that I do not consider in these commentaries. I am largely guided in my selections for these concise textual commentaries by those variants that have been adopted in neo-Alexandrian texts and /or Burgonite Majority texts, and to a lesser extent those of the old Latin Papists (which may or may not be covered). That is because the most serious attack on the neo-Byzantine Received Text presently comes from such neo-Alexandrian and Burgonite texts, with a further attack by the old Latin Papists which since the Vatican II Council has largely abated because following the Vatican II Council the new neo-Alexandrian Papists have emerged to replace the old Latin Papists. Hence while it would be possible here at Matt. 26:60a to individually treat the “*kai* (yea),” and “*ouch* ([yet] none) *euron* (found they),” as two separate variants, I shall deal with them as one, and in doing so I follow the same basic textual selection methodology used here by both von Soden (1913; who is incorrect here in his claim that the variant is followed by Sigma 042, which is von Soden’s ε 18 in his Ιπ group,) and Nestle-Aland (1993).

Thus e.g., I shall not on this occasion be dealing with a variant found in the Greek of Sigma 042, nor some further old Latin variants, some of which appear in various ways to be related to this Greek variant. Nor shall I be referring to all elements of those old Latin Versions I cite, for instance, old Latin ff2, h, f, & c follow the TR but also add some conflation at various points in this verse 60 which is not of interest to us for our immediate purposes. Nevertheless, I shall make some passing reference to the reading of Sigma 042 when discussing the issue of how the principal variant may have arisen.

The Third Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex, and like the Vulgate at Matt. 26:60a, it first reads, “*Et* (but) *non* (‘not’ / ‘no’ = ‘none’) *invenerunt* (found they), *cum* (‘although’ / ‘though’) *multi* (many) *falsi* (false) *testes* (witnesses) *accessissent* (had come),” and then like the Vulgate at Mark 14:58 it reads, “*nec* (‘not’ = ‘none’) *inveniebant* (found they)” (Latin Diatessaron clxxxix) i.e., “but found none: though many false witnesses had come, yet found they none” (showing added word in italics). Since it is clear that multiple gospel sources are being used here as part of Diatessaron formatting, no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, the fact that e.g., Ciasca’s translation with these same Latin words of “*Et* (but)” to “*accessissent* (had come),” *supra*, come just before Mark 14:59, means that once again we cannot be sure to what extent changes have occurred due to Diatessaron formatting (Arabic Diatessaron xlix). Therefore no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:60a, the TR’s Greek, “*kai* (‘yea’ or ‘even’)⁶⁷ ... *ouch* ([yet] none)

⁶⁷ The very elastic and versatile conjunction, “*kai*,” can sometimes have this

euron ('they found' = 'found they,' AV)," in the wider words, "but found none: yea (*kai*), though many false witnesses came, yet found they (*euron*) none (*ouch*)" (AV, showing AV's italics), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), and Pi 041 (9th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, twice in two different readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings). It is also supported as Latin, "*et* (even) ... *non* ([yet] 'not' / 'no' = 'none') *invenerunt* (found they)," in old Latin Versions ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century) and c (12th / 13th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation.

However, a variant omitting Greek, "*kai* (yea), ... *ouch* ([yet] none) *euron* (found they)," and so reading simply, "though many false witnesses came," is a minority Byzantine reading found in N 022 (6th century). It is also omitted in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions b (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th 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 omitted by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

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

Though I am not discussing the minor variant found at Matt. 26:60a in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) with respect to specific textual analysis of it, given that this minority Byzantine reading first omits the "*kai* (yea)," and then has a similar but corrupted form of the "*ouch* ([yet] none) *euron* (found they)," raises the question of whether or not these two elements of this textual corruption occurred separately or simultaneously?⁶⁸

Was the variant an accidental omission? Were the two components of "*kai* (yea)" and "*ouch* ([yet] none) *euron* (found they)," lost in two separate paper fades, or one paper fade? Or was the "*kai* (yea)," possibly abbreviated to a symbol of one letter space and first lost in a paper fade; and then the "*ouch* ([yet] none) *euron* (found they)" lost in ellipsis as the eye of a scribe, who was possibly suffering from a head cold, jumped from the "*n*" ending of the previous word to the "*n*" ending of "*euron*"?⁶⁹

sense e.g., the "*yea* (*kai*)" of Acts 7:43; although it could also be rendered here at Matt. 26:60a as, "even," a fact relevant to its presence in the Latin as, "*et* (even)" in old Latin f & c.

⁶⁸ Sigma 042 reads, "*ou* ([yet] none) *euron* ('found they,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb from *eurisko*, in which unlike in the TR's reading, this word starts with an eta / *e* rather than an epsilon, on the basis of an aorist *e* + *e* = *e*)."

⁶⁹ In the TR the two previous words are, "*pseudomarturon* ('false witnesses,'

Was the variant a deliberate omission? As either two separate scribal prunings or a single scribal pruning “in one foul swoop,” were these words lost in a scribal belief that they were “redundant” and “a more succinct” text without them was “desirable”?

Are these words a deliberate or accidental omission, or was one of the two components accidental, and the other component deliberate? We do not know. We cannot now know. But we can and do know that the correct reading of the Received Text has been preserved for us here in the representative Byzantine text reading.

The TR’s reading has rock solid support in the Byzantine Greek text as the representative reading over time and through time, dating from ancient times. It enjoys the further support of several old Latin Versions, two of which date from ancient times, and one from early mediaeval times; as well as an ancient writer in a Latin translation. By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek, but better support in the Latin. Weighing up these factors, 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. 26:60a 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. 26:60a, “yea ... found they none,” in the wider words, “but found none: yea, though many false witnesses came, *yet found they none*” (showing italics for added word,) is found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and 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), 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 Harclean h Version (616); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

A similar reading to that of the TR is also found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); and *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.* A similar reading to that of the TR is further found in the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century).

word 1) *proeselthonton* (“though came,’ word 2).” See Matt. 26:60b in Appendix 3.

However, the variant which omits “yea ... found they none,” and so reads simply, “but found none, though many false witnesses came,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Armenian Version (5th century). A similar reading to that of the variant is also found in the Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century).

The erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence at Matt. 26:60a the ASV reads, “and they found it not, though many false witnesses came.” So too, the incorrect variant is found in the RSV, ESV, NRSV, and NIV.

This erroneous variant is also found in the NASB and TEV, though elements of this are not immediately apparent due to their confusing translation style. In Greek, a genitive absolute may be formed from a genitive noun + a genitive participle. Where this is done, one possibility is that a *concession* is being expressed (e.g., John 20:26)⁷⁰. If so, it might be rendered as “though” or “although.” One finds such a genitive absolute construction here at Matt. 26:60a, translated in the AV’s “though,” in “*pseudomarturon* (‘false witnesses,’ masculine plural genitive noun, from *pseudomartus*) *proselthonton* (‘coming’ = ‘though ... came,’ AV, masculine plural genitive, active aorist participle, from *proserchomai*),” in the wider words common to both the TR’s reading and that of the variant, “though many false witnesses came.” But a curious twist and potential confusion arises from the fact that rather than rendering the genitive absolute concession as “though” or “although,” both the *New American Standard Bible* and *Today’s English Version* (also known as the “Good News Bible”), renders it as “even though,” in the wider words, “even though many false witnesses came forward” (NASB) or “even though many people came forward and told lies about him” (TEV). This therefore *prima facie* looks like the NASB and TEV might be keeping the “*kai* (‘even’ or ‘yea’)” of the TR’s reading while pruning away the TR’s “found they none,” even though, relative to the neo-Alexandrian Greek, this is an unlikely and improbable construction of what the NASB and TEV translators are actually doing.

This confusion and ambiguity is then further intensified by a *New King James Version* footnote. The NKJV’s main text translates the TR’s “*kai*” as “Even” in its rendering, “but found none. Even though many false witnesses came forward, they found none” (NKJV). But an NKJV footnote then says, “NU-Text puts a comma after ‘but found none,’ does not capitalize ‘Even,’ and omits ‘they found none.’” The first confusion is seen in the fact that the KJV does not “capitalize” this word either, but renders it as “yea,” after a colon. So does that mean the KJV is here following the NU Text? Clearly not, though a NKJV reader might wrongly think this is so from this confusing NKJV footnote. The second confusion in this NKJV footnote is seen in the fact that the issue is made to turn on whether or not the “even” is capitalized. That is because this NKJV footnote fails to distinguish between “even” when it is rendered from

⁷⁰ Young’s *Greek*, p. 159.

the “*kai*” as in the NKJV main text; in contrast with “even” when it is rendered as part of a genitive absolute construction as in the NU Text renderings found in the NASB and TEV which lacks this underpinning “*kai*” in their faulty neo-Alexandrian Greek texts.

This in turn presents further confusion as to where the NKJV’s rendering of “even” is coming from in its main text at Matt. 26:60a. Is it translating from a text which lack the “*kai*,” and then getting it from the genitive absolute construction? Certainly on the basis of its confusing footnote and translation alone, this would be a possible interpretation; although on its principles of translation, which its translators state in the NKJV’s 1982 “Preface” are to use the TR and then purportedly “correct” this with the Majority Text readings as now found in Hodges & Farstad (1982 & 1985), we would have to say this is not what the NKJV is doing at Matt. 26:60a. By contrast, the *King James Version* of 1611 is crystal clear here at Matt. 26:60a, since by rendering the “*kai*” as “yea,” it is clear that indeed it is the “*kai*” that is here being rendered; and so no potential confusion arises of the type and kind that occurs if the “*kai*” here is rendered “even,” in which instance one does not know if the “even” is part of an “even though” of a genitive absolute construction, or if the “though” is from a genitive absolute construction but the “even” is a rendering of the “*kai*.” *Let us thank God for the clarity of the King James Version of 1611, which stands in contradistinction to the bewildering confusion and lack of clarity in “modern” versions such as the New King James Version, New American Standard Bible, and Today’s English Version!*

The attack on the neo-Byzantine *Textus Receptus* here at Matt. 26:60a is nothing new. The erroneous variant which is now found in the new neo-Alexandrian Papists’ Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB, is earlier found in pre-Vatican II Council times in the old Latin Papists’ Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version. Hence at Matt. 26:60a the Douay-Rheims (NT, 1582) reads in somewhat awkward English, “And they found not, whereas many false witnesses had come in;” although this type of construction may make more sense if read over with a strong French accent, followed by the question, “*Oui?*” (French, “Yes?”). Thus the stilted English form of the Douay-Rheims’ English here may reflect the foreign French influence on this Popish version. The *Book of the Chronicles of Neo-Byzantine Battles* records that here at Matt. 26:60a, French sounding Papists with Clementine Vulgates and Douay-Rheims Versions sticking out of their pockets, came at Protestants defenders of the Received Text and King James Version, declaring of these omitted words, “Touché away! Le Textus Receptus she will not stay!” But the gallant Protestants struck back hard at these cutting omissions of the variant here at Matt. 26:60a, and as the Papists retreated the Protestants declared, “So you stenchy Popish Frenchies, for you it’s Touché away! For the Textus Receptus is here to stay!”

Matt. 26:60c “false witnesses” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. The TR’s reading here in Lectionary 2378 is part of the writing

of the corrector scribe referred to at Matt. 26:60a in “Preliminary Textual Discussion,” “The First Matter,” *supra*.

The Second Matter. My photocopy of a photolith copy of Manuscript London (A 02) contains some irregularities near the end of the line of this reading. The textual apparatuses of both Tischendorf (1869-72) and Swanson (1995) state that A 02 here originally read, “*martyres* (witnesses),” but was then later changed by a “corrector” scribe to the TR’s “*pseudomartyres* (false witnesses).” Though from the copy standard of my photocopy, I am unable to deduce, or confirm this for myself, I have no reason to doubt its accuracy. Since I leave out a host of minor variants that are no part of the debates between we Neo-Byzantines, and our various opponents, whether the Neo-Alexandrians, Burgonites, or old Latin Papists, I shall make no reference to Codex A 02, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:60c the TR’s Greek, “*pseudomartures / pseudomartyres* (false witnesses)⁷¹,” in the wider words, “At the last came two false witnesses (*pseudomartyres*)” (TR & 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), N 022 (6th century), and Gamma 036 (10th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, twice in two different readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings). It is also supported as Latin, “*falsi* (false) *testes* (witnesses),” 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), l (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, Origen (d. 254).

However, a variant omitting Greek, “*pseudomartyres* (false witnesses),” and so reading simply, “At the last came two,” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 924 (12th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text which thus must stand. The origins of the variant are conjectural. However, both readings were known to Origen who is the probable originator of the variant.

⁷¹ When this compound word is transliterated from the Greek as, “*pseudomartyres* (‘false witnesses,’ masculine plural nominative noun, from *pseudomartyrs*),” one readily sees the origins of our English words, “pseudo (false)” and “martyr (witness).”

Was the variant an accidental omission? In a given manuscript, did the word “*pseudomartyres* (false witnesses)” come at the end of a line on the last line of a page? Due to paper damage, was this part of the page lost? E.g., was it accidentally ripped by someone when turning the page? Was the ripped off piece placed loosely inside the page? Did it then fall out? Did a subsequent scribe then think that the passage “made sense” without it, so that “there mustn’t have been anything there” at the point where this word was missing? Did this copyist scribe thus accidentally produce a corrupted text?

Was the variant a deliberate omission? The probable origins of the variant with Origen increases this possibility. Did a prunist scribe, if so, probably Origen, consider that this word was “redundant”? Did he therefore prune it away to make “a more succinct text”? If so, was he further influenced in this decision by the absence of this word at Mark 14:58? If so, this would make the omission here an assimilation to the Marcan account.

Was the variant a deliberate or accidental omission? In my opinion, on this occasion, probably deliberate, and probably from the hand of Origen. But we cannot be sure of this. However, we can be sure that this was an omission from the Received Text here Provisionally preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR’s reading has rock solid support in both the Greek and Latin, over time, and through time, dating from ancient times. By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek, no support in the Latin, and looks very much like the type of silly thing that Origen would do on one of his “bad” days when he had “a mood swing” into “the silly season.” (Even though, paradoxically, on one of his “good” days he was the very opposite, exhibiting an intellect that was “as sharp as a tack,” and “well ahead of the pack.”) On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 26:60c 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. 26:60c, “false witnesses,” in the wider words, “At the last came two false witnesses,” 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) 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), 1071 (12th century, independent), 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels), 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 Harclean h Version (616); the Armenian Version (5th century); and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-

14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the variant which omits “false witnesses,” and so reads simply, “At the last came two,” 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 the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscles 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 Pesitto Version (first half 5th century); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

At Matt. 26:60c, the erroneous variant entered the NU Text *et al.* Hence the ASV reads, “But afterward came two.” So likewise the incorrect variant is found at Matt. 26:60c in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

The monolithic support of the Latin textual tradition for the TR’s reading at Matt. 26:60c, meant that for the wrong reasons, the old Latin Papists of post Trent Council (1545-63) and pre-Vatican II Council (1962-5) times, adopted the right reading in both their Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version. Hence the Douay-Rheims correctly reads, “And last of all there came two false witnesses.” But the post Vatican II Council new neo-Alexandrian Papists, hankering for the reading of Codex Vaticanus, here departed from the correct reading of the *Textus Receptus*, and followed the incorrect variant in their Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB. Looking at this reading at Matt. 26:60c there is some qualified truth in the claim that “Rome has changed since Vatican II,” since here at Matt. 26:60c the old whore of Rev. 17 has gone from bad to worse, and thus changed *for the worse!*

Matt. 26:61b “it” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. The UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and Nestle-Aland (1993) edition, distinguish between the Greek readings of “*oikodomēsai* (‘to build,’ word 1) *auton* (‘it,’ word 2),” and the same reading in word order 2,1. Inside the closed class of sources, the Greek word order 2,1, has minimal support, including Origen whose writings here also exhibit other readings. The NU Text Committee’s claim that one can discern between Latin readings that likewise use word order 1,2, or 2,1, is in my opinion here unsustainable, since such word order could be easily changed as part of the act of translation. The meaning is the same either way, and so I shall generally treat these readings the same.

The matter appears to have taken on much greater significance for the neo-Alexandrians than it does for us neo-Byzantines. That is because, outside the closed class of sources, Codex Vaticanus follows the variant, whereas in word order 2,1, the

TR's basic meaning is found in Codex Sinaiticus, and e.g., Codices C 04, L 019; and the neo-Alexandrian's "Queen of Minuscules," Minuscule 33.

The Second Matter. Inside the closed class of sources, Gregory here supports the TR's reading (in Latin word order 1,2) as Latin, "*illud* (it)." This is the first reference to a relevant citation of Gregory in this Volume 4. The lack of reference to Gregory's writings both here, and elsewhere in the textual apparatuses of e.g., UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, or Nestle-Aland's (1993) edition, is a notable omission in those works. Thus I again remind the reader that these textual commentaries represent the first time that citations have been collated and itemized from the writings of St. Gregory the Great, one of the Western Church's four doctors, who receives the honour of a black-letter day on 12 March in The Calendar of the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662. (See Preface, "Scripture Citations of Bishop Gregory the Great in Matt. 26-28.")

The Third Matter. Swanson shows the *Family 13 Manuscripts* as following the TR's reading, and Swanson's itemization of this manuscript family contains e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee*), outside the closed class or sources, Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 13 (13th century, independent text), and 69 (15th century, mixed text type in e.g., Matthew's Gospel). But in a contradictory manner, he then specifically shows Minuscules 788 and 69 following the variant. Both Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) and von Soden (1913) show Minuscule 69 following the variant. The UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, together with the Nestle-Aland (1993) edition, all show the Family 13 manuscripts following the variant. Therefore I think one can safely conclude that the Family 13 manuscripts here follow the variant, and that Swanson's contradictory statements are to be resolved in favour of the view that an error was made in including the Family 13 manuscripts in his list of those manuscripts following the TR's reading.

The Fourth Matter. Old Latin d here reads, "*eum eum* (it)." Latin "*eum* ('it,' masculine singular accusative pronoun, from *is-ea-id*)" is a demonstrative pronoun. Generally demonstrative pronouns are used to replace a noun / noun phrase / group of nouns, in a generic way, here, "*templum* ('temple,' neuter singular accusative noun, from *templum*) ... *Dei* ('of God,' masculine singular accusative genitive noun, from *Deus*)." It should therefore agree in gender (neuter), number (singular), and case (accusative), with the noun⁷² i.e., with the *neuter* noun "*templum*;" like the Vulgate's demonstrative pronoun "*illud* ('that things' = 'it,' neuter singular accusative pronoun, from *ille*)." So the first question is, Why is the scribe of old Latin d using a *masculine* form in "*eum* (it)" rather than a *neuter* form in "*illud*" or "*id* ('it,' neuter singular accusative pronoun, from *is-ea-id*)"? Is he gendering it to the masculine on the basis of the connected *masculine* genitive noun, "*Dei* (of God)"? If so, he is grammatically wrong to do so.

⁷² Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, pp. 25 & 68; Harry Scott's (d. 1941) *Using Latin*, by John F. Gummere *et unum*, Book One, Scott, Foresman, & Co., Chicago, USA, [1948-1954,] p. 156.

Nevertheless, such a “scribal slip” in which he meant to use “*id*” but instead used “*eum*” does not invalidate the fact that he is clearly intending to follow the TR’s reading here.

The second question is, Why is the scribe of old Latin d using “*eum* (it)” twice rather than once? Was this an accidental repetition of “*eum* (it),” i.e., in dittography?

Was this a deliberate repetition of “*eum* (it)”? On the one hand, simple repetition may be used for emphasis in Latin, as it may in English. But on the other hand, to do so for a demonstrative pronoun like “*eum* (it)” at the end of a sentence looks unusual and irregular, though I suppose if it took the scribe’s fancy, not theoretically impossible.

The neuter form, such as “*illud* (‘that [thing]’ = ‘it,’ neuter singular accusative pronoun, from *ille*)” (Vulgate *et al*), often refers to a clause / phrase / idea, here generically for, “the temple of God;” whereas *is-ea-id*, such as “*eum*” (old Latin d) is often used with emphasis of a particular thing already named, here once again for “the temple of God”⁷³. While the *ille* (*ille-illa-illud*) form carries the connotation of “that [thing] *over there*,” by contrast, the “*is*” (*is-ea-id*) form is used when any such greater precision is either deemed not desirable or not possible⁷⁴. Therefore, as part of an *emphasis* on the “*templum* (the temple) ... *Dei* (of God),” did the scribe select the “*is*” (*is-ea-id*) form rather than the “*ille*” (*ille-illa-illud*) form to as to avoid any connotation of the temple being more remote and “over there”? If so, such a view *might* additionally be compatible with the idea of deliberate repetition for emphasis of “*eum* (it)” as “*eum eum* (it).”

Are there any answers to any of these questions? If one were looking at a Vulgate Codex and one saw something like this, then one could more quickly say fairly safely that the repetition of the “*eum* (it)” as “*eum eum* (it)” was most likely a scribal mistake of dittography; and the incorrect gendering of the masculine “*eum* (it)” probably occurred after a paper fade of the neuter “*illud*” or “*id*” by a “corrector” scribe who acted in haste. So if this “*eum eum* (it)” were in this same spot of Matt. 26:61b in a Latin Vulgate Codex, the conclusion of “*eum* (it)” as a scribal “reconstruction” of “*illud*” following a paper fade, coupled with a scribal error in which this word was then repeated could be fairly safely drawn without too much fuss.

But this is not a Vulgate Codex we are looking at. It is certainly possible that a similar set of dynamics was operating here with the scribe of old Latin d. But if so, one cannot reach this conclusion quite so quickly. That is because old Latin d is an unusual manuscript in that it often uses rarer, unnecessarily complex, or elongated forms of Latin. It is thus quite different to the Vulgate which generally uses more common, simple, and

⁷³ See Allen & Greenough’s *New Latin Grammar, For Schools & Colleges* (1888, 1903, 2000), Pullins Company, Focus Publishing, Newbury, Massachusetts, USA, 2000, pp. 170-172, sections 297 & 298.

⁷⁴ Betts, G., *Latin*, Teach Yourself Books, Hodder & Stoughton, Sevenoaks, England, 1986, section 8.1/2, p. 52.

straightforward forms of Latin. On the one hand, this factor raises the possibility that the repetition of the “*eum (it)*” as “*eum eum (it)*” in old Latin d was deliberate. But on the other hand, the fact that this was given the incorrect masculine gendering as “*eum (it)*,” rather than the correct neuter gendering of “*id*,” indicates that the scribe of old Latin d was not thinking too clearly when he wrote this down. Therefore, on the balance of probabilities, on this occasion I think that we can say that old Latin d suffered from an accidental “scribal botch up.” Was he, e.g., distracted by an external stimulus? We cannot be sure. But by “*eum eum*” he evidently meant “*id (it)*.”

Thus for our immediate purposes here at Matt. 26:61, I think we can also see beyond what seems to be “a scribal botch up” of the text of old Latin d, so as to still be able to confidently say that the scribe’s intention was to follow the TR’s reading. Hence I show old Latin d supporting the TR, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:61b, the TR’s Greek, “*auton (it)*,” in the wider words, “and to build it (*auton*) in three days” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., *Codex Alexandrinus* (A 02, 5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), *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), the purple parchment, *Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus* (N 022, 6th century), and *Codex Cyprius* (K 017, 9th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark; Paris, France), 2 (12th century; Basel, Switzerland), and 1010 (12th century; Athos, Greece); and the two Sydney University Lectionaries written in brown ink with colourful bright red illumination of key letters and section markers, to wit, Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*, twice in two different readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*, twice in two different readings, with a local revowelling variant of omicron “*o*” to omega “*ω*” at the first reading, p. 164b, but not at the second reading, p. 177a).

The TR’s reading is further supported as Latin, “*illud* (‘that [thing]’ = ‘it’),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century); 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 as Latin, “*eum eum (it)*”⁷⁵ in old Latin Version d (5th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254), in both the Greek and also a Latin translation; and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, a variant omitting Greek, “*auton (it)*,” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 924 (12th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254). A similar reading is also found in Minuscule 1328 (14th

⁷⁵ See “Preliminary Textual Discussion,” “The Fourth Matter,” *supra*.

century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is therefore correct. The origins of the variant are speculative. But both readings were known to Origen who is the probable originator of the variant.

Was the variant an accidental omission? In a given manuscript, did the “*auton* (it),” come at the end of a line, possibly in some abbreviated form? Was it then lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was the variant a deliberate omission? The likely origins of the variant with Origen increases the probability of this. Did a prunist scribe, if so, probably Origen, consider that this word was “superfluous”? Or relative to the Greek “*allon* (other)” of Mark 14:58, did he see himself as “standardizing the text” so that one could “then take this to mean ‘another’”? Evidence for something of this type of thinking is found in the scribal corruption of old Latin *c* (12th / 13th century) which here reads, “*aliud* (another),” as does Mark 14:58 in e.g., the Vulgate⁷⁶.

Was this a deliberate or accidental omission? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that it was a change to the text here Providentially preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR’s reading here has rock solid support in both the Greek and Latin, over time and through time. Its support in the Latin includes two of the Western Church’s four doctors, being found in the Vulgate of the church father and doctor, St. Jerome; as well as enjoying further support from the church doctor, St. Gregory the Great. By contrast, the variant has weak support in both the Greek and Latin, and looks very much like the type of thing that Origen was known to do on one of his fluctuations into “the silly season.” Therefore, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 26:61b 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. 26:61b, “it,” in the wider words, “and to build it in three days,” 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 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), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in

⁷⁶ The old Latin *c* reading of Mark 14:58 as “*illud* (it),” may reflect the complexities of different corrupter scribes working on the same manuscript at different places.

Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels), and 579 (13th century, mixed text). It is further found in the Syriac Harclean Version (616); and Ethiopic Version (in a manuscript of Pell Platt, based on the Roman edition of Rome 1548-9).

However, the variant which omits “it” is 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 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), 69 (15th century, 15th century, mixed text type in e.g., Matthew’s Gospel), *et al*. It is also found in the Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Versions (Roman edition of Rome 1548-9; & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

At Matt. 26:61b, working on the Neo-Alexandrian School rule, “the shorter reading is the better reading,” the variant was adopted in the NU Text *et al*. But with a major split between the two leading Alexandrian texts, things are generally more complex than that. After all, when so much hangs on just two texts, it is easy from the Neo-Alexandrian paradigm for “a 50:50 bet” to be “a game of Russian roulette.” And, “Is there not external support for Codex Vaticanus in e.g., the Latin Text, and the ‘Caesarean Text’ (‘Pre-Caesarean’: Families 1 & 13; ‘Caesarean Proper’: Theta 038, Armenian Version, & Georgian Version)?” Might it not have been “deleted by copyists who felt it to be superfluous” (a possibility raised but inadequately considered by the NU Text Committee, Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 65)? Thus the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions placed the variant in the main text, but said, “there is a considerable degree of doubt whether the” reading in their main “text or the apparatus” showing the TR’s reading “contains the superior reading.”

In this game of Neo-Alexandrian “hop-scotch,” after the NU Text *et al* “reached their first goal” by “jumping” as far as they could in the direction of *Codex Vaticanus*, both the ASV and NASB then “turned about” and “jumped back” in the direction of *Codex Sinaiticus*. So where on this hop-scotch pattern of lines are the other neo-Alexandrian Versions? Are they “jumping forward” with the NU Text *et al* and *Codex Vaticanus*, or have they “turned around” and are “jumping back” with the ASV, NASB, and *Codex Sinaiticus*?

It is unclear what most neo-Alexandrian versions are doing here as they do not use italics for added words. They all include “it.” But what does it all mean? Is this because like the ASV and NASB they are following *Codex Sinaiticus*, or is this because they are following *Codex Vaticanus* and adding it in as part of their act of translation? Their lack of italics for added words means we simply do not know, and one neo-

Alexandrian version may be doing one thing, and another, another thing. And so we once again find greater obscurity and uncertainty in a host of new neo-Alexandrian versions, which relative to their claim of making the Word of God clearer, in fact make it here at Matt. 26:61b, “as clear as mud!”

Matt. 26:63 “answered” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Remarks & Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Just before this reading in Lectionary 1968 the scribe wrote the opening words of Matt. 26:63 twice, “o (-) de (But) Is (with a bar on top = *Iesus*, ‘Jesus’) *esiopa* (held his peace.) + (a section marker approximating verses) o (-) de (But) Is (Jesus) *esiopa* (held his peace.) *kai* (And)”. This was the end of a line, and looking back, he then realized he had made a mistake, and so he put a line through the second “o de Is *esiopa*”. On the next line he wrote, “*kai* (And) *apokritheis* (answered)” etc. . But in doing so he had forgotten to cross out the “*kai* (And)” at the end of the first line, so this manuscript wrongly reads, “*kai* (And) *kai* (And) *apokritheis* (answered)” etc. .

Hence here at Matt. 26:63 we have documentary evidence in Lectionary 1968 of a scribal copyist’s “accident scene.” We see not only a copyist’s scribal accident in the making, but a corrector scribe’s partial correcting of it. Of course, if this manuscript had been copied out again, it is possible that a later scribal copyist may have wrongly copied out “*kai* (And) *kai* (And) *apokritheis* (answered)” without much thinking about it, and that would then have left us with the definitively insoluble puzzle of, How did the textual corruption of a double “*kai* (And)” come about?

While textual apparatuses are very good and desirable, and while the type of thing that Swanson has done is also very useful, at the end of the day, there’s nothing quite as good as *looking at the manuscripts themselves!* I thank God that he so Providentially ordered things, that of the manuscripts inside the closed class of sources, one Evangelion (Gospel) Lectionary (Lectionary 2378), and one Evangelion (Gospel) and Apostolos (Acts-Jude) Lectionary for the Saturdays & Sundays of the year together with annual festival days (Lectionary 1968), came to both be placed at Sydney University. This he did in preparation for the day that he would, for the first time in over 300 years, graciously call forth for a neo-Byzantine textual analyst to undertake major work in defending the *Textus Receptus*. Yet who at the time these Lectionaries were placed at Sydney University would have imagined such a thing? “How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!” (Rom. 11:33)

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Inside the closed class of sources, the Latin Vulgate *et al* reads at Mark 14:60, “*Et* (And) *exurgens* (rising up),” whereas old Latin a reads here, “*Et* (And) *surgens* (rising);” and then at Matt. 26:63 the Vulgate reads, “*Et* (And) *princeps* (the high) *sacerdotum* (priest),” etc. . The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron reads, “*Et* (And) *surgens* (rising) *princeps* (the high) *sacerdotum* (priest)” etc. (Latin Diatessaron chapter 189). This means that for the purposes of Diatessaron formatting, this Vulgate Codex is here drawing on multiple sources from multiple

gospels. Therefore no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Notably, this is one of the relatively rare occasions where the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron follows elements of a reading found in an old Latin Version, and not, to the best of my knowledge, any other Vulgate Codex. (Although this last sentence is qualified by the fact that for my knowledge of such Vulgate Codices I am very largely limited to the very incomplete citations of them in the textual apparatuses of Wordsworth & White's *Novum Testamentum Latine* of 1911, Merk's *Novum Testamentum* of 1964, and Weber & Gryson's *Biblia Sacra Vulgata* of 2007.)

By contrast, outside the closed class of sources, Ciasca's historically modern Latin translation of the mediaeval Arabic Diatessaron as, "*Respondit* ('he answered' = 'answered') *autem* (And) *princeps* (the high) *sacerdotum* (priest) *et* (and) *ait* (said) *illi* ('unto that [one]' = 'unto him')," etc. (Arabic Diatessaron chapter 49) i.e., "And the high priest answered and said unto him," looks sufficiently different to the Marcan and Lucan accounts, and sufficiently like the Matthean account, for me to show the Arabic Diatessaron following the TR's reading, *infra*.

The Third Matter. Outside the closed class of sources, Nestle-Aland (1993) says all extant Syriac Versions follow the TR's reading; whereas the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions show the Syriac: Sinaitic, Pesitto, and Harclean Versions following the TR's reading, and the Syriac Palestinian Version following the variant. The greater specificity of break-up by these UBS editions means that on this occasion I shall "take the risk" that they are correct. But what if I am wrong? It does not ultimately matter. Those manuscripts which are outside the closed class of sources did not have general accessibility over time and through time, and are not used to determine the NT Text. At best, they are consulted purely out of interest, and in the case of this textual commentary, to also help the reader better understand where the wayward neo-Alexandrian School textual critics are coming from. Thus if a neo-Byzantine textual analyst wanted to, he could totally ignore these manuscripts outside the closed class of sources since they are of no serious textual value for determining the NT text. From the neo-Byzantine paradigm, one can "Take 'em or leave 'em," but either way, NEVER EVER use them to determine the New Testament text.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:63 the TR's Greek, "*apokritheis* ('answering' = 'answered [and]')," in the wider words, "And the high priest answered and (*apokritheis*) said unto him" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), 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 S 028 (10th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), 2 (12th century), and 1242 (13th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, twice in two different readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings). It is further found as Latin, "*respondens* ('answering' = 'answered')," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century),

reading “answered ... and”), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), and c (12th / 13th century).

However, a variant omitting Greek, “*apokritheis* (answered [and]),” and so reading simply, “And the high priest said unto him,” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex G 011 (9th century) and Lectionary 547 (13th century). It is further found in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th 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 both the Greek and also a Latin translation; and the ancient church Greek writer, Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which thus must stand. The origins of the variant are conjectural. However, Origen appears to be the probable originator of the variant.

Was the variant an accidental omission? In the thin two-columned page of Lectionary 2378, the “*apokritheis* (answered [and])” starts with the first “*a*” on one line, and goes till after the middle of the next line, and then comes “*o* (the) *archiereus* (high priest)” etc. . Did a scribe have a similar type of thin columned manuscript, possibly with even thinner columns again? Did his eye jump down a line from the “*a*” of “*apokritheis*” to the “*a*” of “*archiereus*”, but before he wrote it he thought about the definite article, so his eye then look back quickly one letter space to the “*o*” which he wrote, and then did he just keep writing, thereby accidentally omitting the “*apokritheis*”?

Was the variant a deliberate omission? The probable origins of the variant with Origen increases this likelihood. Did an arrogant scribe, if so, probably Origen, consider that this sentence in which the high priest “answered” after Jesus “held his peace,” was “internally contradictory”? If so, he failed to recognize that one can have both an answer from silence, and an answer to silence. Did this superficial scribe then prune away the “*apokritheis* (answered [and]),” regarding it as some kind of “stylistic improvement”? If so, was he further influenced in his thinking with a desire for a semi-assimilation with Mark 14:61 which lacks “answered”?

Was this a deliberate or accidental omission? We do not know. We cannot now know. But we can know that it was a change to the Received Text here preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR’s reading has rock solid support in the Greek over time, and through time, dating from ancient times. It also has good support in the Latin with about two-thirds of the old Latin Versions, once again, over time, and through time, dating from ancient times. By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek, but better support in the Latin with the Vulgate and about one-third of the old Latin Versions. However, it appears to have originated with Origen in one of his dizzy mood swings into folly. 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. 26:63 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. 26:63, "answered and," in the wider words, "And the high priest answered and said unto him," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century⁷⁷). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels), and 579 (13th century, mixed text). It is further found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the variant which omits, "answered and," and so reads simply, "And the high priest said unto him," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); although it also appears in what is an otherwise vacant manuscript at this point, as a marginal reading added by a "corrector" scribe in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also 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); and Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), and 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; 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 Bohairic Version (3rd century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

On the one hand the neo-Alexandrians had the support of Codex Vaticanus and "external support" from e.g., the Syriac Palestinian Version and Coptic Bohairic Version, in favour of the shorter reading, and on neo-Alexandrian rules, it is generally considered

⁷⁷ While the TR reads, "*Kai* (And) *apokritheis* ('answering' = 'answered [and]') *o* (the) *archierues* (high priest) *eipen* (said)," i.e., "And the high priest answered and said," etc.; by contrast, D 05 reads, "*apokritheis* ('answering' = 'answered [and]') *oun* ('then' / 'whereupon' / 'therefore') *o* (the) *archierues* (high priest) *eipen* (said)," i.e., "Then the high priest answered and said," etc. .

“the shorter reading is the better reading.” But on the other hand, in favour of the TR’s reading, there was “that nagging doubt” about the vacancy in Codex Sinaiticus, a “vacancy” that could e.g., mean the TR’s reading was there, and the scribe of Codex Sinaiticus left the space because the manuscript he was copying from was damaged at this place. Is it not “the harder reading” since “answered” is, “unsuited to the” silence referred in “preceding clause” (Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 65)? And on neo-Alexandrian rules, is not “the harder reading the more likely reading”? And what about “the external support” for the TR’s reading from e.g., the Western Text, the Syriac texts (Sinaitic, Pesitto, & Harclean), and the so called “Caesarean Text” (“Pre-Caesarean”: Family 13; & “Caesarean Proper”: Armenian Version⁷⁸)?

All this meant that the normative “security blanket” the neo-Alexandrians “clutch at” of their two Alexandrian texts was somewhat missing. Their “left hand” could still “clutch at” Codex Vaticanus, but their “right hand” was “clutching at air.” It was a case of “one hand” not knowing “what the other hand was doing.” Such are the pains and strains of the Neo-Alexandrian paradigm which hangs so much on silly circular-reasoning neo-Alexandrian rules; and just two dark manuscripts, in broad terms brought from the obscurity of oblivion only in historically modern times; even though back in the 16th century, the learned neo-Byzantine textual analyst, Erasmus, learnt of, and understandably dismissed as a clearly corrupt text, Codex Vaticanus.

Thus for the wrong reasons, the right reading of the TR was adopted in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72). By contrast, the erroneous variant was adopted by Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle’s 21st edition (1952). The incorrect variant is also found in the NU Text; although when the NU Text Committee came to look at this, they were perplexed and confused. Thus “in the end,” on the one hand they opted for “the certainty” of the reading found in Codex Vaticanus, and so put the variant in their main text. But on the other hand, as they “wiped the sweat from their neo-Alexandrian brows,” the NU Text Committee of the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions exclaimed in confused exacerbation, “There is a considerable degree of doubt whether the text” i.e., the variant, “or the apparatus” i.e., with the TR’s reading, “contains the superior reading” (e.g., UBS 3rd corrected edition, pp. xiii & 106).

But among neo-Alexandrian translators at Matt. 26:63, such uncertainties among the neo-Alexandrian textual critics seem to have been set aside for “the certainty” of the reading of Codex Vaticanus, and the Neo-Alexandrian School’s general rule, “the shorter reading is the better reading.” Thus the erroneous variant was adopted at Matt. 26:63 by the American Standard Version which reads, “And the high priest said unto him” (ASV). So too, the incorrect variant is found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

Of course, fighting against such textual corruption here at Matt. 26:63 is nothing new for we of the Neo-Byzantine School. The old Latin Papists of pre-Vatican II

⁷⁸ Though I do not support the theory of a “Caesarean Text,” some neo-Alexandrians do, and some neo-Alexandrians do not. Some of them, like Metzger have shown fluidity on this issue, first arguing for, and then arguing against, such a text type.

Council times followed the variant in their Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version. Hence the Douay-Rheims here reads, “And the high priest said to him.” So too, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post-Vatican II Council times adopted the variant of their beloved Codex Vaticanus in the Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB.

Matt. 26:65b “his” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Nestle-Aland (1993) refer to some Vulgate manuscripts following the TR’s reading. Inside the closed class of sources, the Vulgate manuscript of the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron first follows the Vulgate’s Matt. 26:65b and then the Vulgate’s Luke 22:71 in its reading, “*ecce* (behold) *nunc* (now) *audistis* (ye have heard) *blasphemiam* (the blasphemy) [Matt. 26:65b, Vulgate] *de* (‘of’ or ‘from’) *ore* (mouth) *eius* (‘of him’ = ‘his own’) [Luke 22:71, Vulgate]” etc. (Sangallensis Diatessaron chapter cxci). Since as a consequence of Diatessaron formatting it is clear that multiple gospel readings are here being conflated in such a way as may or may not have led to the omission of the TR’s reading of the “*eius* (his)” following the “*blasphemiam* (the blasphemy)” at Matt. 26:65b, no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron reads in Ciasca’s Latin translation, “*Blasphemavit!* (He hath blasphemed)” (Arabic Diatessaron chapter xlix), from the earlier part of Matt. 26:65. But it lacks reference to the later part of this verse of relevance to this reading. I remind the reader that when this occurs, I make no reference to the Arabic Diatessaron, and usually do not say specifically say so at “Preliminary Textual Discussion.”

The Second Matter. A matter I do not always draw specific attention to, namely the fact that certain manuscripts are missing sections, is doubly relevant here, since it touches upon both the Greek and Latin.

With regard to the Greek, this will be the last citation of Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) for a while. The reading of this Minuscule ends early in Matt. 26:70 and does not resume until part way into Matt. 27:48. Of course, we will not be much interested in this Minuscule in St. Mark’s Gospel, since it is there non-Byzantine text; and so like e.g., W 032 outside of its Byzantine Text in St. Matt. 1-28 and St. Luke 8:13-24:53; or like A 02 outside of its Byzantine Text Gospels; Minuscule 28 is of no real interest to us in its non-Byzantine text section of Mark. Nevertheless, the fact that such different text types were stitched together in the same manuscript, also acts to remind us that the scribes of the Byzantine School existed contemporaneously alongside other scribes, and that the final redactor of a given manuscript could therefore select portions from the work of different text type scribes, either knowingly being aware of such textual diversity or unknowingly not being aware of such textual diversity.

With regard to the Latin, a similar issue arises with old Latin Version d (5th

century). This manuscript is textually broken from Matt. 26:65 till Matt. 27:2.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:65b the TR's Greek, "*autou* ('of him' = 'his')," in the wider words falsely said against Christ, "now ye have heard his (*autou*) blasphemy" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), Codex 090 (6th century, Matt. 26:59-70; 27:44-56; Mark 1:34-2:12; from the same manuscript as Codices 064 & 074), and U 030 (9th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, twice in two different readings⁷⁹) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings). It is also found as Latin, "*eius* ('of him' = 'his')," in old Latin Versions b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), and q (6th / 7th century). It is further found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254), in both the Greek and also a Latin translation.

However, a variant omits "his (Greek, *autou*; Latin, *eius*)," and so reads simply, "now ye have heard the blasphemy." This variant is found 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), 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, Chrysostom (d. 407); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

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

Was the variant an accidental omission? In a given manuscript, did the "*autou* (his)," come at the end of a line, possibly in an abbreviated form? Was it then lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was the variant a deliberate omission? Did an assimilationist scribe, first look at Mark 14:64, "Ye have heard the blasphemy (*blasphemias*⁸⁰)"? Seeking a "more standard text," did he then make a semi-assimilation of this to Matt. 26:65b by pruning away the "*autou* (his)," thus making it read, "Ye have heard the blasphemy (*blasphemian*⁸¹)"?

⁷⁹ Though the first reading (p. 74a, column 2) is unabbreviated; at the second reading (p. 81a, column 1) the final "ou" of this word is abbreviated, and looks something like an "8" without the top curve on the "8" i.e., a "v" that sits on top of a "o" (cf. Lectionary 2378 at Matt. 26:60a, *supra*).

⁸⁰ Feminine singular genitive noun, from *blasphemia*.

⁸¹ Feminine singular accusative noun, from *blasphemia*.

Was this a deliberate or accidental omission? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that it was an omission to the text of Scripture here preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR's reading has rock solid support in the Greek over time, and through time, dating from ancient times. It further enjoys the support of about two-fifths of the old Latin Versions dating from ancient times. Moreover, in a situation like this where we know that Origen has not tampered with the text, his further attestation in both the Greek and Latin of ancient times is of value. By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek, though better support in the Latin with the Vulgate and about three-fifths of the old Latin Versions dating from ancient times. 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. 26:65b 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. 26:65b, "his," in the wider words, "now ye have heard his blasphemy," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in 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), 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 the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant which omits "his," and so reads simply, "now ye have heard the blasphemy," 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 Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.

At Matt. 26:65b the erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence

the ASV reads, “now ye have heard the blasphemy.” So too, the incorrect variant is followed at Matt. 26:65b in the NASB, NIV, NEB, and REB.

The old Latin Papists of pre-Vatican II Council times followed the variant in both the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Versions. Hence the Douay-Rheims reads at Matt. 26:65b, “now you have heard the blasphemy.” So likewise, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post-Vatican II Council times follow the variant in their Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB.

Prima facie, the TR’s reading was here followed by the RSV, ESV, NRSV, TEV, TCNT, and Moffatt Bible. E.g., the *English Standard Version* reads at Matt. 26:65b, “You have now heard his blasphemy” (ESV). Is this an example of the exercise of the non-Alexandrian pincer arm which is occasionally used in conjunction with the more common Alexandrian pincer arm by those of the Neo-Alexandrian School? If so, were these neo-Alexandrians here attracted by the idea of a semi-assimilation of Matt. 26:65b with Mark 14:65, coupled with such “external support” beyond the two main Alexandrian texts found in e.g., Codices C 04 and 090; the Alexandrian’s “queen of minuscules,” Minuscules 33; and the Syriac (Pesitto & Harclean) and Armenian (“Caesarean Text”) Versions? Certainly in the case of much older neo-Alexandrians, one could also include in here Dillmann’s Ethiopic Version. (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.) Or is this an example of these versions adding in the word as part of English translation, but because they do not believe in using italics for added words, it is put in normal print? Did some of them go one way, and some the other way? Such are the confusing vagaries of these “modern” versions which while claiming to make the Word of God “clearer,” in fact here at Matt. 26:65b and elsewhere, make it *very dark indeed*. In contrast to these dark versions, let us thank God for the bright clarity of the Neo-Byzantine School’s *King James Version* both here at Matt. 26:65b and elsewhere!

Matt. 26:70 “*them* all” (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Von Soden (1913) says the majority Byzantine reading has the support of his K group of c. 1,000 manuscripts, which due to the generalist nature of his groups means c. 90% plus of the K group. Therefore on any reasonable statistical projections, the minority Byzantine reading of the TR is here supported by less than c. 10% of Byzantine manuscripts. Von Soden shows Minuscule 1200 (12th century, ε 1250 in Ikb) following both the TR’s reading and that of *Variant 1*. Since I am unsure which of these two citations is correct, no reference will be made to this Minuscule, *infra*.

The 12 Greek manuscript readings (two from one Lectionary) itemized, *infra*, include 9 from von Soden’s I and K groups. In von Soden’s I and K groups of c. 1,500 manuscripts, there are more than c. 85% which are exclusively Byzantine text, and more than c. 90% which are Byzantine if one includes those that are Byzantine text only in specific parts. Looking at the exclusively Byzantine figures, c. 85% of I and K group

1,500 manuscripts is *c.* 1300 manuscripts; and 9 of the Greek manuscripts itemized, *infra*, are also exclusively Byzantine. 9 out of 1300 manuscripts is *c.* 0.7%. But as to exactly where the figure lies between *c.* 0.7% and *c.* 10% cannot be safely determined on von Soden's generalist groups data. Similar issues also exist as to what, below *c.* 10%, is the manuscript support for *Variant 1*.

The TR's reading is thrice found in the two Sydney University Lectionaries. It is found in Lectionary 2378 at both the first reading (p. 74a, column 2) and second reading (p. 81a, column 2). Then in Lectionary 1968, the TR's reading is found at the second reading (p. 177b), whereas *Variant 1* is found at the first reading (p. 165b). It is a solemn thought to consider, that of the 12 Greek Byzantine readings that we know of for the TR's reading, three of them, representing 25%, or one-quarter of the known Greek Byzantine readings, are here documented for the first time, being the three readings found in the two Sydney University Lectionaries. Thus once again the value of increased research on the Greek Lectionaries is startlingly apparent. (Von Soden also here lists a relatively small number of other Greek manuscripts that are unclassified outside of his system, and this also reminds us of the need to get textual classifications for all manuscripts, so as to be able to better use von Soden's data.)

The Second Matter. Beyond the majority Byzantine reading (*Variant 2*), we are *prima facie* left with two possible readings, that of the TR with 12 itemized attestations in the Greek Byzantine manuscripts, and that of *Variant 1* with 6 itemized attestations in the Greek Byzantine manuscripts. Quite apart from the fact that on these very limited figures of 19 Greek readings, it would be quite possible for some presently unitemized manuscripts in von Soden's selections to turn up that changed the precise numbers we here have, or some further work on the Greek Lectionaries to bring about such a precise numbers change; in broad terms when the numbers are this small it is pointless to say, "the TR's reading is twice as strong as *Variant 1*." The reality is, that when known Greek manuscript is this small, one can only say that the remaining Greek text manuscript support *is fairly evenly divided* between the TR's reading and *Variant 1*.

In such circumstances, one must first look corporately at the overall support inside the closed class of sources, to see if one of the two readings is clearly the stronger reading overall. Only if this cannot be done, or if there is a clear and obvious textual problem with the overall clearly stronger attested to reading, does one go to further textual analysis betwixt such two or more readings (see commentary at Matt. 26:33b, "Principal Textual Discussion," *supra*).

Here at Matt. 26:70 it is clear that inside the closed class of sources, between the reading found in Scrivener's Text (1894 & 1902) and that of *Variant 1*, Scrivener's reading is overall the clearly stronger reading since it has the monolithic support of the Latin textual tradition, as well as an ancient church Greek writer in both the Greek and a Latin translation. Hence only if there was a clear and obvious textual problem with Scrivener's reading, that could be remedied by adopting *Variant 1*, would one then proceed to a reading that had such overall minority support from all quarters inside the closed class of sources. But that is not the case here. In broad-brush terms, the contest

at Matt. 26:70 is clearly that between the TR's reading as manifested in the Latin of Jerome's Latin Vulgate *et al*, and the majority Byzantine reading of the Greek. Yet lest these comments be misconstrued, it might also be remarked, that in so selecting the reading of Scrivener's Text manifested in the Latin of the Vulgate *et al* over that of *Variant 2*, we here see an instance of the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, bowing down humbly to its master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. That is because the textual analysis remains on the Greek, and only if a clear and obvious textual problem with the Greek reading of Scrivener's Text existed, as remedied by *Variant 2*, would one then go to this other reading. The position of the Neo-Byzantine in favour of the TR's reading here at Matt. 26:70 as manifested in the Latin of the Vulgate *et al*, is thus fundamentally different to that of the old Latin Papists of pre-Vatican II Council times, even though on this occasion, both agree, albeit with a different wider ideological framework to the maxim, that at Matt. 26:70, *The Latin improves the Greek*.

The reading of Scrivener's Text is clearly that of the TR here at Matt. 26:70. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the detailed textual analysis found in the "Principal Textual Discussion," *infra*, shall be undertaken between the readings of the TR and the majority Byzantine reading of *Variant 2*.

The Third Matter. Outside the closed class of sources, Nestle-Aland (1993) shows Minuscule 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), following *Variant 1*; whereas Swanson (1995) shows it following the TR's reading. Therefore no reference is made to Minuscule 1424, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:70 the TR's Greek "*panton* ([them] all)," in the wider words, "But he denied before *them* all (*panton*)" (AV, showing italics for added word), is a minority Byzantine reading found in less than *c.* 10% of Byzantine manuscripts. It is supported in *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042 late 5th / 6th century, Rossano, Italy); *Codex 090* (6th century, Matt. 26:59-70; 27:44-56; Mark 1:34-2:12, St. Petersburg, Russia; from the same manuscript as Codices 064 & 074), *Codex Basilensis* (E 07, 8th century, Basel, Switzerland), and *Codex Seidelianus* (G 011, 9th century, Trinity College, Cambridge University, England); Minuscules 998 (12th century, Athos, Greece), 1010 (12th century, Athos, Greece), 1355 (12th century, Jerusalem, Israel), and 482 (13th century, British Library, London, UK); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*, twice in two different readings; Sydney University, Australia) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*, in one of two readings, p. 177b; Sydney University, Australia).

The TR's reading is further supported as Latin, "*omnibus* ([them] all)," in the *Versio Vulgata Hieronymi* (Jerome's Vulgate Version, 4th / 5th centuries), and *Codex Veronensis* (old Latin Version b, 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), *Codex Corbeiensis* (old Latin Version ff1, 10th / 11th century), and *Codex Colbertinus* (old Latin Version c, 12th / 13th century); as well as *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 also supported (in a differently constructed sentence) as Latin, “*omnium* (of all),” in *Codex Vercellensis* (old Latin Version a, 4th century) and *Codex Sangallensis* (old Latin Version n, 5th / 6th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254), in both the Greek and also a Latin translation.

The TR’s reading at Matt. 26:70 is manifested only in the Latin reading of the Greek and Latin *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) 1516 edition of Erasmus, and in both the Greek and Latin readings of the Greek and Latin *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) 1522 edition of Erasmus. It is further manifested in the Greek *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of e.g., Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633).

Variant 1 omitting Greek “*panton* (all),” and adding, “*auton* (them),” in the wider words, “But he denied before them,” is a minority Byzantine reading. It is found in Codices K 017 (9th century), Y 034 (9th century), and Pi 041 (9th century); Minuscules 270 (12th century) and 1375 (12th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D. in one of two readings, p. 165b).

Variant 2 adding Greek, “*auton* (them),” i.e., “*auton* (‘them,’ masculine genitive, 3rd person plural, personal pronoun from *autos-e-o*) *panton* (‘all,’ masculine genitive, adjective from *pas-pasa-pan*),” in the wider words, “But he denied before all of them,” is the majority Byzantine reading found in more than c. 90% of Byzantine manuscripts. It is found in e.g., Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), and S 028 (10th century); and Minuscule 2 (12th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407). It is manifested only in the Greek reading of the Greek and Latin New Testament 1516 edition of Erasmus.

There is a textual problem in the majority Byzantine reading (*Variant 2*) here at Matt. 26:70 with respect to the grammatical relationship of “*auton* (them)” from *autos-e-o* and “*panton* (all)” from *pas-pasa-pan*. In NT Koine Greek, as a general though not absolute rule, the adjective *pas* (masculine) – *pasa* (feminine) – *pan* (neuter) (or where relevant I shall also cite some similar examples from, *apas-asa-an*⁸²), is used in one of four broad ways. Firstly, it might be used with a verb, for instance, a third person plural verb (“they ...”), e.g., at Acts 2:4, “*Kai* (And) *eplesthesan* (they were filled with)⁸³

⁸² See the examples I use of *apas-asa-an* at Matt. 24:39 and Acts 2:4, *infra*, which for my immediate illustrative purposes here are grammatically operating in a comparable way with *pas-pasa-pan*.

⁸³ Indicative passive aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *pimplemi*.

apantes (all⁸⁴) *Pneumatos* (Ghost) ‘*Agiou* (Holy),’ i.e., “and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost” (cf. e.g., Acts 8:1; or with the infinitive at e.g., Acts 4:29). Secondly, it may be used with a definite article, “the [ones]” and a connected participle, and rendered “they” or “them.” E.g., at Matt. 26:52, Christ says, “for all (*pantes*⁸⁵) they (*oi*, ‘the [ones]’ = ‘they’⁸⁶) that take (*labontes*, ‘taking’ = ‘that take’⁸⁷) the sword shall perish with the sword;” or at Luke 2:38, we read the prophetess Anna “spake” of Christ “to all (*pasi*⁸⁸) them (*tois*, ‘the [ones]’ = ‘them’⁸⁹) that looked for (*prosdechomenois*, ‘looking for’ = ‘that looked for’⁹⁰) redemption in Jerusalem.” (Cf. e.g., Matt. 21:12; Mark 12:43; Luke 1:66; 2:18; Acts 4:16; 9:14.)

Thirdly, it may be attached to a qualifying noun (or pronoun, see a personal pronoun at e.g., John 1:16; I Cor. 14:18; 15:10; 16:24; or a demonstrative pronoun at e.g., Luke 2:51; Acts 24:8), so as to mean “all” of something. E.g., in Matt. 13:32 we read “*panton* (all⁹¹) *ton* (of the) *spermaton* (seeds)” i.e., “all seeds” (AV); or in Matt. 24:9, “*panton* (all⁹²) *ton* (of the) *ethnon* (nations),” i.e., “all nations” (AV). (Cf. e.g., Matt. 11:13; Acts 2:47; I Cor. 15:19; II Cor. 3:2.) Or fourthly, it might stand by itself, either with or without an implied word in English translation. E.g., without an implied word, we read at Matt. 22:27, “And last of all (*panton*⁹³) the woman died also;” or at Acts 1:1, “The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus, of all (*panton*⁹⁴) that Jesus began both to do and teach.” But with an implied word in English translation it might be used like it is here at Matt. 26:70 in the TR. E.g., in Matt. 10:22 Christ says, “ye shall be hated of all

⁸⁴ Masculine plural nominative, adjective from *apas-asa-an*. A minority Byzantine reading in Minuscules 378 (12th century, Byzantine outside of General Epistles) and 61 (16th century, Byzantine in Gospels & Acts) alters this to “*pantes* (masculine plural nominative, adjective from *pas-pasa-pan*),” but keeps the same basic meaning.

⁸⁵ Masculine plural nominative, adjective from *pas-pasa-pan*.

⁸⁶ Masculine plural nominative, definite article from ‘*o* / *ho*.

⁸⁷ Masculine plural nominative, active aorist participle, from *lambano*.

⁸⁸ Masculine plural dative, adjective from *pas-pasa-pan*.

⁸⁹ Masculine plural dative, definite article from ‘*o* / *ho*.

⁹⁰ Masculine plural dative, middle present participle, from *prosdechomai*.

⁹¹ Neuter plural genitive, adjective from *pas-pasa-pan*.

⁹² Neuter plural genitive, adjective from *pas-pasa-pan*.

⁹³ Masculine plural genitive, adjective from *pas-pasa-pan*.

⁹⁴ Neuter plural genitive, adjective from *pas-pasa-pan*.

(*panton*⁹⁵) *men*” (AV, showing italics for added word); or in Matt. 11:27 Christ says, “all (*panta*⁹⁶) *things* are delivered unto me of my Father” (AV, showing italics for added word); or in Matt. 24:39 Christ says, “and took *them* all (*apantas*⁹⁷) away” (showing italics for added word).” (Cf. e.g., Mark 2:12.)

To this broad general rule there is a relevant rare and usual exception in NT Koine Greek, in which *autos-e-o* + *pas-pasa-pan* is used as a limitation device in order to limit the scope of the “all” for some contextual reason. In the case of Matthean Greek this grammatical limitation device is used to prevent potential confusion, so that we read “*autous* (them) *pantas* (all)” at Matt. 12:14,15, “Then the Pharisees went out But . . . Jesus . . . withdrew himself from thence: and great multitudes followed him and he healed them (*autous*⁹⁸) all (*pantas*⁹⁹)” etc. (AV). Here the limitation device of *autos* is used so that Matt. 12:15 refers to “all” of these “great multitudes” rather than “all” *per se*. (Cf., Matt. 13:58, “And he did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief.”)

By contrast, in Lucan Greek, this grammatical limitation device though generally absent (e.g., Luke 4:20; 17:29), is occasionally used to create a sense of “cosiness” around the community of believers as opposed to unbelievers. Hence we read of “*pantas* (all) *autous* (them)” in Acts 4:33,34 “And with great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus: and great grace was upon them (*autous*¹⁰⁰) all (*pantas*¹⁰¹). Neither was there any among them that lacked” etc. . Or in Acts 20:36-38 we read of “*pasin* (all) *autois* (them),” when St. Paul “had thus spoken, he kneeled down, and prayed with them (*autois*¹⁰²) all (*pasin*¹⁰³). And they all wept sore, and fell on Paul’s neck, and kissed him, sorrowing most of all for the words which he spake, that they should see his face no more. And they accompanied him unto the ship.”

⁹⁵ Masculine plural genitive, adjective from *pas-pasa-pan*.

⁹⁶ Neuter plural nominative, adjective from *pas-pasa-pan*.

⁹⁷ Masculine plural accusative, adjective from *apas-asa-an*.

⁹⁸ Masculine plural accusative, 3rd person plural, personal pronoun from *autos-e-o*.

⁹⁹ Masculine plural accusative, adjective from *pas-pasa-pan*.

¹⁰⁰ Masculine plural accusative, 3rd person plural, personal pronoun from *autos-e-o*.

¹⁰¹ Masculine plural accusative, adjective from *pas-pasa-pan*.

¹⁰² Masculine plural dative, 3rd person plural, personal pronoun from *autos-e-o*.

¹⁰³ Masculine plural dative, adjective from *pas-pasa-pan*.

The textual problem in the majority Byzantine reading (*Variant 2*) at Matt. 26:70 is now readily apparent. There is no sense in which what in NT Koine Greek is the rare and unusual limitation device of *autos-e-o + pas-pasa-pan*, is appropriate here at Matt. 26:70. Peter is *speaking publicly*, for *all the world to hear*, for “Peter sat without in the palace: and a damsel came unto him, saying, Thou also wast with Jesus of Galilee” (Matt. 26:69). Thus we would expect to read of Peter, “But he denied before *them* all (*panton*), saying, I know not what thou sayest” (TR, showing italics for added word), not “But he denied before all (*panton*) of them (*auton*),” etc. (majority Byzantine Text variant) i.e., in some kind of manner necessary for contextual limitation purposes. Hence the majority Byzantine reading here at Matt. 26:70 “clangs on the ears” as bad NT Koine Greek in general, and bad Matthean Greek in particular. Clearly something is wrong with it. In order to correct this screaming textual problem which like Peter in this same verse, “screams out” an evident falsehood, we have to adopt the TR’s minority Byzantine reading which is therefore the correct reading here at Matt. 26:70.

The origins of the two variants are conjectural.

Was *Variant 1* an accidental alteration? The presence of the TR’s reading in one of the two readings of Lectionary 1968, and *Variant 1* in the other reading of this Lectionary, raises the following question with regard to what may have happened much earlier in another Greek manuscript. Did a manuscript originally reading “*panton* ([them] all),” as a consequence of a paper fade or loss, come to look something like, “*:a:ton*”? Was this then “reconstructed” by a scribe as “*auton* (them)”? If so, was he at all influenced in this decision by the nearby presence of “*auton* (them)” at Matt. 26:73?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate alteration? Did “the great brain” of a corrupter scribe consider it was some kind of “stylistic improvement” to here alter the “*panton* ([them] all)” to “*auton* (them)”?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental alteration? Did a scribe, knowing of the existence of both the TR’s reading, “*panton* (all)” and the *Variant 1*’s reading “*auton* (them);” wrongly think that “both were right” and that “the “*panton*’ must have been lost on a ‘*ton*’ ellipsis with ‘*auton*’”? Did he then “reconstruct” these two readings as, “*auton panton*”?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate alteration? Did a corrupter scribe, not understanding the NT Koine Greek nuance in which *autos-e-o + pas-pasa-pan* is used as a limitation device in order to limit the scope of the “all” for some contextual reason, think it would be some kind of “stylistic improvement” to here supply an “*auton* (them)” before the “*panton* (all)”? If so, was “the great brain” of this corrupter scribe at all influenced by the Matt. 12:15 reading of “*autous* (them) *pantas* (all),” which he “brilliantly deduced” meant that his corruption at Matt. 26:70 “would still sound like Matthean Greek”?

Were these two variants deliberate or accidental alterations? Or was one accidental and the other deliberate? We do not now know. But we do now know that the correct reading of the *Textus Receptus* has here been Providentially preserved for us.

The TR's reading is found in less than *c.* 10% of Byzantine manuscripts, and *possibly* less than 1% of such manuscripts. It is a relatively weak Greek reading, although it is notable that it is still found in the Greek *over time* (3rd century, Origen to 16th century in Lectionary 1968), and *through time* (5th / 6th century in Sigma 042; 6th century in 090; 8th century in E 07; 9th century in G 011; 11th century in Lectionary 2378; 12th century in 998, 1010, & 1355; 13th century in 482; & 16th century in Lectionary 1968), *dating from ancient times* (Origen). It is the reading strongly favoured by textual analysis, and it further has rock solid support in the Latin textual tradition as the monolithic Latin reading; where once again, it is found over time, and through time, dating from ancient times. This Latin support includes the *Vulgata* of the ancient church father and doctor, St. Jerome, who is one of the Western Church's four ancient and early mediaeval church doctors. By contrast, *Variant 1* has weak support in the Greek and no support in the Latin, and in the absence of any good textual argument in its favour, it may therefore be safely dismissed. *Variant 2* has the overwhelming support of the representative Byzantine Greek text, being found in more than *c.* 90% of Byzantine manuscripts and *possibly* more than 99% of such manuscripts; although it has no support in the Latin textual tradition. Weighing up these factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 26:70 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. 26:70, "[them] all," in the wider words, "But he denied before *them* all" (showing italics for added word), 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). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (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 further found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.

Variant 1 omitting "all," and adding, "them," in the wider words, "But he denied before them," is found in Minuscule 565 (9th century, independent).

Variant 2 adding "them," in the wider words, "But he denied before all of them," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 1071 (12th century, independent), 1241 (12th century, Alexandrian corruption in General Epistles, Byzantine text in Acts, independent text elsewhere i.e., independent scribal corruption elsewhere e.g., in the Gospels), 579 (13th century, mixed text); a later corrupter (so called "corrector") scribe

of Minuscule 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.* It is also found in the Gothic Version (4th century).

We cannot believe that the textual buffoons of either the ancient Alexandrian School or Greek Western School would have been able, on the basis of textual analysis, to correct the corrupt reading of the majority Byzantine text on the basis of a known minority reading here at Matt. 26:70. Therefore we must conclude that on this occasion the Alexandrian and Greek Western Schools' scribes simply preserved this pure reading in their respective manuscript lines. The practical consequence of this was that for the wrong reasons, the correct reading of the TR was adopted at Matt. 26:70 by the NU Text *et al.*

It is possible to render *Variant 2* in English the same as the TR's reading, but the fact that "them" is in italics in the AV tells us that it is clearly following the TR. The ASV, without putting "them" in italics, reads at Matt. 26:70, "But he denied before them all" (ASV); and the NASB does the same. Why is this? Is it because they are exercising their non-Alexandrian text pincer arm, and here following the majority text reading, or is it because they sloppily failed to use italics? (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.)

A similar problem besets us with those neo-Alexandrian versions that misleadingly never use italics. What then are we to make of similar readings in the RSV, ESV, NIV, TEV, TCNT, NEB, REB, and Papists' JB and NJB? What are we to make of e.g., the *English Standard Version* which reads at Matt. 26:70, "But he denied it before them all" (ESV); or the *New Revised Standard Version* which reads at Matt. 26:70, "But he denied it before all of them" (NRSV)? When Moffatt renders Matt. 26:70, "But he denied it before them all" (Moffatt Bible), is it the TR's reading or that of *Variant 2* that he is following? Are these "new" versions here exercising their non-Alexandrian text pincer arm and following the majority text reading; or are they following the TR's reading? (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.)

Given the monolithic support of the neo-Alexandrian texts we consider, it might be said that *probably* these "modern" versions are following the TR's right reading for the wrong reasons of its presence in the two leading Alexandrian texts. Nevertheless, to this it must be said that we can never be sure when one or more of these neo-Alexandrian versions may be exercising their non-Alexandrian text pincer arm. *So what does it all mean?* Simply this. *Confusion reigns in these "modern" versions where either italics are not used (e.g., ESV, NRSV, NIV, TEV, etc.), or used but possibly not used as consistently as they should be (ASV and NASB?).* Therefore let us thank God for our Authorized King James Bibles of 1611, which not only use the best text, but also bring to it a high level of precision accuracy so that at a passage like this one here at Matt. 26:70, *we know exactly what it is saying relative to the underpinning Greek!*

Such confusions are known to we neo-Byzantines here at Matt. 26:70 from long afore these “modern” neo-Alexandrian versions. The old Latin Papists of pre-Vatican II Council times rendered this in their Douay-Rheims as, “But he denied before them all.” Due to the monolithic support of the Latin textual tradition for the TR’s reading, we can confidently say that the Douay-Rheims translators were here following the correct reading of the TR found in the Latin, “*omnibus* ([them] all).” Nevertheless, the fact that the Douay-Rheims never uses italics for added words, means that this basic problem is once again highlighted.

The Burgonite Majority Text reading of *Variant 2* is adopted in the majority texts of both Hodges & Farstad (1982 & 1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). But more misleading inconsistencies and more confusion again occurs in the Burgonites’ *New King James Version* (1982) since it follows the TR in the main text, but as in so many other places, it then fails to give a footnote stating the Majority Text here varies from the TR. As always, this acts to give the false and misleading impression that the Majority Text is a lot closer to the Received Text than what it actually is.

Pointing his anti-Reformation Puseyite gun at the Protestant’s *Textus Receptus*, the gun-totting founding father of the Majority Text Burgonites, John Burgon (d. 1888), bragged, “Again and again we shall have occasion to point out ... that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction;” and that “the ‘*Textus Receptus*’ ..., calls for ... revision,” “upon the” basis of the “majority of authorities¹⁰⁴.”

The *Book of the Chronicles of Neo-Byzantine Battles* records that here at Matt. 26:70, “out in the old wild west,” a gunman representative of the Neo-Byzantines and a gunman representative of the Majority Text Burgonites met at high-noon at the local corral. They stood back-to-back with loaded pistols in their holsters. The Burgonite gunman, a Puseyite devotee of his fellow Puseyite, John Burgon, signalled for a Puseyite priest to run up, who held up a censer (thurible) around the Burgonite gunman’s head area in order to cover him with incense “for good luck.” There was more smoke than smell from the censer, and some of the smoke of the incense got caught in the nostrils of the Neo-Byzantine gunman who started coughing, and then exclaimed, “Pew, no wonder they call you guys ‘Pew-seyites!’” The two gunmen then both walked apart counting out loudly 15 paces, and then turned. But the Neo-Byzantine gun-man was quicker on the draw than his Burgonite opponent, and fired a clean shot that sent the Burgonite gunman straight back on his back. But as the Burgonite gunman fell back from this blast, his gun went off, as it were, shooting wildly into the sky. But all to no avail, for the Burgonite gun here experienced a back-fire blasting the gun off the Burgonite’s hand and taking a sizeable and fatal part of his anatomy from this back-blast. Thus at Matt. 26:70 the Burgonites “were blown away.” Hence the *Textus Receptus* stood firm and triumphed over this Burgonite opposition. What? Hast thou not heard? Or hath it not been told unto thee? For from the Latin Vulgate of St. Jerome which preserved this very reading at Matt. 26:70 over time and through time, I Peter 1:25 reads, “*Verbum Domini Manet in*

¹⁰⁴ Burgon’s *Revision Revised*, p. 21; *Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, pp. 13,15.

Aeternum”!, that is to say, “The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever”!

Matt. 26:71c “also” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. In the Anglican Church of Ireland Dean of Raphoe’s edition (1913) of *The Book of Armagh* (812) that I use, John Gwynn (d. 1917) supplies the Latin, “*et* (also),” in italics here at Matt. 26:71c. Since it is thus added, I show this manuscript following the variant, *infra*.

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex, and *prima facie* follows the TR’s reading (Latin Diatessaron clxxxviii). However, it is also possible that as a consequence of Diatessaron formatting, it got the Latin, “*et* (also),” from the Vulgate at Luke 22:58 and / or John 18:25. Therefore no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, similar problems exist with the Latin translation of “*etiam* (‘and also’ or ‘too’)” in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic Diatessaron chapter xlix). Therefore no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:71c, the TR’s Greek, “*kai* (also),” in the wider words, “This *fellow* was also (*kai*) with Jesus of Nazareth” (AV, showing italics for added word), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), G 011 (9th century), and X 033 (10th 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), 1292 (13th century, Byzantine outside of the General Epistles), and 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, twice in two different readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings). It is also supported as Latin, “*et* (also),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), n (5th / 6th 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 supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; and the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

However, a variant omits “also (Greek, *kai*; Latin *et*),” and so reads simply, “This

fellow was with Jesus of Nazareth” (showing italics for added word). This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 1355 (12th century). It is also found in the Latin in the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.).

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

Was the variant an accidental omission? In a given manuscript was the “*kai* (also)” abbreviated to a symbol taking up one letter space? Was it then lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was the variant a deliberate omission? When seeking to “reach inside the head” of any “which corrupt the word of God” (II Cor.2:17), one can only guess at their machinations, and one might guess wrongly. But since “*kai* (also)” is used at the first denial (Matt. 26:69) and the third denial (Matt. 26:73), did a scribe think it “a stylistic improvement” to prune away the “*kai* (also)” at the second denial of Matt. 26:71, so as “to increase the pathos of the passage with a climaxing ‘*kai* (also)’ in the third denial after the absence of such a ‘*kai* (also)’ in the second denial”?

Was this a deliberate or accidental omission? We do not know. We cannot now know. But we can know that it was an omission to the text Providentially preserved for us here in the representative Byzantine Greek text.

The TR’s reading has rock solid support in the Greek over time and through time, dating from ancient times. It enjoys the near monolithic support of both the Greek and Latin textual traditions. It further enjoys the support of the church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom of Constantinople. By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek and Latin, and no good textual argument to commend it. Taking into account these considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 26:71c 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. 26:71c, “also,” in the wider words, “This *fellow* was also with Jesus of Nazareth” (showing italics for added word), is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in 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), 1071 (12th century, independent), 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels), 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 Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian “A” Version (5th century); Ethiopic Version (c. 500); and Slavic Version (9th century).

However, the variant which omits “also,” and so reads simply, “This *fellow* was with Jesus of Nazareth” (showing italics for added word), 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 Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions; and Georgian “1” & “B” Versions (5th century).

At Matt. 26:71c, seemingly impressed by the “wide external support” for the TR’s reading in e.g., the Latin, C 04, L 019, the Syriac, and “Caesarean Text” (e.g., “Pre-Caesarean”: Families 1 & 13; “Caesarean Proper”: Theta 038, 565, 700, Armenian Version), on this occasion, the *American Standard Version* translators exercised their non-Alexandrian pincer arm. (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.) Thus for the wrong reasons the right reading is found in the ASV, “This man was also with Jesus of Nazareth” (ASV, which fails to use italics here for “man” as an added word).

But “the comfort zone” of the two leading Alexandrian texts, some “external support” in e.g., the Western Text and Syriac, and the neo-Alexandrian rule that “the shorter reading is generally the better reading;” meant that most neo-Alexandrians could “live up to” their ridiculous “academic stereotype” by prattling on about this being some assimilation from Luke 22. Thus e.g., the NU Text Committee thought that this second denial of Matt. 27:71,72 was assimilating the “also” from the third denial of “Luke 22.59” (Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 65; 2nd ed., 1994, p. 54).

Hence at Matt. 26:71c the erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. Thus e.g., the *English Standard Version* reads, “This man was with Jesus of Nazareth” (ESV); and Moffatt reads, “This fellow was with Jesus the Nazarene” (Moffatt Bible). So too, the incorrect variant is found at Matt. 26:71c in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

The near monolithic support of the Latin textual tradition for the TR’s reading here at Matt. 26:71c meant that the old Latin Papists of pre-Vatican II Council times got the correct reading in the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version. Thus the Douay-Rheims reads, “This man also was with Jesus of Nazareth.” By contrast, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post-Vatican II Council times here swerved away from the

truth of the *Textus Receptus* in order that they might embrace the falsehood of a neo-Alexandrian text with its Codex Vaticanus. Thus the incorrect variant is found in the Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB.

Matt. 26:75b “unto him” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Prima facie the reading of Latin, “*ei* (unto him)” in the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron supports the TR’s reading (Latin Diatessaron chapter clxxxviii). However, the Sangallensis Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex and the Vulgate has this same reading at Mark 14:72. Since it may have been brought in from Mark 14:72 as a consequence of Diatessaron formatting, no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 26:75b, the TR’s Greek, “*auto* (unto him),” in the wider words, “And Peter remembered the word of Jesus, which said unto him (*auto*),” etc. (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text, e.g., Codices A 02 (5th century, Byzantine in Gospels, Matt. 25:6b-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and Gamma 036 (10th century); Minuscule 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, twice in two different readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings). It is also found as Latin, “*ei* (unto him),” in old Latin Versions b (5th century) and f (6th century); and as Latin, “*sibi* (unto him),” in old Latin Version q (6th / 7th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Basil the Great (d. 379); the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; and the early mediaeval church Greek writer, John of Damascus (d. before 754).

However, a variant omitting Greek, “*auto* (unto him),” and so reading simply, “And Peter remembered the word of Jesus, which said,” etc., is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 61 (16th century, Byzantine in Gospels & Acts). It is further found in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the 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, Chrysostom (d. 407).

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

Was the variant an accidental omission? In a given manuscript did the “*auto* (unto him)” come at the end of a line? Was it then accidentally lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was the variant a deliberate omission? Did a prunist scribe consider that the

“*autō* (unto him)” was “unnecessarily wordy”? Did he then prune it away in order to make “a more succinct text”?

Was this a deliberate or accidental omission? We do not know. We cannot know. But we can know that it was an omission from the text as Providentially here preserved in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR’s reading is the representative Byzantine Greek text and has rock solid support in the Greek over time, and through time, dating from ancient times. It also has support in the Latin from ancient and early mediaeval times. It further enjoys the support of the church father and doctor, St. Basil the Great of Caesarea. By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek, although stronger support in the Latin. Weighing up these factors, 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. 26:75b 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. 26:75b, “unto him,” in the wider words, “And Peter remembered the word of Jesus, which said unto him,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in 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 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in all extant Syriac Versions; Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions, and a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant omitting, “unto him,” and so reading simply, “And Peter remembered the word of Jesus, which said,” 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); and Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 892 (9th century, mixed text type). It is also found in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and the Armenian Version (5th century).

At Matt. 26:75b the erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence the ASV reads, “And Peter remembered the word which Jesus had said,” etc. . So too, the incorrect variant is found at Matt. 26:75b in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, and NIV.

There is nothing new about this corrupt variant here are Matt. 25:75b. The old Latin Papists of pre-Vatican II Council times used it in both the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version. Hence the Douay-Rheims reads, “And Peter remembered the word of Jesus which he had said,” etc. . So too, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post-Vatican II Council times have adopted this incorrect variant in their Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB.

At Matt. 26:75b the *Today's English Version* reads, “and Peter remembered what Jesus had told him:” etc. (TEV). What are we to make of this reading? Is this an example of the TEV translators using their non-Alexandrian text pincer arm which neo-Alexandrians occasionally employ in conjunction with their Alexandrian text pincer arm? Did the TEV translators here consider that the “wide attestation” of the TR’s reading in e.g., the Syriac, Egyptian Coptic, and C 04, mean that this was “therefore the better reading”? (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.) Or is this a TEV “dynamic equivalent”? Sadly, the TEV is such a loose’n’liberal “translation” we cannot be sure of the answers to these questions, and nor can any of their sadly misguided devotees.